

GOALS 2000: EDUCATE AMERICA ACT STATE PROFILES



COUNCIL OF CHIEF STATE SCHOOL OFFICERS
STATE LEADERSHIP CENTER

NOVEMBER 1995

GOALS 2000: EDUCATE AMERICA ACT STATE PROFILES



COUNCIL OF CHIEF STATE SCHOOL OFFICERS
STATE LEADERSHIP CENTER
NOVEMBER 1995

COUNCIL OF CHIEF STATE SCHOOL OFFICERS (CCSSO)

The Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) is a nationwide, nonprofit organization of the 57 public officials who head departments of public education in the 50 states, five U.S. extra-state jurisdictions, the District of Columbia, and the Department of Defense Dependents Schools. It has functioned as an independent national council since 1927 and has maintained a Washington office since 1948. CCSSO seeks its members' consensus on major education issues and expresses their views to civic and professional organizations, to federal agencies, to Congress, and to the public. Through its structure of committees and task forces, the Council responds to a broad range of concerns about education and provides leadership on major education issues.

Because the Council represents each state's chief education administrator, it has access to the educational and governmental establishment in each state and to the national influence that accompanies this unique position. CCSSO forms coalitions with many other education organizations and is able to provide leadership for a variety of policy concerns that affect elementary and secondary education. Thus, CCSSO members are able to act cooperatively on matters vital to the education of America's young people.

The CCSSO State Leadership Center provides direct assistance to chief state school officers and state policy makers on leadership and systemic planning issues and the coordination of activities in support of systemic arrangements at the state and federal levels.

Council of Chief State School Officers

Judith A. Billings (Washington), President

William T. Randall (Colorado), President-Elect

Gordon M. Ambach, Executive Director

John T. MacDonald, State Leadership Center Director

One Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.

Suite 700

Washington, DC 20001

(202) 408-5505

ISBN 1-884037-19-4

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Introduction	1
STATE PROFILES	
Alaska	3
Arizona	7
Arkansas	11
California	15
Colorado	21
Connecticut	25
Delaware	29
Hawaii	35
Illinois	39
Indiana	43
Iowa	49
Kansas	53
Kentucky	59
Louisiana	65
Maine	71
Maryland	77
Massachusetts	83
Michigan	89
Minnesota	93
Mississippi	97
Missouri	103
Nebraska	107
Nevada	111
New Jersey	117
New Mexico	121
New York	125
North Carolina	129
North Dakota	135
Oklahoma	141
Oregon	145
Pennsylvania	153
Rhode Island	157
South Carolina	163
Tennessee	169
Texas	173

Utah	179
Vermont	183
Washington	187
West Virginia	191
Wisconsin	197
Wyoming	201
GOALS 2000 STATE CONTACTS	205

INTRODUCTION

Goals 2000: Educate America Act was signed into law March 31, 1994, marking a major turning point in the focus of federal education legislation. By endorsing national education goals and procedures to establish education standards, by providing grants to states and local districts to advance reform, by promoting deregulation for better results with federal programs that serve the same children, and by developing work-force skill standards, Goals 2000 is helping states and localities build a new capacity for an education system that promotes higher levels of performance by all students. Title III of Goals 2000, "State and Local Education Systemic Improvement," has provided the framework for the development and implementation of systemic education improvement plans at the state and local levels. Year one of the legislation found forty-seven states making application for participation in the federal initiative. Ohio did not file a year one application and chose instead to submit a completed pre-existing improvement plan to bring the level of first year participation to forty-eight states.

States are currently at various stages of development and implementation of improvement efforts. As of November 20, 1995, thirteen states, Delaware, Kansas, Kentucky, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Mexico, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, Texas, Utah, and Vermont completed the peer review and approval of their Goals 2000 State Program Improvement Plans by the U.S. Department of Education. In addition, Nevada has completed the peer review process and Minnesota and West Virginia have indicated that their improvement plans are ready for the peer review and approval process. Furthermore, eighteen states, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Hawaii, Illinois, Louisiana, Maine, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Washington, and the District of Columbia have made substantial progress with their Improvement Plans. To date, thirty-five states have received second year Goals 2000 funding.

To assist states in the first year of the Goals 2000 initiative, the Council published *State Baselines for Goals 2000 Implementation*, in May 1994. The *Baselines* report provided definitive information on the status of the states in relation to Title III of Goals 2000. The follow up report, *Status Report State Systemic Education Improvements, August 1995*, provides a resource for state and federal policy makers informing decision making with the most up-to-date information on state accomplishments and lessons learned in developing and implementing improvement efforts.

To continue the Council's assistance to the states, the State Leadership Center is tracking the progress of states in the development and implementation of Goals 2000 state plans. The information contained in this report has been extracted from the states' first year Goals 2000 applications and is in the format of state profiles. The information was collected and verified with the states over a six month period beginning in May 1995. Updates of the profiles were made through October 1995. The state profiles contain information regarding the process for the state plan development; formation of the state planning panel and development of the plan; learning technologies plan development and integration with Goals 2000; the subgrant program; and budget information. This information is being disseminated to help identify best practices, allow states to share ideas and experiences, and help promote the development of a community

or network of professionals to draw on peer resources.

This report was prepared by Angela Clifford and John MacDonald of CCSSO's State Leadership Center. The production of this report has been made possible by a grant from the U.S. Department of Education to the State Education Improvement Partnership, a joint collaborative effort among the Council of Chief State School Officers, Education Commission of the States, National Association of State Boards of Education, National Conference of State Legislatures, and National Governors' Association. The State Leadership Center of CCSSO is the sole author of this document.

GOALS 2000: EDUCATE AMERICA ACT

STATE PROFILE

STATE: Alaska
DATE APPLICATION SUBMITTED: July 27, 1994
DATE APPLICATION APPROVED: September 12, 1994
FUNDING: FIRST YEAR: \$375,999; SECOND YEAR: \$1,503,996 (estimate);
TECHNOLOGY: \$75,000

I. PROCESS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE STATE PLAN

A Pre-Existing Reform Initiatives:

In June 1991 Alaska's Commissioner of Education, Jerry Covey, developed a plan to improve Alaska's schools. The State Board of Education endorsed Covey's plan, Alaska 2000 and once the State Board of Education conferred with Governor Hickel the campaign began the implementation of 38 recommendations within nine objectives. The nine objectives include: Setting Our Sights; Empowering Parents; Improving Student Performance; Keeping Kids in School; Removing Barriers to Innovation and Excellence; Raising Standards for Educators; Improving Instruction and Administration; Making Dollars Count; and Keeping Schools Safe and Modern. The campaign for this plan is proceeding simultaneously on four fronts: the Legislature, the State Board of Education, the Department of Education, and various ad hoc committees appointed to develop more detailed proposals for implementation.

B Formation of the State Planning Panel and Development of the Plan:

Alaska plans to use the pre-existing Alaska 2000 Steering Committee to serve as the core group for the Planning Panel for Goals 2000. The Panel is made up of 21 Alaskans that represent a statewide group of educators, parents, students, advocacy groups and other interested members of the public. The panel will be joined by an additional 21 Alaskans to fulfill the required categories of representation set in Goals 2000. To develop the Goals 2000 State Improvement Plan, the Panel will meet in the fall of 1994 to review the 38 recommendations approved by the State Board of Education. They will review the progress the Department of Education has made toward those recommendations and Alaska's progress in light of eleven areas of the Goals 2000 plan and make recommendations on ways to redirect or enhance Alaska 2000 in light of Goals 2000. These recommendations will be the basis for the state plan. The Panel will communicate using distance technology for continued planning.

C Learning Technologies Plan Development and Integration with Goals 2000 State Reform Plan:

Aligned with all other aspects of Alaska's Goals 2000, the Technology Plan will build on existing efforts and recommendations of Alaska 2000. A task force which will include members of the Alaska 2000 Steering Committee will be formed to develop the plan. Major components of the plan will be based on the original Alaska 2000 recommendations and include: developing student standards in the area of technological competence;

requiring competency in educational technology for initial teacher certification and certification renewal; providing statewide training and support in educational technology for teachers; combining existing networks to create a statewide educational telecommunications network, accessible to all schools, that will support audio, video and data; and implementing a statewide administrative telecommunications reporting system. The plan will also build upon the various local, statewide and regional work in technology and telecommunications and existing infrastructure such as the 154 Star Schools sites in Alaska, the University of Alaska Computer Network, and the planning and implementation efforts of the Governor's Telecommunications Information Council. The planning process' initial effort will be a joint working conference hosted by the Commissioner of Education, Jerry Covey, and University of Alaska President, Jerome Komisar. This conference, which is modeled on the Secretary of Education's Conference on Educational Technology in May 1994, will bring together representatives of K-12 education, institutions of higher learning, local and long-distance carriers, cable companies, public broadcasters, legislators and other agencies to work on specific recommendations to be included in the plan.

II. DESCRIPTION OF THE SUBGRANT PROGRAM

A Process for Making Subgrants for LEA Improvement Plans:

Alaska plans to use one RFP for the Local Education Agency (LEA) Subgrant process and use a single review process to distribute the funds for LEA Local Improvement Plans, Pre-service Teacher Education and Professional Development. Alaska hopes that this process will encourage collaboration among LEAs and between LEAs and Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs). The grant awards will range from \$3,000 to \$7,000, and part of the grant award will be used to attend a statewide planning meeting modeled on the national Goals 2000 meeting that state teams attended in Washington, DC. This meeting will allow the SEA to work closely with LEAs and IHEs on local and statewide reform plans. Alaska expects to issue predominantly LEA Local Improvement Plan grants. In addition, Alaska will require districts to assure that 75% of their grant will be used for planning for individual school improvement plans.

The Department of Education will facilitate the required peer review process. Department staff and members of the public, appointed by the Commissioner of Education, will constitute a review team of five to seven members. The Commissioner will appoint some members from the Quality of Workforce Committee to ensure expertise to make quality decisions concerning pre-service teacher education and professional development.

Review Process Timeline:

August 1, 1994	RFP distributed
September 20, 1994	Proposals due
September 27, 1994	Peer Review process
October 3, 1994	LEAs notified
October 17, 1994	Grant Awards distributed

B Process for Making Subgrants for Improvements in Preservice Education Programs:

Alaska will fund at least two proposals that address Preservice Teacher Education and Professional Development. See "A" above for process.

C Process for Making Subgrants for Continuing Professional Development:
See "A" and "B" above.**III. GOALS 2000 1994-95 PROPOSED ALLOCATIONS**

A	Subgrants	<u>\$269,394</u>
	1. LEA Improvement	\$225,599
	2. Grants Administration	\$43,795
B	State Plan Development	<u>\$106,605</u>
C	Technology Plan Development	<u>\$75,000</u>
D	Total Title III Allocation	<u>\$375,999</u>
E	Total Goals 2000/Technology Allocation	<u>\$450,999</u>

GOALS 2000: EDUCATE AMERICA ACT

STATE PROFILE

STATE: Arizona
DATE APPLICATION SUBMITTED: July 29, 1994
DATE APPLICATION APPROVED: September 14, 1994
FUNDING: FIRST YEAR: \$1,257,598; SECOND YEAR: \$5,030,392 (estimate);
TECHNOLOGY: \$75,000

I. PROCESS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE STATE PLAN

A Pre-Existing Reform Initiatives:

In the development of today's state standards and assessment program in Arizona, basic skills and tests developed by local school districts in the 1960's and 1970's as a means of establishing Continuous Uniform Evaluation Systems gave way to a statewide system of Essential Skills which were adopted by the State Board of Education in 1987. In that same year, a Governor's Task Force undertook the "Action Agenda for Educational Excellence in Arizona." This Task Force which included the Governor, Superintendent of Public Instruction, state legislators, business, teachers from all levels, administrators, parents and other community interests, conducted hearings across the state before setting forth its recommendations. In 1987 the legislature, acting on their recommendations, passed the "Goals for Educational Excellence" (ARS 15-741) bill which included the Arizona Student Assessment Program (ASAP). This far-reaching program required an extensive analysis of state curriculum guidelines, testing programs and reporting of student progress. As a result, Arizona now has in place a plan which aids schools, districts, educators and policy makers to be more accountable and responsive for the learning success of all students. The ASAP has resulted in sweeping changes in curriculum alignment, student assessment, teaching strategies and accountability processes. The state validation assessments at grades 3, 8, and 12, which were implemented in 1992, have been suspended pending further review and revision. Each district, however, will continue to implement a District Assessment Plan under which all students are to be assessed on the state's standards with proficiency levels determined by the district. In 1993 the State Board of Education considered new graduation requirements for the class of 2000 which were based on ASAP performance assessments. A Standards Task Force made up of representative groups of teachers, administrators, parents, and business people from across the state met to propose the state proficiency levels for this requirement. However, adoption by the State Board has been postponed for one year while the assessment issues are being resolved.

B Formation of the State Planning Panel and Development of the Plan:

In 1987 a large representative panel comprised of legislators, business representatives, educators and parents was involved in a joint legislative committee on "Goals for Arizona's Educational Excellence." This first panel was appointed by the Governor and the Superintendent of Public Instruction. Since 1987 many sub-groups, task forces and state committees have been responsible for continuing the work toward reaching these goals. Goals 2000 has provided an opportunity to expand the involvement of Arizona education

stakeholders in the reform efforts and will provide for continuing refinement and improvement activities. Many communication activities such as meetings, symposiums, forums, and teleconferences across the state have contributed to the involvement of parents and other stakeholders and will provide information to assist in the reform efforts. These communication activities will be used to refine the state standards and assessment process. A state panel made up of liaisons from existing representative groups, will be reestablished to serve as a broad-based committee to guide, monitor and report the progress of the state's reform efforts. Such a panel will comply with Goals 2000 guidelines in representation, and will be coordinated with the School-to-Work efforts in the state.

C Learning Technologies Plan Development and Integration with Goals 2000 State Reform Plan:

The State Board of Education has adopted a "State Board Policy on the Development of a Plan for Technology" (1989) and a master plan for the infusion of technology into Arizona's schools (1990). This plan was developed through collaborative efforts involving government, education, business and industry. There will be activity to: review and modify the plans; review and modify the technological requirements; identify and disseminate through AZ Edlink exemplary programs and practices relating to the use of technology and telecommunications in education and provide technical assistance to schools in the development and implementation of technologies and telecommunications; determine which technologies and applications support the curriculum, instruction and assessment strategies of the Essential Skills and ASAP; develop and deliver teacher training which uses technology and telecommunications; determine a funding estimate and possible sources of funding for the full implementation of TIEDS and AZTEL 2000; determine how the Department and local education agencies will coordinate and cooperate with business and industry and with public and private telecommunications entities; determine how the Department will use technology and telecommunications to meet the needs of children from low-income families; develop a review and update process and cycle; and determine how the Department will facilitate collaborative efforts between literacy resource centers, local education agencies, and adult and family literacy providers.

II. DESCRIPTION OF THE SUBGRANT PROGRAM

A Process for Making Subgrants for LEA Improvement Plans:

82% of the first year allocation for Arizona has been distributed to LEAs for planning, preservice and professional development activity through a single competitive application process. Each application will devote at least 80% of its funds to staff development activity which is relative to the Arizona Goals for Educational Excellence and or expansions of their current plans which are compatible with the intent of Goals 2000. In order to ensure that the subgrants have the greatest potential for bottom-up reform, purchase of equipment and employment of outside consulting services will be prohibited. In addition to the staff development activities, the LEA may include in its application funds for planning and/or preservice activity. Fifty-six subgrants ranging from \$5,000 to \$50,000 have been made to LEAs.

- B Process for Making Subgrants for Improvements in Preservice Education Programs:**
See "A" above.
- C Process for Making Subgrants for Continuing Professional Development:**
See "A" above.

III. GOALS 2000 1994-95 PROPOSED ALLOCATIONS

A	Subgrants	<u>\$1,038,019</u>
	1. Professional Development	
	2. LEA planning and Preservice Teacher Education	
B	State Plan Development	<u>\$219,579</u>
C	Technology Plan Development	<u>\$75,000</u>
D	Total Title III Allocation	<u>\$1,257,598</u>
E	Total Goals 2000/Technology Allocation	<u>\$1,332,598</u>

GOALS 2000: EDUCATE AMERICA ACT

STATE PROFILE

STATE: Arkansas
DATE APPLICATION SUBMITTED: July 26, 1994
DATE APPLICATION APPROVED: August 10, 1994
FUNDING: FIRST YEAR: \$895,400; SECOND YEAR: \$3,581,600 (estimate);
TECHNOLOGY: \$75,000.

I. PROCESS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE STATE PLAN

A Pre-Existing Reform Initiatives:

Arkansas' approach is to utilize Goals 2000 to enhance the state's pre-existing reform agenda which has been well defined and is in the process of implementation. Many of the reforms are a result of the enactment of Act 236 of 1991. The omnibus legislation defines outcomes for students consistent with the national goals based on the premise that students can and must meet high quality educational standards. The components of Act 236 are closely aligned with the requirements of the Goals 2000 legislation and consist of six major components: 1) learner outcomes; 2) curriculum frameworks; 3) performance assessment; 4) system of outcome-based licensure; 5) professional development; and 6) restructuring the SEA. The Act created an Advisory Task Force to oversee the implementation of the program and two additional task forces: a Linkage Task Force with responsibility for curriculum framework development, performance assessment, and professional development; and a Teacher Licensure Task Force with responsibility for restructuring the licensure and certification process. The task forces represent a broad educational constituency base and are supported by the SEA. In addition to the establishment of learner outcomes under Act 236 the Linkage Task Force is developing curriculum frameworks under two USED grants in the core subject areas of math, science, English/language arts, social studies and the arts. Other reform activities include participation in NSF's SSI program, Relearning, Coalition of Essential Schools, Carnegie's Middle Schools Initiative and the Coalition for Restructuring Schools. Act 846 of 1993 has enabled the restructuring of student assessment strategies to link the assessment of student learner outcomes with the curriculum frameworks. Other related reforms include the formation of the 1994 Governor's Task Force to study Arkansas school funding to address current complex policy issues; the formation in 1990 of the Arkansas Family Policy Council for systems changes to children and family services; the receipt of a State Development Grant under Title II of the School-to-Work Opportunities Act; Act 1288 of 1993 to establish alternative learning environments for students; and an early grades initiative (grades K-3) for intensive summer instruction of children.

B Formation of the State Planning Panel and Development of the Plan:

Arkansas will unify the duties of the Advisory Task Force under Act 236 with those of the new State Improvement Plan Panel. The members will be appointed in accordance with Section 306 of the Goals Act. Panel members will serve staggered terms from one to three years determined by lot at their first meeting. Panel members may not serve two

succeeding terms. Three Working Teams will be established and will be chaired by a member of the State Panel: Curriculum, Staff Development and Assessment; Teacher Licensure; and Technology. Additional members may be added to assist with the work of the teams. Reports will be made to the State Panel who will in turn report to the State Board of Education. An SEA Support Team to the State Improvement Panel will be appointed by the Director to provide liaison and assistance to the State Panel. The major focus of the SEA Team will be to link the SEA's research and design work to the planning efforts of the State Panel.

Milestones are as follows:

Name Panel and Chair and SEA Support Team

Panel orientation meeting; Name working teams and additional team members

Work sessions/public sessions with Panel Chair and SEA liaison

Review LEA (consortium) proposals for planning, preservice projects and staff development projects by Panel

Develop draft of the State Improvement Plan by SubTeams and SEA Team

Panel's Regional Meetings of Plan draft

Revision of Plan based on input from regional meetings Submit Plan to State Board of Education for approval by Panel Chair

Submit Plan to USED for approval and (second year funding) by Panel Chair and Director

C Learning Technologies Plan Development and Integration with Goals 2000 State Reform Plan:

It is the intent of the Arkansas Department of Education to utilize the resources of the Planning year, \$75,000, and the structure described under the State Improvement Plan Panel to spend up to one year in consolidating the state's educational technology efforts and to create a State Education Technology Plan that will provide direction and resources at the state level and also provide assistance and structure to local districts so as to enable them to enter into district technology planning. The state educational technology planning process will be coordinated under the Technology Sub Panel of the State Improvement Plan Panel. Three to five members of the State Improvement Plan Panel will form the nucleus of the Technology Sub Panel, with additional members to be named by the Director to ensure integration with the State Plan. One member of the SEA Support Panel will be assigned as liaison to the Technology Sub Panel.

II. DESCRIPTION OF THE SUBGRANT PROGRAM

A Process for Making Subgrants for LEA Improvement Plans:

Arkansas will allocate 60% of its Title III monies \$578,369 to subgrants for LEA Improvement Grants, Preservice Grants and Professional Development Grants. No information is provided as to the division of the funds between areas, nor is there information on the anticipated number of funding range of grants for the three subgrant areas. It is proposed that by September 1, 1994, the SEA team designated by the Director will have completed the development of the subgrant applications in the form of RFPs and application/selection criteria according to sections 309(a) and (b) of the Act. The SEA team, in establishing priorities and additional selection criteria, will also develop a network through which technical assistance will be provided to districts and communities as they begin work to develop proposals. Mention is not made of the application review process for LEA subgrants.

B Process for Making Subgrants for Improvements in Preservice Education Programs:

Subgrants for this area will be made according to procedures as indicated for LEA Improvement Grants excepting that the applications will be subject to a peer review process.

C Process for Making Subgrants for Continuing Professional Development:

Process for subgrants for this area is identical to that of subgrants for Preservice Education.

III. GOALS 2000 1994-95 PROPOSED ALLOCATIONS

A	Subgrants	<u>\$537,240</u>
	1. LEA Improvement Plan	
	2. Preservice Education	
	3. Professional Development	
B	State Plan Development	<u>\$358,160</u>
	Administrative Support	\$100,000
C	Technology Plan Development	<u>\$75,000</u>
D	Total Title III Allocation	<u>\$895,400</u>
E	Total Goals 2000/Technology Allocation	<u>\$970,400</u>

GOALS 2000: EDUCATE AMERICA ACT

STATE PROFILE

STATE: California
DATE APPLICATION SUBMITTED: July 20, 1994
DATE APPLICATION APPROVED: August 24, 1994
FUNDING: FIRST YEAR: \$9,872,285; SECOND YEAR: \$39,489,140 (estimate);
TECHNOLOGY: \$390,688.

I. PROCESS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE STATE PLAN

A Pre-Existing Reform Initiatives:

In the early 1980s California launched a massive statewide educational reform effort to improve student learning. The Hughes-Hart Educational Reform Act of 1983 was based on the firm belief that all students can learn and that improved student learning would occur with the adoption of higher standards for students, teachers, and schools. As a consequence, this Act and the corresponding statewide reform efforts initiated since that time have included the following: reinstated graduation requirements; revamped state curriculum frameworks that emphasize the teaching of a thinking, meaning-centered curriculum for all students; lengthened school day and school year; attraction of high caliber new teachers to the classroom; establishment of a mentor teacher program; revision of the assessment system; improvement in the quality of textbooks by alignment with the curriculum frameworks; improvement in professional development activities for teachers and administrators; and an establishment of stronger accountability systems.

At the center of California's reform efforts is a strong core curriculum that emphasizes reading, writing, problem solving, and conceptual understanding over the memorization of discrete facts and data. California redesigned the curriculum frameworks and improved the quality of instructional materials to match the vision of a challenging core curriculum. New curriculum frameworks were developed in each subject area: mathematics, science, English-language arts, history - social science, foreign language, visual and performing arts, health, and physical education. These frameworks serve as a guide to schools developing their own local curricula. As the frameworks were revised, California also engaged in a drive to improve textbooks in the schools so that they were consistent with the message conveyed through the frameworks: that students need more challenging work. It became clear that teachers would need more support in order to teach the new, more demanding curriculum. California now has in place, through SB 1882, a system for organizing and providing staff development for teachers throughout the state. The system has three parts: site-level grants, Resource Agencies and Consortia, and Subject Matter Projects. Through these projects, higher education faculty members as well as teacher leaders work together to identify exemplary teaching practices, develop materials on teaching the subject areas, and provide opportunities to explore new ways to teach the curriculum outlined in the frameworks. The professional development system is also supported by the School Improvement Program, the Mentor Teacher Program, and the California School Leadership Academy which provides intensive training for principals in the new curriculum.

California also engages in a school site empowerment process. Currently, virtually all of

the state's high schools receive funds which trigger their creation of a school site council and their participation in the Program Quality Review Process. School site councils are composed of an equal number of parents and of school staff and are charged with developing the school site plan and recommending it to the local governing board. Once every three years, schools participate in the Program Quality Review (PQR) Process which includes the school generating a self study and interacting with a team of peer reviewers from another district. The PQR process shapes the school's improvement plan and the expenditure of school improvement funds. In addition, California is in the process of revising its testing system to provide for more congruence between assessment, curriculum, and pedagogy. The California Learning Assessment System (CLAS) in math, literature, and writing was administered statewide for the first time in 1993-94 at grades 4, 8, and 10. At the current time, legislation is pending which would specify a more inclusive process for assessment and standards development and revise the state testing system on the basis of the 1993-94 experience. California also convened a series of task forces to develop visions of what successful elementary, middle, and high schools would look like, as well as recommending sweeping changes in methods of teaching children ages four through six. Task force reports have been published and distributed in all of these areas, and active networks of elementary, middle, and high schools have been created to implement the changes recommended in each of these documents.

B Formation of the State Planning Panel and Development of the Plan:

Although California does not yet have a panel in place and has not begun formal deliberation on the State Plan, a great deal has been accomplished toward the initiation of such a plan and the concurrent operation of local planning processes. Specifically, California has made substantial progress in five major areas: 1) Completion of the first-year subgrant process; 2) Development of a statewide support system and technical assistance network for consortia engaging in systemic planning; 3) Development of a process for integrating state and local planning and implementation under Goals 2000, IASA, and School-to-Work legislation; 4) Substantive information provision to educational and community-based organizations and associated information gathering; and 5) Identification of major policy areas to be addressed by the State Panel and preparation of issue papers in a number of these areas. In addition, a context has been established for movement on appointment of a State Panel and preparation of the State Plan, although this process has been complicated by the election of a new State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Delaine Eastin, as well as the entry of Governor Pete Wilson into the presidential race. Superintendent Eastin has moved to embrace the principles associated with new federal legislation and has prepared a roster of potential panel members and suggested chairpersons. She has recently been appointed Chair of the Governing Board of the New Standards Project and is a strong supporter of Goals 2000. Governor Wilson commissioned a major report on the status and future of California public education through the Education Commission of the States. The report, *Rising to the Challenge*, calls for rethinking, along the lines recommended by Goals 2000 legislation, several facets of the educational system, including ways to improve student achievement, reconnect schools and communities, and build a framework of support for the new system of schools. Together, these actions have set the stage for appointment of the State Panel and initial productive work toward a State Plan. Operating on the assumption that appointment of the Panel will occur during the summer of 1995, California is planning for the first general

meeting of the State Panel to be held in September of 1995. At this meeting, Panel members will be assigned to subcommittees and will develop a schedule for further subcommittee meetings to be held during the fall and winter. In February 1996 a second general meeting will be held for presentation of subcommittee reports and general discussion. Based on information presented at this meeting, a draft of the State Plan will be developed. This draft will be mailed to the State Panel for comments, and following revision, will be available for public critique during public hearings and a teleconference in March. The final draft of the State Plan will be ratified by the Panel at the April meeting, at which time a continuing process for the Panel to be updated on the progress of local systemic reform efforts will be developed. In addition, the Panel will determine a process for making revisions to the State Plan, if necessary, and informing the public of such revisions. During May 1996 the State Plan will be reviewed by the State Board of Education, during which process the public will have an opportunity to comment on the Plan. The completed Plan will then be approved by the Superintendent of Public Instruction and by the State Board of Education and submitted to the U.S. Department of Education during June 1996.

C Learning Technologies Plan Development and Integration with Goals 2000 State Reform Plan:

Since 1984 California has developed a broad range of programs to support technology use in the schools (e.g., Model Technology Schools, the California Technology Project, Software and Video Clearinghouses, Instructional Television, Research and Development Projects, California Student Information Services Project, the Telemation Training Project, and the Building the Future Project). All of these efforts are based on the belief that technology is a powerful support for the kind of curriculum outlined in the California Curriculum Frameworks. Many of these programs have been identified as "technology" projects that work in isolation of other programs in the state. California's Technology Plan within the Goals 2000 Plan will be a plan to move technology into the center of the reform effort. One goal of the Education Technology Plan is to create a strategy to use funding more powerfully to provide support services to other programs and organizations that impact California schools. During the past year, with the advice of the Education Council for Technology in Learning (ECTL) and the approval of the State Board of Education, the Department developed plans for implementing the California Technology Assistance Project (CTAP) in 1995-96 and beyond. The CTAP will change the way California provides funding for technology. For example, rather than funding state-level programs, such as the Model Technology Schools, instructional television services, the Telemation Project, and research and development projects, California will allocate funds to the ten county superintendents' regions to develop and implement regional technology plans which are focused on local needs. Each region, with input from teachers, students, parents, librarians, administrators, and representatives from the community, business, and higher education, will develop a regional plan that meets the criteria established by ECTL. The regions will not only prepare regional plans for approval by ECTL, but they will also develop partnerships with other regions through the Central Coordinating Council of Regional Representatives. The restructuring described above will be implemented in three phases. Phase 1 will be a planning phase lasting from July 1995 through January 1996. The proposed scope of CTAP functions, the number of districts and counties involved in each region, and the need to develop a more "assistance" oriented and coordinated set of

services will require developmental time and support from state staff. Phase 2 will be a start-up phase covering the period from January through December 1996, a time for regions to select staff and coordinate their services with other state, regional, and local initiatives. Phase 3, beginning in January 1997, will be the comprehensive implementation of CTAP. Technology planning will be carried out in conjunction with the development of the State Plan in order that the Technology Planning Committee can work with the Goals 2000 State Panel to ensure that the technology plan is integrated with the reforms proposed in the Goals 2000 State Plan and that technology has a central place in education reform.

II. DESCRIPTION OF THE SUBGRANT PROGRAM

A Process for Making Subgrants for LEA Improvement Plans:

Development of the Request for Applications (RFA) for subgrants, information provision to potential applicants, and the processing and scoring of applications have constituted the major portion of Goals 2000 activities in California during 1995. In the summer and fall of 1994 numerous meetings were held to solicit recommendations for shaping the local grant process. These meetings, like others, included representatives of local districts and schools, staff development professionals and regional trainers, California Department of Education managers and consultants possessing a broad range of expertise covering various categorical programs, curriculum and assessment areas, and the elementary, middle, and high school grade level initiatives. During the winter, while writing of the RFA was progressing, conferences were held in the northern and southern portions of the state, with, among other purposes, that of providing information on Goals 2000 and building a constituency interested in applying for grants. The Request for Applications was distributed to all district and county offices of education on March 1, and conferences were held in Santa Clara and Los Angeles on March 1 and 2 to build support for the application process and to distribute RFAs and additional materials to other interested parties. A support system was also available to individuals interested in putting together a Goals 2000 consortium. Two hundred and twenty-six applications for subgrants were read and scored by approximately 100 readers who represented a cross-section of local educators and administrators, parents and community leaders, and representatives of the CDE. Applications were scored against seven rubrics representing components spelled out in the RFA (leadership capacity, plan for forming a local panel, process for developing a local improvement plan, commitment to individual and organizational learning, schools' rationales for participation, budget, and systemic approach). One hundred and sixty-nine consortia representing approximately 1600 participating schools were selected for funding and will receive initial funding in October from 1994-95 monies. Each of the subgrant applicants will receive written feedback on strengths of their application and recommendations for improvement. California also intends to set in place a process for supporting those districts whose applications were turned down, so that they will continue work in preparation for a second grant application.

In order to ensure that districts and county offices receive sufficient information and support in developing grant applications and, following receipt of funds, in carrying out the activities proposed in their plan, the Department of Education has developed an extensive technical assistance process based on regional support services. Because

California has over 5 million students and over 1000 school districts, there is already in existence a system of regional staff development and support provision through county offices of education in 12 regions of the state. In order to support Goals 2000, the Department has made an effort to bring together individuals within each region that specialize in staff development related to categorical programs, special education, bilingual education, curriculum and instruction related staff development, colleges and universities, and support for school change and restructuring. In addition, experts on technology, collective bargaining, integrated children's services, school leadership, and other specialized areas have been involved. Two major support structures have been created. Regional Support Team members numbering approximately 350 have been providing information on Goals 2000 and systemic reform since the fall of 1994. In the spring of 1995, in conjunction with the RFA conferences, two statewide institutes were held for the purpose of training Regional Facilitators. This group of approximately 200 staff development professionals, some of whom are also Support Team members, have conducted regional training on preparing for and writing the grant application. In addition, Goals 2000 staff and Categorical Programs staff are currently developing this system of support that will be delivered through Regional Centers and School Support Teams composed of outstanding educators.

B Process for Making Subgrants for Improvements in Preservice Education Programs:
See "A" above.

C Process for Making Subgrants for Continuing Professional Development:
See "A".

III. GOALS 2000 1994-95 PROPOSED ALLOCATIONS

A	Subgrants	<u>\$6,178,643</u>
B	State Plan Development	<u>\$3,693,642</u>
	1. Administration	\$1,378,555
	2. Local Assistance	\$2,315,087
C	Technology Plan Development	<u>\$390,688</u>
D	Total Title III Allocation	<u>\$9,872,285</u>
E	Total Goals 2000/Technology Allocation	<u>\$10,262,973</u>

GOALS 2000: EDUCATE AMERICA ACT

STATE PROFILE

STATE: Colorado
DATE APPLICATION SUBMITTED: July 21, 1994
DATE APPLICATION APPROVED: August 10, 1994
FUNDING: FIRST YEAR: \$986,663; SECOND YEAR: \$3,946,652 (estimate);
TECHNOLOGY: \$75,000

I. PROCESS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE STATE PLAN

A Pre-Existing Reform Initiatives:

Colorado has a rich history of public education reform. There has long been a focus in Colorado on student performance results, community involvement and choice. Within the past few years, legislation has been enacted concerning waivers, teacher licensure, standards, and charter schools. Reforms promoting lifelong learning and enhancing specific educational programs have been implemented. **Student Performance Standards:** In 1985 the Colorado State Board of Education adopted new accreditation rules which required school districts to publicly disclose student performance results to their constituencies and the state. The requirements for public disclosure included graduation rates, graduate success in higher education and the work place, student achievement and student dropout rates. **Colorado State Goals:** The 1988 Public School Finance Act's accountability requirements established: state goals for achievement, graduation rate, and student attendance; strategies to address state goals which include improved teaching methods that provide students with the opportunity for scholastic achievement, increased parental and community support and involvement in meeting expectations of the educational system, provision of a learning environment and staff that is responsive to the individual needs of students, and provision of a learning environment based on high expectations and challenges for students and staff; that every public school have an advisory accountability committee which annually develops measurable goals and plans for improving that school's achievement and graduation rates - such advisory committees must include students, parents, community members, and teachers; that each school annually submit a report to the school's constituency and the school district describing progress related to the school's measurable goals; and that each school district submit a report to its community and the state describing progress toward the district's goals for achievement, attendance and graduation rate. **Community Involvement:** Since 1971 all school districts have had required advisory accountability committees involving parents and community members. Since 1988 each public school has required advisory accountability committees involving students, parents and community members in decisions about school improvement. Annually, each school in Colorado must provide a report to the community which describes the level of community involvement in decision-making for the past year. **Flexibility and Waivers:** In 1989 the Colorado Legislature gave the State Board of Education power to waive any education statute or regulatory requirement for schools or school districts. Such waivers are for the purpose of enhancing educational opportunity and eliminating any legal barriers preventing schools from

realizing their achievement goals. **Preschool Program:** The General Assembly established a Colorado preschool program which began implementation in school districts as of January 1989. The program is designed to adequately prepare all children to learn through preschool programs in school districts with high dropout rates or low performance of children in kindergarten and primary grades. Each district's program is managed by a district advisory council with broad-based community involvement. **Plan for Improving Achievement in Math, Science, and Technology:** Colorado is one of five states to receive ten million dollars through the Statewide Systemic Initiative. This grant enables the state to actualize the statutorily defined plan to broaden the impact, accelerate the pace and increase the effectiveness of, and achieve significant improvements in science, mathematics, and technology education in pre-K through 12 and post-secondary levels. **Teacher Licensure and Professional Development:** In 1991 the Colorado Legislature replaced teacher certification with a new teacher licensure program requiring licensed teachers to demonstrate proficiency related to new professional standards recommended by two state professional standards boards and enacted by the State Board of Education. **Academic Content Standards:** In 1993 House Bill 1313 enacted by the Colorado Legislature set in motion the development of state model content standards for six core subject areas to be adopted by June 1, 1995. State model content standards in five additional subject areas will be distributed for public input in April 1995. State assessments measuring the state model content standards will begin September 1, 1996. Local districts must develop content standards in the same subject areas and begin student achievement assessment related to those standards by July 1, 1998. **Charter Schools:** In 1993 Colorado adopted charter schools legislation which permitted self-governing charter schools to be organized by students, teachers and parents within the public school districts. During 1993-94, two charter schools operated in the state. Sixteen charter schools will operate during the 1994-95 school year. **Choice:** Colorado's choice laws now require that school districts admit students from other districts to their schools, without payment of tuition. **Colorado Commission for Achievement in Education:** In 1991 a commission of achievement in education was created. The commission's powers and duties are to recommend goals, objectives, and standards for the Colorado program for achievement in education and for Colorado's education and training system to be met by the year 2000. The Colorado program for achievement in education and the assessment of student achievement in public schools will relate to America's education goals. **School-to-Work:** Colorado is in the process of developing a plan to move the state toward a comprehensive school-to-work system. Colorado will apply for a competitive implementation grant as efforts move from the planning to the implementation stage. In addition, Colorado has integrated academic and vocational education through the Carl Perkins Act and provides services to typical and special populations through the implementation of the Colorado Vocational Act of 1993 and Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA).

B Formation of the State Planning Panel and Development of the Plan:

The Governor and Commissioner of Education jointly appointed a 40 member broadly representative state panel (consistent with the membership requirements of the Goals 2000 legislation) and are serving as co-chairs. During the 1995 calendar, the Colorado Education Goals Panel will analyze current state initiatives, develop a Colorado State Improvement Plan, promote statewide outreach for plan development, assure public

awareness of the statewide plan for improvement, and oversee the state local improvement grants. To develop a cohesive education plan, Panel working groups will identify current initiatives, build on what is in place and determine gaps and key linkages. Proposed focus areas include: standards based education (aligning content standards, assessments, programs of instruction, professional development, and opportunity to learn strategies); public engagement (parent, business, and community involvement in the development of the state plan and in the local school improvement process); school to work, professional development / local improvement grants process; accountability and governance; and assuring safe and disciplined schools. Important themes in the work of these groups include: using the eight national goals as guidelines, promoting equity, focusing planning from Pre-Kindergarten through grade 16, keeping change local, taking advantage of technology, and establishing benchmarks and timelines. The Panel's work at developing and communicating a state plan will be assisted by Colorado Department of Education staff who are active in these priority areas and by community and education leaders from across the state. Expertise of the Mid-Continent Regional Educational Laboratory and the U.S. Department of Education Region VIII Office will be utilized to provide support for Goals 2000.

C Learning Technologies Plan Development and Integration with Goals 2000 State Reform Plan:

To secure funding under Section 317 of the Educate America Act, Colorado has recently created a statewide technology plan, *A Vision for Technology in Colorado Education*. This plan is focused on increasing the use of state-of-the-art technologies to enhance elementary and secondary level student learning and staff development and to promote the National Education Goals. A Technology Task Force will work with the state panel to determine how this technology plan will be implemented.

II. DESCRIPTION OF THE SUBGRANT PROGRAM

A Process for Making Subgrants for LEA Improvement Plans:

A request for proposal (RFP) was developed and sent to the 176 school districts and 17 Boards of Cooperative Educational Services within Colorado. Granting parameters: of the 60% of the total appropriation to be distributed to LEAs, a minimum of \$100,000 was made for funding local reform efforts across Colorado. A minimum of one grant was made to a rural LEA and one grant to an urban LEA. A peer review process was employed to review and rate applications.

B Process for Making Subgrants for Improvements in Preservice Education Programs:

Information was disseminated statewide to districts, institutions of higher education, and other agencies outlining criteria regarding the availability of grant funds for use in preservice teacher education. Granting parameters: grant funds are to be used to support the improvement of preservice teacher education and school administrator programs so that such programs equip educators with the subject matter and pedagogical expertise necessary for preparing all students to meet standards. Of the 60% of the total appropriation to be

distributed to LEAs, a minimum of \$50,000 was available for preservice teacher education subgrants. A peer review process was employed to review and rate the applications.

C Process for Making Subgrants for Continuing Professional Development:

Districts were notified by a RFP that competitive staff development funds were available. Granting parameters: grant funds will be used to support the development and implementation of new and improved forms of continuing and sustained professional development opportunities for teachers, principals and other educators at the school or district level that equip educators with such expertise, and with other knowledge and skills necessary for leading and participating in continuous education improvement. Of the 60% of the total appropriation to be distributed to LEAs, a minimum of \$50,000 was be available for professional development subgrants. A peer review process was employed to review and rate the applications.

*As of December 1994, seventeen grants were awarded to local communities that met the parameters described above. Grants ranged from \$4,184 to \$112,071 for a total of \$531,998.

III. GOALS 2000 1994-95 PROPOSED ALLOCATIONS

A	Subgrants	<u>\$531,998</u>
	1. LEA Improvement	
	2. Preservice Teacher Education	
	3. Professional Development	
B	State Plan Development	<u>\$461,853</u>
	1. Planning	\$320,673
	i State Panel Support	
	ii Technical Assistance to LEAs	
	iii SEA Capacity Building	
	2. Administrative	\$90,416
	3. Indirect Costs	\$50,764
C	Technology Plan Development	<u>\$67,812</u>
D	<u>Total Title III Allocation</u>	<u>\$993,851</u>
	1. Title III Allocation	\$986,663
	2. Transfer of Remaining Technology Funds	\$7,188
E	Total Goals 2000/Technology Allocation	<u>\$1,061,663</u>

GOALS 2000: EDUCATE AMERICA ACT

STATE PROFILE

STATE: Connecticut
DATE APPLICATION SUBMITTED: July 11, 1994
DATE APPLICATION APPROVED: September 1, 1994
FUNDING: FIRST YEAR: \$865,237; SECOND YEAR: \$3,460,948(estimate);
TECHNOLOGY: \$75,000.

I. PROCESS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE STATE PLAN

A Pre-Existing Reform Initiatives:

Currently Connecticut has many state, regional and district improvement efforts underway. State standards for student performance are reflected the Connecticut Mastery Tests for students in grades 4, 6, and 8, and in the Connecticut Academic Performance Test for 10th graders. Connecticut's Common Core of Learning defines a common set of skills, knowledge, and attributes essential to the development of all Connecticut students. Strategic School Profiles, which provide a comprehensive and consistent set of information on schools, are produced annually to provide principals, policy makers, parents and citizens with important accountability data and to stimulate local improvement efforts. Connecticut also has a comprehensive teacher assessment program, including assessment of essential skills (reading, writing, and mathematics) and content knowledge for prospective teachers and assessment of professional knowledge for beginning teachers once they are employed. The State Board of Education has established as its priorities initiatives in the areas of early childhood, programs for limited-English proficient students, special education, school-to-work transition, and adult literacy. In conjunction with P.A. 93-263 (An Act Concerning Educational Quality and Diversity), educators and citizens across Connecticut have been engaged in a grassroots regional planning process, whose goals are to improve the quality of school performance and outcomes; reduce barriers to opportunity; and to enhance student diversity and awareness of diversity. Many districts and schools across the state are engaged in a variety of school improvement projects designed to increase student achievement.

B Formation of the State Planning Panel and Development of the Plan:

In the spring of 1994 the Connecticut State Board of Education identified the improvement of achievement for all students as the highest priority of public schooling in Connecticut. The Board acknowledged that the goal of increased student achievement could only be accomplished through the collective effort of all those involved in Connecticut schools: teachers, administrators, parents, students, community leaders and others. In response to the Board's direction, the Connecticut State Department of Education established the Connecticut School Improvement Initiative as a strategy to help achieve the Board's goal. This initiative was launched through funding under Title III of the Federal Goals 2000: Educate America Act. The Connecticut School Improvement Panel has been established to identify Connecticut's school improvement priorities and to fulfill the federal grant requirement to develop and implement a state-wide comprehensive school improvement

plan. The Panel, as required by federal law, will be representative of the executive branch, legislature, State Board of Education, administrators, principals, community-based organizations, teachers' organizations, parents, business leaders, local boards of education, and higher education. The Panel is scheduled to begin its work in late February 1995 and work throughout the spring to develop and implement a grassroots outreach campaign leading to the development of a comprehensive state improvement plan for Connecticut. A 21-member internal committee of Connecticut State Department of Education staff will provide resources and technical assistance to the Connecticut School Improvement Panel, as well as to local districts receiving Title III subgrants.

Timeline for activities:

June 21, 1994	State Board Adoption of Application for Year One Funding under Title III of Goals 2000
July 11, 1994	Application submitted to Washington for Year One Funding
August 26, 1994	Release of Request for Proposals to provide subgrants for local reform and professional development to local education agencies
September 1, 1994	Approval of first-year grant for Connecticut by USED
November 17, 1994	Award of 25 subgrants, resulting in the provision of funding or services to 74 or 45% of Connecticut's districts
November 1994 - February 1995	Internal Advisory Committee conducts preliminary work to prepare for State Panel and provides technical assistance to LEAs receiving subgrant awards
February / March 1995	First meetings of State Panel
April, 1995	Grassroots outreach by State Panel
May / June 1995	Development of State Plan Framework; public discussion
June 1995	Adoption of State Plan Framework by State Board; Submission of State Plan Framework to USED

C Learning Technologies Plan Development and Integration with Goals 2000 State Reform Plan:

A Task Force composed of the members of the Joint Committee on Educational Technology, other experts in the educational use of technology, and representatives of the Connecticut School Improvement Panel will be overseeing the development of a comprehensive statewide educational plan. The Task Force will build upon the work of the Joint Committee on Educational Technology as the basis for the development of goals and objectives for a long-range plan for the use of educational technology in Connecticut. Technical assistance will be provided by the Center for Educational Leadership and Technology to review existing reports and literature, identify an implementation strategy for the development of a technology infrastructure, establish parameters for building telecommunications, delineate milestones and associated costs, and provide the foundation for a comprehensive educational technology plan.

II. DESCRIPTION OF THE SUBGRANT PROGRAM

A Process for Making Subgrants for LEA Improvement Plans:

On August 26, 1994, as part on Year One of the Connecticut School Improvement Initiative, the Connecticut State Department of Education released a Request for Proposals (RFP) to provide subgrants for local reform and professional development to local education agencies in accordance with Title III of the Goals 2000: Educate America Act. Approximately \$675,000 was available for distribution as subgrants on a competitive basis. Subgrants were to be made available in three categories. 1) School District Improvement Plans and School-based Initiatives: to support the development of school improvement plans as well as improvement initiatives in individual schools. Priority in funding was to be given to districts that demonstrated a commitment to improving achievement, focused on improving teaching and learning, enhanced school improvement capacity within the district, and relied on data in working toward greater improvement for all students. 2) Preservice and Continuous Professional Development for Administrators: to support the preparation and continuous professional development of principals and other school administrators to initiate, lead, manage, encourage and support school-based educational changes designed to support student achievement. Priority in funding was to be given to activities involving collaboration with higher education and other non-profit organizations. 3) Continuous Professional Development for Teachers: to support working groups of teachers within and across schools to work collectively to focus on specific aspects of teaching and learning as they relate to improving student achievement for all students. As of the October 7, 1994 application deadline, 111 proposals were received: 43 for subgrant 1 (School and District Improvement Initiatives); 21 for subgrant 2 (Administrator Preservice and Professional Development); and 47 for subgrant 3 (Teacher Professional Development). In mid-October a 37-member Peer Review Committee, consisting of teachers, administrators, higher education faculty, as well as representatives of parent organizations, boards of education and other non-profit organizations was convened to review the proposals and select 25 proposals for funding. These awards will result in the provision of funding or services to 74 or 45% of Connecticut's districts.

- B Process for Making Subgrants for Improvements in Preservice Education Programs:**
See "A" above.
- C Process for Making Subgrants for Continuing Professional Development:**
See "A" above.

III. GOALS 2000 1994-95 PROPOSED ALLOCATIONS

A	Subgrants	<u>\$675,000</u>
1.	Local Improvement Plans	\$360,000
2.	Professional Development for Administrators	\$115,000
3.	Professional Development for Teachers	\$200,000
B	State Plan Development	<u>\$190,000</u>
1.	Preparation of Improvement Plan	\$100,000
2.	Regional Technical Assistance	\$90,000
C	Technology Plan Development	<u>\$75,000</u>
D	Total Title III Allocation	<u>\$865,000</u>
E	Total Goals 2000/Technology Allocation	<u>\$940,000</u>

GOALS 2000: EDUCATE AMERICA ACT

STATE PROFILE

STATE: Delaware
DATE APPLICATION SUBMITTED: July 7, 1994
DATE APPLICATION APPROVED: August 15, 1994
FUNDING: FIRST YEAR: \$323,044; SECOND YEAR: \$1,292,176 (estimate);
TECHNOLOGY: \$75,000

I. PROCESS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE STATE PLAN

A Pre-Existing Reform Initiatives:

In 1992 Delaware's State Board of Education launched a systemic reform strategy called "New Directions for Education in Delaware," with the goal of achieving excellence and equity for all students. Standards and assessments are at the heart of New Directions. New Directions seeks to create an education system that will help all students meet or exceed the content and performance standards established by the new Curriculum Frameworks Commissions which are establishing clear expectations for all students in a variety of disciplines. The results of the first interim assessments in May 1993 indicated there is significant room for improvement as only about 1% of the students tested met or exceeded the standards in the three areas assessed (reading, writing, and mathematics). For the five years of the New Directions Partnerships -FY '93-97, four permanent educational priorities have been established to guide reform: Standards and Curriculum, Assessments and Instruction, Capacity Building and Local Implementation, and Partnerships. Highlights of efforts to date on the priorities are as follows: 1) Standards: four diverse curriculum framework commissions are drafting content standards for mathematics, science, social studies, and English language arts. The standards will be reviewed by educators and in public forums in the 1994-95 school year and presented to the State Board of Education for approval by the summer of 1995. Four new commissions will be formed to develop standards in the areas of the visual/performing arts, foreign languages, business education, and agriculture education. Each commission has a broad based representation of 45 members and is co-chaired by a Delaware teacher. The Delaware Education Research & Development Center at the University of Delaware is leading efforts to develop exemplars of teaching and learning strategies and performance tasks linked to the content and performance standards to assist teachers in building instructional capacity to undertake the new approaches; 2) Assessments: Delaware has instituted an interim assessment program to be administered annually at grades 3, 5, 8, and 10 to monitor student progress in mathematics, reading and writing while the Curriculum Framework Commissions are completing their work. The new assessment system will be designed and piloted over the next two years and implemented during the 1996-97 school year. The assessment design and development work will be coordinated with the New Standards Project in mathematics, science, and English language arts and in mathematics and science with the Project 21 SSI through the NSF Grant; 3) Capacity Building and Implementation: Thirteen education stakeholder groups have collaborated to develop a capacity building plan for the local implementation of New Directions. The Delaware Professional Standards Council which

is an independent body reporting to the State Board of Education has developed an educational plan to ensure the quality of teachers and administrators in the schools. The National Advisory Council for New Directions, a diverse panel of thirteen leading education researchers and practitioners, provides guidance and feedback to assist the New Directions partnership; 4) Leadership provided by the Business Community: In 1990 Delaware's Business/Public Education Council was created to provide a vehicle for business involvement in education reform and has supported the New Directions agenda statewide. In November 1993 the Council released a comprehensive report that provided a systems approach to education reform based on the National Business Roundtable's Nine Essential Components of a Successful Education System which complemented the New Directions initiative. Some challenges to the New Directions initiative have been made by anti-OBE constituency groups.

B Formation of the State Planning Panel and Development of the Plan:

To ensure a coherent statewide planning process, the Goals 2000 State Panel and the recently appointed Governor's Education Improvement Commission will compose a single entity for FY '95. Governor Carper announced the formation of the Commission in August 1994 to drive implementation of the Gap Analysis report released by the Business Council. Delaware plans to seek secretarial approval to charge the pre-existing body with the development of the State Improvement Plan. Additional members will be appointed if necessary by the Governor and Chief to comply with Title III. Throughout the year, the Panel/Commission will be responsible for looking across all areas addressed to assure alignment and consistency of policy and planning. A communications subcommittee will focus on ensuring appropriate public outreach and involvement in the deliberations and the development of the State Plan. Delaware's current improvement activities already begin to address the areas of: Teaching, Learning, Standards and Assessments; Opportunity-to-Learn Standards and Strategies; Dropout Strategies; Parental and Community Support and Involvement; Coordination of School-to-Work Programs; and Coordination Strategies. The Department of Public Instruction (DPI) will provide on-going support for the Panel/Commission through a shared Goals 2000 State Panel/Commission Director contracted initially through the Governor's Office and a clerical support position established at the DPI. Once the original charge to the Governor's Commission is completed the DPI will establish a full time position for the management of the Goals 2000 grant and policy implementation activities stemming from the federal legislation.

Milestones and Activities:

August 1994	Governor's Commission/Goals 2000 Panel launched
December 1994	Interim Panel/Commission Report on governance, accountability and finance policy recommendations due
January 1995	Work on formal development of Goals 2000 state plan begins
January - February 1995	Public hearings on interim report

April 1995	Commission final report (re: Gap Analysis charge) due to Governor
Spring 1995	Public hearings on draft state improvement plan
May 1995	State Improvement Plan completed
Ongoing	Public outreach, involvement and communications efforts

C Learning Technologies Plan Development and Integration with Goals 2000 State Reform Plan:

With the \$75,000 technology grant the DPI will establish a representative Technology Task Force to develop a comprehensive plan to increase the use of technology throughout the state's education system. The plan will be integrated with the broader Goals 2000 State Improvement Plan by linking the work of the Technology Task Force and Panel/Commission through an overlap of participants. The Technology Capacity Building Committee, formed in the Spring of 1994, will serve as the core of the proposed statewide Technology Task Force and will include all necessary groups per the legislation. The focal points of the plan will be: 1) Development of telecommunications strategies for delivery of enhancements to instruction into every classroom; 2) Establishment of standards for school library/media/technology centers; 3) Definition of physical plant building requirements; 4) Development and maintenance of information systems and statewide networking strategies; 5) Development of long-term professional development strategies; and 6) Formulation of strategies for securing specific annual funding allocations for technology. Communication and the majority of "meetings" among members of the Task Force will take place via the state telecommunications network. Members will use electronic mail and "conferencing forums" to communicate ideas and responses to others' ideas. The Governor and Legislature have agreed to match the federal \$75,000 grant for technology planning and implementation.

II. DESCRIPTION OF THE SUBGRANT PROGRAM

A Process for Making Subgrants for LEA Improvement Plans:

Of the \$194,000 available for subgrants, 82% or \$159,000 will be awarded to local educational agencies (LAS) in a competitive process that combines the two Goals 2000 subgrant categories for local improvement and professional development. The intent is to generate and support bottom-up, system wide improvement and to help prepare schools for the implementation of new standards and assessments in the 1996-97 school year. The "First Schools in the First State" demonstration program will focus on systemic changes and capacity building at the school level to align curriculum and professional development with the new standards, and to promote site-based management and the increased use of technology. In FY '95, three \$53,000 grants will be awarded by the State Board of Education through a competitive RFP process to vertical teams of schools (a high school and its feeder schools) within a district, one in each of Delaware's three counties. It is

expected that FY '95 subgrantees will receive second year grants to support the implementation of their plans, contingent upon appropriate completion of first year activities. The Goals 2000 Orientation Team established to attend the USED briefing conference will serve in an advisory role to the DPI in the first year grant process. In August 1994 the team hosted a pre-application workshop for those interested in applying for the subgrants. The team also served as the core of a proposal review committee. Selection criteria included commitments to: high academic standards, planning for systemic changes to improve teaching and learning, continuous improvement, professional development at the school site, shared decision-making, community involvement, and technological advancement. Vertical team proposals required the sign-off of the district superintendent and Board Chair and had a clear indication that the RFP had teacher involvement in the development of the proposal. The subgrants were awarded by the State Board in October 1994. The awardee vertical teams were convened in November for a kick-off conference and professional development session. In the summer of 1995 the teams will again be convened to share experiences and lessons learned with other school districts to spread the impact of the first years grants.

B Process for Making Subgrants for Improvements in Preservice Education

Programs:

In FY '95, one \$35,000 grant will be awarded through a competitive RFP process to a university / district / school preservice teacher education partnership formed to establish the first Professional Development School (PDS) in the southern part of the state. This new partnership will be networked with an existing, funded PDS partnership "up-state" to establish a preservice consortium for the purpose of sharing and evaluating experiences and strengthening preservice education throughout the state. As outlined by the Holmes Group, Professional Development Schools are partnerships between a local school and district and a university based teacher education program. Selection criteria will include most of the "First School" demonstration site requirements; and 1) aligning the university teacher education program with the new teacher standards being developed by the Delaware Professional Standards Council; 2) evaluating and refining teaching methods; and 3) fostering organizational cultures that support reflective practice and active collaboration. The RFP's will be subject to a peer review committee.

C Process for Making Subgrants for Continuing Professional Development:

See "A" above.

III. GOALS 2000 1994-95 PROPOSED ALLOCATIONS

A	Subgrants	<u>\$194,000</u>
	1. LEA and Professional Development	\$159,000
	2. Preservice Teacher Education	\$35,000

B	State Plan Development (Program and Administrative Support)	<u>\$129,044</u>
1.	Technical Assistance Conferences	\$8,000
2.	DE Professional Standards Council	\$25,000
3.	Activities and support of State Panel/Governor's Commission and Administration of Subgrants	\$96,044
C	Technology Plan Development	<u>\$75,000</u>
D	Total Title III Allocation	<u>\$323,044</u>
E	Total Goals 2000/Technology Allocation:	<u>\$398,044</u>

GOALS 2000: EDUCATE AMERICA ACT

STATE PROFILE

STATE: Hawaii
DATE APPLICATION SUBMITTED: June 13, 1994
DATE APPLICATION APPROVED: July 1, 1994
FUNDING: FIRST YEAR: \$334,227; SECOND YEAR: \$ 1,336,908 (estimate);
TECHNOLOGY: \$75,000.

I. PROCESS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE STATE PLAN

A Pre-Existing Reform Initiatives:

The Hawaii Education Summits of 1990, which included approximately 150 participants, became the basic model for formulating a sweeping and comprehensive reform effort. Between the first Summit in early June and the second Summit in early September, approximately 60 volunteers from among the Summit participants worked on goal development subcommittees. These volunteers refined the language of the goals and developed objectives for the goals. During the second Summit, the subcommittee members presented the objectives--a total of 38--for the goals. Using facilitative leadership techniques, the Summit participants as a group arrived at consensus on the final version of the Hawaii Goals for Education and the objectives to achieve the goals. Their final products were approved by the Governor, the Legislature, and the Board of Education.

B Formation of the State Planning Panel and Development of the Plan:

A modification of the above Summit model was used for the Hawaii Goals 2000 Panel to meet the requirements of the Goals 2000 legislation. Basically, panelists self selected topical areas of interest from Section 306 (c)-(m). Originally there were 11 "Work Groups" identified from Section 306 (c)-(m): Teaching, Learning, Standards and Assessment; Opportunity-to-Learn Standards; Developing Education Work Force Competency; Integrating Academic and Vocational Instruction; Parental and Community Support, Involvement; Coordination of School-to-Work Programs; Dropout Strategies; Governance, Accountability, Management; Promoting Bottom-up Reform; Technological Support; and Making Improvements Systemwide. Upon review and comments from persons within the Hawaii Department of Education, however, it was decided that Making Improvements Systemwide and Promoting Bottom-up Reform details should be part of the product of every Work Group. Thus the number of Work Groups was reduced to nine. Work Groups follow a timeline and submit progress reports. Their work products include: implementation strategies or processes; actions or tasks; benchmarks or indicators of progress; program improvement and accountability; bottom-up reform and systemwide improvement; timelines; budgets; and follow-up actions to secure necessary resources. Networking, integration, integrity and other aspects of accountability for the comprehensiveness and completeness of the Hawaii State Improvement Plan for Education is the responsibility of the Panel's chairperson, who heads a Coordinating Council made up of the chairs of each Work Group. A pool of 32 specialists from within the Hawaii State Department of Education's State and district offices serves in such resource capacities

as researchers, recorders, analysts, and facilitators to the Work Groups. From May 31 until June 10, 1994, the Offices of Governor John Waihee, Superintendent Herman M. Aizawa, and State Board of Education Chair Debi Hartmann planned, developed, and implemented a broad-based effort to solicit nominations to the Goals 2000 Panel, combined with a public information thrust to inform and educate the public about the purpose, content, and objectives of Goals 2000: Educate America Act.

Milestones and activities:

July 11, 1994	Deadline for submitting applications to the Goals 2000 Panel
Late July 1994	Notification of selection to Goals 2000 Panel
August 6, 1994	First Meeting of Goals 2000 Panel
Mid-August 1994 to Mid-March 1995	Work Groups & General Panel Meetings
March and April 1995	Informational Meetings on "Hawaii State Improvement Plan for Education"
May 1995	Revisions to the Plan
June 1995	Submission of Plan to U.S. Department of Education Secretary

C Learning Technologies Plan Development and Integration with Goals 2000 State Reform Plan:

Hawaii is developing its technology plan in concert with the overall Goals 2000 state improvement planning carried out by the Goals 2000 Panel. Collaboration between the technology task force and the Goals 2000 Panel was stressed to promote integration of technology into the overall Hawaii education improvement plan. The Goals 2000 Panel and the technology task force identified jointly how technology resources would support and be integrated into the vision and objectives of the overall Goals 2000 state improvement plan. The *Hawaii Technology Plan*, presently undergoing its final revision, includes a set of components which describe strategies with benchmarks and activities to be taken by the state that are necessary to implement the objectives and vision of the plan. The Technology Plan components suggest state policies, legislative initiatives, direction for various state, regional, and local agencies, and suggestions for business and industry. It provides a blueprint for statewide leadership and coordination inclusive of state agencies, business and industry, non-profit organizations, districts, and schools.

II. DESCRIPTION OF THE SUBGRANT PROGRAM

A Process for Making Subgrants for LEA Improvement Plans:

Hawaii's Department of Education is designated as both the State Education Agency (SEA) and the Local Education Agency (LEA). Within this context, Hawaii's Goals 2000 State Improvement Plan (SIP) is a plan that will be used by the SEA and the LEAs. Therefore, the subgrant award process will have schools use the SIP to focus their grant writing. For this first year, since the SIP was not available, schools were asked to use the guidelines specified in Title III and Section 309 of the Title interpreted for Hawaii, i.e., Hawaii as both an SEA and an LEA. For this first year, six grant awards were made totaling \$190,536 from requests exceeding \$3 million. The grant review committee whose recommendations were approved by the Superintendent of Education was comprised of representatives of higher education, teachers, principals, the Hawaii State Commission on Performance Standards, and the SEA. Two of the members are also members of the Goals 2000 Panel developing the SIP.

Four grants were awarded for local reform totaling \$115,259. Projects focus on restructuring curriculum; literacy through creative dramatics; integration of technology to support student achievement and resolve community-based problems and issues; and a multidimensional approach to improving academic success in the language arts.

Milestones and activities:

July-August 1994	Plan and develop the requirements and details for the subgrant process.
September 1994	Distribute initial Request for Proposals
October 31, 1994	Submit Intent to Apply
November 22, 1994	Send final Request for Proposals
December 20, 1994	Submit proposals
December - January 1995	Review and recommend proposals for funding
January 6, 1995	Notify grant awardees
February 1995-June 1996	Implement projects
June 15, 1995	Submit year-end progress report
June 15, 1996	Submit project evaluation report

B Process for Making Subgrants for Improvements in Preservice Education Programs:

See first paragraph of "A" above.

One grant of \$27,558 was awarded for an innovative field-based course work context in teacher education.

Milestones and activities: see "A" above.

C Process for Making Subgrants for Continuing Professional Development:

See first paragraph of "A" above.

One grant of \$47,719 was awarded for systemic improvements in writing curriculum and instruction, facilitate teacher-practitioner research, and support professional networking among educators.

Milestones and activities: see "A" above.

III. GOALS 2000 1994-95 PROPOSED ALLOCATIONS

A	Subgrants	<u>\$200,536</u>
	1. LEA Improvement Plans	
	2. Preservice Teacher Education	
	3. Professional Development	
B	State Plan Development	<u>\$133,691</u>
C	Technology Plan Development	<u>\$75,000</u>
D	Total Title III Allocation	<u>\$334,227</u>
E	Total Goals 2000/Technology Allocation	<u>\$409,227</u>

GOALS 2000: EDUCATE AMERICA ACT

STATE PROFILE

STATE: Illinois
DATE APPLICATION SUBMITTED: August 18, 1994
DATE APPLICATION APPROVED: September 14, 1994
FUNDING: FIRST YEAR: \$3,885,801; SECOND YEAR: \$15,543,204 (estimate);
TECHNOLOGY: \$153,777.

I. PROCESS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE STATE PLAN

A Pre-Existing Reform Initiatives:

Illinois has been working toward systemic school improvement since 1985 when specific school reform legislation was enacted based on the recommendations of representative committees of Illinois citizens who designed an improved educational foundation. The committees concentrated on six fundamental learning areas which include biological and physical sciences, fine arts, language arts, mathematics, physical development and health, and social sciences. Membership on these committees included representatives from education, professional organizations, the business community, and the community at large. In 1985 the State enacted educational reform legislation which formally accepted these six fundamental learning areas, established the 34 State Goals for Learning, and mandated the development of a state level testing system (Illinois Goal Assessment Program) to measure achievement of these goals at benchmark grades. In addition, each school district was required to develop a plan that described both what its students should know and be able to do, and its assessment methods. In 1988 specific legislation to improve Chicago Public Schools was enacted which notably shifted governance responsibility to each school and required local school improvement plans to be written. Testimony and advice from Illinois citizens led to the establishment of nine fundamental principles for school accountability as the State began to move from an "input" to an "output" school accreditation model. A statewide implementation panel, the Implementation Advisory Committee, led this movement by recommending legislation that would create the Illinois School Accountability Act. The Illinois School Accountability Act, which became law in 1991, expanded local school responsibility to include the review of student performance and comprehensive school improvement planning measures to ascertain whether all students were learning and all students were being served within the public education system. The Illinois State Board of Education, in cooperation with various statewide representatives, then designed the Illinois Public School Accreditation Process, which was piloted during 1991-92 and implemented in the fall of 1992. The Accreditation Process is predicated on learning outcomes, and requires schools to provide evidence to the extent that all students are meeting standards for student performance based on the State Goals for Learning and all students are being served. The Accreditation Process is two-pronged: a Recognition Designation, for compliance with basic safety and certification requirements, and a Performance Designation, for the evaluation of student progress as measured by the Illinois Goals Assessment Program and the local assessments as established in each local school improvement plan. The local school improvement plan

is the current focus of Illinois school improvement efforts.

B Formation of the State Planning Panel and Development of the Plan:

The Governor and the State Superintendent of Education along with the Chairperson of the Illinois State Board of Education will nominate individuals to augment the previously mentioned Implementation Advisory Committee which will serve as the Goals 2000 panel. The individuals nominated are those that have been determined to best represent the constituencies specified in the Goals legislation. The Governor and the State Superintendent of Education will then appoint the Goals 2000 panel and select the Chairperson. Managerial staff representing the various departments of the SEA involved in school reform and school improvement will be assigned to staff the panel in order to expedite meeting logistics and to provide resources and assistance to Panel members. The Panel with the assistance of Illinois State Board of Education staff will develop the Illinois Systemic Improvement Plan. The Panel will conduct public meetings and related public involvement activities to provide for public review of the Plan. In addition, the Plan will be reviewed by the Illinois State Board of Education, the Governor, and the Chairs of the House and Senate Elementary and Secondary Education Committees. After review the Panel will make revisions and then submit the revised Plan to the Illinois State Board of Education and the State Superintendent for further review and approval. The Plan will then be submitted to the U.S. Department of Education.

Timeline and activities:

August 15, 1994	Individuals nominated for Panel
August 31, 1994	Goals 2000 Panel appointed; Chairperson selected
September 30, 1994	Goals Panel convenes its first meeting
January 31, 1995	Initial development of the Illinois Systemic Improvement Plan completed
February - April 1, 1995	Goals Panel conducts public meetings and public involvement activities; Plan reviewed by the Illinois State Board of Education, the Governor, and the Chairs of the House and Senate Elementary and Secondary Education Committees
April - May 1, 1995	Goals Panel develops Plan for submission to the Illinois State Board of Education and the State Superintendent
June 1995	Plan submitted to U.S. Department of Education

C Learning Technologies Plan Development and Integration with Goals 2000 State Reform Plan:

The Illinois State Board of Education will expand the work of the two current advisory groups established in 1993 and 1994 to provide information and guidance to the SEA in the development of a long term strategy for increasing the use of technology in K-12 education. In that regard, the SEA will reference the *Framework for Action*, a report presented in June 1994 by the Planning Coalition for Educational Technology to the Illinois State Board of Education. This Coalition was convened to interpret the policy and program development implications of State Board Goal #5: *All Illinois public school students will attend schools which effectively use technology as a resource to support student learning and improve operational efficiency*. In addition, membership from the Coalition and the Governor's Task Force for Technology will be merged to develop a unified state plan for technology. The Illinois State Board of Education has initiated a number of activities in 1994 to improve the use of technology in schools and provide staff development activities for teachers and other school staff. The following represent a brief description of several of those projects: 1) Collaboration with higher education institutions to provide mentors for grades K-12 teachers in districts for the purpose of understanding the uses of and accessing the Internet - small grants were given to both the universities and the participating K-12 schools to defray startup costs and communication expenses; 2) Organization of sixty K-12 school improvement teams (librarians, administrators, math and science teachers) to participate in a two-day intensive training to learn about developing resource databases and how to organize materials collections to optimally support school improvement practices; 3) Completion of the Illinois School Improvement Information Management software program for both Windows and Macintosh application in 1994, including the free distribution to all Illinois school districts to assist personnel with creating databases and reports relative to their school improvement activities; 4) Projected completion of the second generation of this software program in 1995 to reflect recommendations of school personnel during 1994.

II. DESCRIPTION OF THE SUBGRANT PROGRAM

A Process for Making Subgrants for LEA Improvement Plans:

The Illinois State Board of Education will use approximately 60% (\$1,400,000) of the funds set aside for competitive grants to fund LEA Improvement Plans. It is anticipated that not more than 20 grants will be issued in the first year with these funds. The Grants and Applications Section in the Department of School Improvement and Assessment has been assigned the responsibility for designing and implementing the grant programs. Grant proposal will be solicited from LEAs during the fall of 1994 with the grant period extending from approximately January through August 1995. The criteria for selection of successful applications will be developed by Department staff. The Illinois School Improvement initiative exceeds the Goals 2000 requirement for LEA improvement plans by requiring plans at the school level. The Illinois State Board of Education (SEA) established a competitive grant program (School Improvement Change Grants) in 1991 to assist schools in developing the learning outcomes and related assessment practices required by the Illinois Public School Accreditation Process. This Illinois grant program

as currently administered is parallel in purpose to the Goals 2000 grant program. In FY '94, 544 schools were awarded grants with total funding in the amount of \$4,170,000. The state FY '95 competitive RFP will again provide monies to support the development and refinement of local school improvement plans.

B Process for Making Subgrants for Improvements in Preservice Education Programs:

The Illinois State Board of Education will make grants through a competitive process and peer review to LEAs or consortia of LEAs in cooperation with institutions of higher education and nonprofit organizations to improve educator preservice programs consistent with the Illinois Systemic Improvement Plan. Approximately 15% (\$350,000) of the funds will be awarded for preservice teacher education. It is anticipated that no more than five preservice proposals will be funded. Grant applications will be solicited during the fall of 1994 and will be funded approximately January 1995 to December 1995.

C Process for Making Subgrants for Continuing Professional Development:

Approximately 25% (\$580,000) of the funds available will be awarded for professional development. It is anticipated that no more than ten professional development proposals will be funded. The timeline for grant applications is as stated above.

III. GOALS 2000 1994-95 PROPOSED ALLOCATIONS

A	Subgrants	<u>\$2,331,481</u>
	1. School Improvement	\$1,398,889
	2. Preservice Teacher Education	\$349,722
	3. Professional Development	\$582,870
B	State Plan Development	<u>\$1,554,320</u>
	1. State Plan Preparation	\$1,398,888
	2. LEA Grant Administration	\$155,432
C	Technology Plan Development	<u>\$153,777</u>
D	Total Title III Allocation	<u>\$3,885,801</u>
E	Total Goals 2000/Technology Allocation	<u>\$4,039,578</u>

GOALS 2000: EDUCATE AMERICA ACT

STATE PROFILE

STATE: Indiana
DATE APPLICATION SUBMITTED: January 24, 1995
DATE APPLICATION APPROVED: January 30, 1995
FUNDING: FIRST YEAR: \$1,621,101; SECOND YEAR: \$6,484,404 (estimate);
TECHNOLOGY: \$75,000.

I. PROCESS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE STATE PLAN

A Pre-Existing Reform Initiatives:

Goals 2000: Educate America Act presents Indiana with the opportunity to build upon and connect the existing components of Indiana's school restructuring efforts into a unified plan to ensure improvement in schools and increased performance for all students. Indiana has a strong tradition of local control of public education. All decisions about curriculum and instruction are made by local school boards guided by State Board of Education rules and Indiana General Assembly statutes. As a result, there exists in Indiana an on-going need to align school reform efforts at the local and state levels in the areas of curriculum standards, assessment, instruction, and professional development. Goals 2000 will provide Indiana with the opportunity to continue along the pathway to systemic reform and to build capacity for restructuring. For Indiana, the term "restructuring" means creating new learning environments which are fundamentally different from those that presently exist. It is changing the conditions of teaching and learning while at the same time exploring fundamentally new ways of governing and organizing schools. It is a continuous, self-reflective process that includes all stakeholder groups in the school, community, and state. Since the release of *A Nation at Risk* in 1983, education change has risen to the top of the political agenda as well as the education agenda in Indiana. The Indiana 1987 *A+ Program for Educational Excellence* initiated a high level of reform activity, both top-down and bottom-up, which has continued ever since. The pace of educational reform legislation has more than doubled in the last 7 years. Legislation has been enacted concerning waivers, teacher licensure, content and performance standards, school accreditation, accountability, and assessment. These reforms have touched the lives of teachers, students, parents, school administrators, school board members, community leaders, community youth serving agencies, and other interested parties in various and significant ways affecting most aspects of the educational system. Indiana has demonstrated a rich history of systemic school improvements. Reforms have lengthened the school year and given schools flexibility through a waiver process. Curriculum reform has focused on specifying and increasing requirements and adding educational programs. Reforms in student assessment have demonstrated a widespread concern for accountability in Indiana's educational system.

B Formation of the State Planning Panel and Development of the Plan:

The comprehensive school improvement plan for Indiana, in accordance with Section 306, will be developed by a broad-based state panel. The Governor and the State Superintendent of Public Instruction shall each appoint half of the members of the panel

and shall jointly select the Chair of the panel and the representative of private schools. The Governor, or his designee, and the State Superintendent, who is also chairperson of the State Board of Education, will serve on the panel. Approximately 20-30 members will be appointed. Recognizing the existence of a significant number of committees, task forces, and advisory boards currently involved in statewide systemic restructuring initiatives, the State Superintendent of Public Instruction will solicit nominations for state panel representatives from members of these groups, the Indiana Department of Education staff, practitioners involved in local school improvement initiatives, professional education organizations, institutions of higher learning, philanthropic foundations involved with education, community-youth serving agencies, the business sector, and the public in general. At the same time, the Governor and his staff, through a process designed by the Governor's office, will develop a pool of names for panel representation. The membership of the panel shall be geographically representative of the state and reflect the diversity of Indiana's population with respect to race, ethnicity, gender and disabling characteristics.

Timeline and activities:

January - March 1996

Needs Assessment, Literature Review: practitioners from schools which have demonstrated improvements in student performance, staff from the SEA and other governmental agencies, state researchers, and panel-designated consultants will be called on to work with the panel.

March - April 1996

Outreach Effort: The State Board of Education has scheduled town meetings to discuss standards and assessment in ten locations throughout the state. The panel will also utilize the Indiana University Public Opinion Laboratory or a similar institution to do telemarketing research.

May - November 1996

Writing of the Plan: The contracted consultant will work with the panel and sub-groups of the panel to develop a first draft of the plan. The full panel will adopt a version of the plan that can be circulated for public input. The following months will be devoted to disseminating the plan and conducting hearings for public input. The panel will complete its work and submit its plan to the SEA.

December 1996

Submission of the Plan: The Indiana Department of Education will submit the original plan developed by the panel and the state improvement plan if modified by

the SEA to the Secretary of Education for approval. If changes are made to the original plan the agency will also submit an explanation of any such changes to the Secretary.

The goal of the state plan will be to provide a vision for comprehensive systemic school restructuring which strengthens and supports Local Education Agencies (LEAs) efforts to develop restructuring plans which reflect statewide reform initiatives and respond to the spirit of the National Education Goals. Thus, the focus of the plan development will be on state support for local restructuring initiatives. The state plan will reflect local needs and provide the flexibility called for in the legislation. In addition, the state restructuring plan will include specific goals and benchmarks established by the panel as well as strategies for the implementation and evaluation of the plan. Strategies designed to evaluate the implementation of the plan will rely strongly on evaluation conducted at the local level. The results gleaned from the evaluation process will be communicated to the public.

Indiana Department of Education staff shall furnish assistance to the panel in the development of the plan, expedite meeting logistics, and supply resources. A Title III program coordinator has been assigned to assist the Department in supporting the state panel. In addition, an interdepartmental task force comprised of consultants involved with school restructuring, curriculum, instruction, standards, assessment, at-risk student programs, school accreditation, technology, special education, Title I, and other federally funded projects has been formed to provide guidance to the program coordinator and the state panel. The Indiana Department of Education will contract with an independent consultant with expertise in group dynamics and school restructuring to facilitate the panel's efforts in performing its responsibilities.

C Learning Technologies Plan Development and Integration with Goals 2000 State Reform Plan:

The Indiana Department of Education will appoint a technology panel to develop a systemic statewide technology plan to help achieve state and national education goals. The technology plan will be part of the state comprehensive school improvement plan and will provide use of state-of-the-art technologies to enhance staff development and student learning. The technology panel will have the broad-based representation required under Section 317(d)(1)(A). At least one representative of the state panel will sit on the technology panel to ensure the integration and coordination of the technology plan with the state plan. This panel will also include members of existing statewide committees engaged in technology initiatives, including the State Board of Education Technology Task Force, Corporation for Educational Technology, Corporation for Educational Communications, and Access Indiana. Within one month of receiving the planning grant, the panel will be created, and the schedule will be determined. It is anticipated that the process for developing the technology plan will include: reviewing current technology related initiatives at state, local, and national levels; and seeking broad-based input from appropriate agencies, LEAs, telecommunications entities, libraries, business community, teachers, parents, students, and leaders in the field of technology. A tentative plan will be prepared by the midpoint of the second year and presented to the state panel and the State

Board of Education for review. Currently, the state requires that LEAs submit 5-year technology plans prior to spending capital projects funds and common school fund money on technology. Preliminary data from these plans indicate that in the next five years, schools will need approximately \$651 million for technology equipment, \$494 million for software, \$546 million for maintenance, and \$74 million for staff training. Training and staff development for teachers and other school personnel were priorities in Indiana before capital expenditures. Support for this area has varied over the years but again is coming to the forefront as the state recognizes that staff development is critical to the effective use of technology in schools. The State Board of Education is requesting that the legislature fund five additional days to be used for staff development, including technology training. A critical area in the state plan will be how ongoing staff development in the uses of technology to improve instruction and meet individual learning needs will be provided to educators. Telecommunications and distance learning have also received strong support from the state. IDEAnet, a statewide telecommunications network, is accessible to all educators through an 800 number. Access Indiana is a new statewide initiative that includes local K-12 Internet access among its services. In the last two years, the state has awarded over \$300,000 in distance education planning grants and grants to assist schools in offering required advanced placement courses via distance education.

II. DESCRIPTION OF THE SUBGRANT PROGRAM

A Process for Making Subgrants for LEA Improvement Plans:

The Indiana Department of Education made available 60 percent of Year 1 funds for the purpose of awarding subgrants to LEAs or consortia of LEAs in the categories of local school improvement, professional development, and preservice education. Of the 60 percent total appropriation awarded in competitive subgrants, \$263,000 was allocated for local school improvement, \$551,500 for professional development, and \$167,500 for preservice training. Competitive subgrant funds were directed to only those LEAs or consortia of LEAs that had previously demonstrated a commitment to restructuring and was to be used by the LEA or consortium to expand and enhance the implementation of existing school restructuring plans. The subgrants were awarded through a competitive, peer review process coordinated by the Indiana Department of Education. The peer review process is consistent with the Indiana Department of Education's standard procedures for selecting and awarding competitive grants. The peer review panels represent the diversity of Indiana with respect to race, ethnicity, geographic region, and other characteristics. Each peer review panel consisted of approximately 10 to 15 individuals who read and evaluated all applications within a subgrant category. The reviewers included practitioners and representatives from higher education, business, and the community who have a deep understanding of systemic change. Each subgrant application was read by three reviewers. The evaluation of the subgrant applications was established by rating the applications against a specific criteria based on the requirements delineated in Title III and measures identified by the interdepartmental task force of the SEA. Rating forms were developed to facilitate the evaluation process. Those applicants receiving the highest ratings by the reviewers were awarded subgrant funds. The Title III program coordinator administered the subgrant process.

As stated above, Indiana used \$263,000 to make grants to LEAs or consortia of LEAs in accordance with Section 309(a). Seventy-five percent of the funds awarded to each LEA must be used to support individual school restructuring initiatives related to providing all students with the opportunity to achieve high standards. The amount awarded to each LEA or consortia of LEAs varied based on student enrollment. Each LEA received a minimum of \$5,000. Each LEA then received additional funds based on the number of pupils to be served in the designated school buildings. Fifty percent of the funds awarded to the LEA must serve schools which are in need of special assistance.

B Process for Making Subgrants for Improvements in Preservice Education

Programs:

The Indiana Department of Education used \$167,500 for the purpose of awarding grants to LEAs or consortia of LEAs, in cooperation with institutions of higher education, non-profit educational organizations, or any combination thereof, to support the improvement of preservice teacher education and school administrator programs. Information regarding the availability of the subgrants was disseminated by the Title III program coordinator to all LEAs, institutions of higher education, and other non-profit education agencies as appropriate. The subgrants were awarded through a competitive, peer-review process, described above ("A"), and administered by the SEA.

C Process for Making Subgrants for Continuing Professional Development:

The Indiana Department of Education awarded \$551,500 to LEAs or consortia of LEAs for the purpose of supporting the development and implementation of new and improved forms of continuing and sustained professional development opportunities for teachers, principals, and other educators at the school or LEA level. Information regarding the availability of the subgrants was disseminated by the Title III program coordinator to all LEAs, institutions of higher education, and other non-profit education agencies as appropriate. The subgrants were awarded through a competitive, peer-review process, described above ("A"), and administered by the SEA.

III. GOALS 2000 1994-95 PROPOSED ALLOCATIONS

A	Subgrants	<u>\$982,000</u>
	1. LEA Improvement	\$263,000
	2. Preservice Teacher Education	\$167,500
	3. Professional Development	\$551,500
B	State Plan Development	<u>\$639,101</u>
	1. Support of Panel & Plan Development	\$539,101
	2. Administration of Subgrant Process	\$100,000
C	Technology Plan Development	<u>\$75,000</u>

D	Total Title III Allocation	<u>\$1,621,101</u>
E	Total Goals 2000/Technology Allocation	<u>\$1,696,101</u>

GOALS 2000: EDUCATE AMERICA ACT

STATE PROFILE

STATE: Iowa
DATE APPLICATION SUBMITTED: November 29, 1994
DATE APPLICATION APPROVED: January 11, 1995
FUNDING: FIRST YEAR: \$792,961; SECOND YEAR: \$3,171,844 (estimate);
TECHNOLOGY: \$75,000.

I. PROCESS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE STATE PLAN

A Pre-Existing Reform Initiatives:

The Iowa State Board of Education and the Iowa Department of Education have provided supportive leadership for school improvement efforts through a long-range planning process that was initiated in January of 1991. This process utilized a statewide group of constituents that closely resembled the composition of the statewide panel described in the Goals 2000 legislation. After extensive public input, the State Board of Education approved a long-range plan in December of 1991. Using a similar process, the State Board approved a revision of the original plan in February of 1994. The four goals of the plan focus statewide school improvement efforts on: increasing the level of achievement for all students; enhancing educator preparation and development; organizational transformation at all levels of the system; and systemic planning and quality assurance. Iowa has demonstrated an on-going commitment to improving its educational system. The Code of Iowa currently requires local school districts to determine local educational needs, to establish goals for student achievement and performance, to develop plans for meeting these goals, and to evaluate and report progress on a regular basis. Consistent with this effort, the state legislature has provided \$26,000,000 annually to local school districts for implementation of staff development strategies which will redesign the educational system. Iowa has a number of existing education indicators that provide high levels of community involvement, strong site-based decision making, high expectations for students, and innovative educational practices including the nation's only statewide, interactive fiber optic network.

B Formation of the State Planning Panel and Development of the Plan:

Following a series of meetings and communications with Michael Cohen and Tom Payzant (U.S. Department of Education), it was decided to submit Iowa's strategic plan (*Education is Iowa's Future*) as a pre-existing plan for continued funding under Section 306 of the Goals 2000 Educate America Act. The strategic plan, adopted in 1991 and revised in 1994, was developed using a broad-based council similar in nature to the state planning panel required by Goals 2000 legislation. Once this decision was made, the timeline in the original Iowa application for planning funds was nullified. It is now anticipated that Iowa will submit its pre-existing plan during the week of November 6, 1995.

C Learning Technologies Plan Development and Integration with Goals 2000 State Reform Plan:

Education is Iowa's Future, the state plan for educational excellence, charges the Iowa Department of Education with taking a "leadership role by developing and communicating a compelling vision for using technology to transform the teaching and learning process, by facilitating the acquisition of technologies and providing appropriate staff development." As part of that charge, Iowa has been involved in the development of the Iowa Communications Network, a fully interactive fiber optic telecommunications network, which is designed to link all of Iowa's K-12 schools, area education agencies, community colleges, public and independent colleges and universities. In addition, the Iowa State Board of Education accepted a report from the Iowa Technology Commission in April 1994 which outlines a vision for the creative uses of technology to improve teaching and learning in Iowa's schools at the building, district, area, and state levels. The Commission, comprised of 17 Iowa educators, business and foundation leaders, technology experts, legislators, and other government leaders compiled a number of recommendations for developing "...a bold strategic technology plan that secures Iowa's national leadership in educational excellence well into the 21st century." Among the major recommendations of the Technology Commission are the following: establishment of an Office of Educational Technology in the Office of the Director of the Iowa Department of Education; continued development of a long-term strategic vision and policies that support the equitable access to and creative uses of information technologies in Iowa schools; establishment of an Educational Technology Trust Fund to support acquisition, maintenance, and upgrading of technology hardware and software, as well as fund professional development programs for Iowa educators; convening of an Educational Technology Advisory Committee to provide ongoing consultation in technology policy and planning; designation and support of technology coordinators in each school district to assist teachers in the development and uses of technology that improve learning; development of incentives for teachers to strengthen the curriculum and their teaching methods in ways that take advantage of the learning benefits from technology. These recommendations, among others contained in the commission's report, exemplify Iowa's commitment to ongoing utilization and expansion of technology as a means of improving the teaching and learning process in the state's schools.

II. DESCRIPTION OF THE SUBGRANT PROGRAM

A Process for Making Subgrants for LEA Improvement Plans:

The Iowa Department of Education will award approximately \$480,000 to LEAs under the provisions of Sections 309(a) and (b) of the Act. These subgrants will be awarded to a number of school districts (approximately 30-45) for the purpose of planning and developing local school improvement plans. These grants will range in size from approximately \$10,000 to \$18,000. At least two other grants will be awarded totaling approximately \$44,000 and \$24,000, respectively, for plans which focus on targeted preservice and inservice collaborations between school districts and area education agencies and/or institutions of higher learning. The Department of Education established an RFP process for awarding subgrants and the awardees were notified May 1, 1995.

Grant proposals were solicited from LEAs during the spring of 1995. The RFP process for local school improvement plan development required LEAs to address the following: how the local school improvement plan will be developed; strategies for assuring that all students will meet locally established high expectations; flexibility in allowing schools within the LEA to address their particular needs; and processes for broad-based community participation in the development, implementation, and evaluation of the local improvement plan.

B Process for Making Subgrants for Improvements in Preservice Education Programs:

See "A" above for the number and amount of subgrant awards for this category. The RFP process for preservice subgrants required LEAs (or consortiums of LEAs, area education agencies, and institutions of higher education) to address the following: processes to be used to improve preservice teacher education and school administrator preparation programs so that such programs provide increased emphasis on recommending practitioners for licensure based on the assessment of teaching performance that assures subject matter and pedagogical expertise necessary for preparing all students to meet high standards.

C Process for Making Subgrants for Continuing Professional Development:

See "A" above for the number and amount of subgrant awards for this category. The RFP process for inservice subgrants required LEAs (or consortiums of LEAs, area education agencies, and institutions of higher education) to address the following: processes to be used for the development and implementation of new and improved forms of continuing and sustained professional development opportunities for teachers, principals, and other educators at the school or district level that will enhance their knowledge and skills necessary to enable their students to meet the rigorous standards established in Iowa school districts.

III. GOALS 2000 1994-95 PROPOSED ALLOCATIONS

A	Subgrants	<u>\$475,777</u>
	1. School Improvement Plan Development	\$415,777
	2. Preservice Teacher Education	\$36,000
	3. Professional Development	\$24,000
B	State Plan Development	<u>\$317,184</u>
	1. State Panel Work	\$77,836
	2. Agency Planning & Support	\$110,000
	3. Administrative Costs	\$35,000
	4. Materials & Supplies	\$14,348
	5. Contract Services	\$50,000
	6. Travel	\$30,000
C	Technology Plan Development	<u>\$75,000</u>

D Total Title III Allocation

\$792,961

E Total Goals 2000/Technology Allocation

\$867,961

GOALS 2000: EDUCATE AMERICA ACT

STATE PROFILE

STATE: Kansas
DATE APPLICATION SUBMITTED: June 30, 1994
DATE APPLICATION APPROVED: August 3, 1994
FUNDING: FIRST YEAR: \$771,349; SECOND YEAR: \$3,085,396 (estimate);
TECHNOLOGY: \$75,000

I. PROCESS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE STATE PLAN

A Pre-Existing Reform Initiatives:

The Kansas State Board of Education began its improvement/reform process in 1989 with the adoption of its mission statement and strategic direction providing a framework for quality education and lifelong learning for all Kansas citizens. A framework for implementing the Kansas State mission is developed in seven Strategic Directions which are aligned with the Eight National Goals. The Strategic Directions in summary include: 1) quality early childhood programs; 2) results oriented curriculum and instruction; 3) safe, nurturing, and technologically advanced learning environments for all diverse groups; 4) strengthened parental involvement in schools; 5) quality staff and organizational development; 6) creation of learning communities; and 7) strengthened business and industry involvement in education. Improving student achievement in math and science has been a state priority since 1990. The state has developed content standards and state assessments for math, science, social studies and communications. The vehicle for achieving Kansas' Goals is the Kansas Quality Performance Accreditation (QP) process. The QP identifies three major process outcomes: 1) effective schools principles; 2) outreach for a learning community; 3) effective staff development. In addition, the QP specifies a minimum of state indicators, required local indicators and optional local indicators. State monitoring of plans is carried out annually. In summary, many of the policies, programs, and approaches for school improvement reform are in place. Goals 2000 provides Kansas with the opportunity to undertake the following: expand outreach activities; refine state improvement programs currently underway; extend alignment and refinement of content standards, benchmarks, assessments and instructional practices; and specify and initiate professional development programs.

B Formation of the State Planning Panel and Development of the Plan:

A broad-based State Panel, approximately 30 persons, meeting Title III requirements will be appointed by the Governor and Chief. The Chair and a five to seven member Executive Committee will also be appointed by the Governor and Chief to guide the development of the agenda and activities of the State Panel. It is anticipated that the panel will meet six times during the first year and concentrate on the enhancement and further development of the Quality Performance Accreditation System. Two sets of Work Groups will be put in place to refine standards, benchmarks and assessments. SEA staff groups will be used to collect and summarize information to be used in strategies and programs in support of the Working Groups. The School-to-Work Transition Plan is in the process of

development by another broad-based state commission and will be coordinated with the Goals 2000 Plan. Six Regional Hearings and two Educational Forums will be held for input and reactions and will be carried out by teams composed of state board members, panel members, SEA staff and Work Group members. The Executive Management Team will meet periodically to review reports of the Panel and Task Force to ensure coordination with state education activities.

Milestones and Activities:

7/1/94 - 10/11/94

Subgrant Design:

7/1/94 - 8/1/94

SEA design team selection and development of timelines, criteria and application.

9/1/94 - 10/1/94

Selection of peer review group and reading, rating and selection of winners.
Final list to state board for approval of grant awards.

7/10/94 - 8/15/94

Appointment and orientation of state panel, work groups and staff groups:

7/10/94 - 7/20/94

Develop potential list of appointees for panel and work groups; secure panel appointments from governor and chief and the appointment of work groups by chief.

8/1/94 - 8/15/94

Prepare orientation plan and materials, implement session.

9/10/94 - 6/1/95

Provide panel with work group reports and recommended plan for content standards, performance standards and assessments:

9/10/94 - 11/20/94

Complete meeting with work groups on content standards and meet with state panel.

1/5/95 - 2/1/95

Complete staff work on standards and systemic change and develop panel plan for dealing with standards, benchmarks and assessment.

8/15/94 - 6/15/95

Provide panel with workgroup reports and complete recommended plan for systemic changes:

8/15/94

Work group orientation on systemic change issues.

1/5/95 - 4/10/95

Systemic change work group meetings and panel meeting and review of working group reports.

4/30/95 - 6/15/95

Public hearing process for community on plan contents, formulation of plan draft and final panel sessions to finalize state plan.

6/10/95 - 6/30/95

Compilation and Submission of State Plan: 1) Plan review by panel members and executive/management committee; 2) Submission of plan to USED.

C Learning Technologies Plan Development and Integration with Goals 2000 State Reform Plan:

Kansas staff is discussing expanding the development of cluster sites (currently 12) where two-way interactive fiber optic systems are operating using Internet. Given the needs the development of the State Technology Plan will include the formation of a task force of 20 LEA/IE technology experts who will meet a minimum of six times to: develop an overall plan; develop specifications for a state clearinghouse for school and district information on technology; design and implement a plan for training teachers as consumers and users of technology; design and implement a training of trainers cadre of 30 persons; field test the first level of training and evaluate needs and progress made during the first year. The task force will focus on integrating the plan to assist in current reform efforts related to Goals 2000 in carrying out the QP activities.

Milestones and Activities:

7/20/95 - 5/15/95

Development of Technology Plan:

7/20/95 - 8/30/95

Appointment of task force, orientation and task force meetings to develop work plan, specifications and initial formulation of state plan.

11/30/95 - 6/15/95

Design and review of survey of district technology needs and review of training model for the training of technology trainers-field test and refine.

II. DESCRIPTION OF THE SUBGRANT PROGRAM

A Process for Making Subgrants for LEA Improvement Plans:

A total of 65% (\$300,000) of the \$462,000 available for subgrants will be used for this category. The (RFP) will be developed and sent to the 304 school districts outlining the purpose, criteria for selection and conditions for implementation of grants. The proposals will be read and evaluated by a panel of knowledgeable local educators and experts in educational systems. All LEA subgrants will require some inclusion of content standards and a relationship to QP. The subgrant process will consist of: a) selection of a grant reading committee of 15-20 members representing broad-based education groups; b) one day committee training session; c) grant to be read and rated by 5 members; d) high and low score will be discarded and the remaining 3 scores will be totaled; e) grants will be

rated from high to low based on total score; f) grants will be awarded from high to low until all designated funds are depleted. It is anticipated that 15-16 grants will be awarded to LEAs to develop program improvement plans and initiatives. The maximum amount of these awards will not exceed \$2.00 per student with a minimum grant of \$5,000.

B Process for Making Subgrants for Improvements in Preservice Education Programs:

The grant process for awards for preservice and professional development are to follow the process as outlined for LEA subgrants. \$162,000 or 35% of the subgrant allocation has been reserved for this category. It is estimated that two to six grants will be awarded for preservice and professional development purposes. A RFP and a pre-submission workshop will be held with IHRs and other professional development organizations to explain the focus of these grants on the implementation of content standards and an expansion of instructional strategies. A panel of IHE, LEA and other selected persons will evaluate the proposals.

C Process for Making Subgrants for Continuing Professional Development:

The process for P/D grants is the same as outlined for preservice grants. A request for proposal and a pre-submission workshop will be held concurrently with the Preservice Teacher Education Workshop for groups who are interested in inservice training and staff development. A group of LEA experts and other training experts will evaluate the proposals. The critical task of the SEA staff is to ensure the targeting of these funds on areas related to content standards, instruction and assessment in the districts of highest need.

III. GOALS 2000 1994-95 PROPOSED ALLOCATIONS

A	Subgrants	<u>\$462,809</u>
	1. LEA Improvement	\$300,809
	2. Preservice Education	}
	3. Professional Development	
		\$162,000
B	State Plan Development	<u>\$408,040</u>
	1. Administration	\$100,000
	a) Personnel	\$85,000
	b) Travel	\$5,000
	Other operating costs	\$10,000
	2. Panel costs-Meeting and hearing expenses	\$40,000
	3. Work Group costs	\$60,000
	4. Forum/Hearing expenses	\$20,000
	5. Pre-application Workshops- participants	\$10,000

6.	Information, publications and leadership development with administrators/board	\$28,040
7.	Members, consultants and training	\$50,000
C	Technology Plan Development	<u>\$75,000</u>
D	Total Title III Allocation	<u>\$771,349</u>
E	Total Goals 2000/Technology Allocation	<u>\$846,349</u>

GOALS 2000: EDUCATE AMERICA ACT

STATE PROFILE

STATE: Kentucky
DATE APPLICATION SUBMITTED: July 15, 1994
DATE APPLICATION APPROVED: September 7, 1994
FUNDING: FIRST YEAR: \$1,369,799; SECOND YEAR: \$5,479,196 (estimate);
TECHNOLOGY: \$75,000

I. PROCESS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE STATE PLAN

A Pre-Existing Reform Initiatives:

The Kentucky Education Reform Act (KERA) was signed into law in July 1990. The legislation, originally intended to establish equal educational opportunities for children among the 176 school districts in Kentucky, has opened the way for systemic reform affecting every aspect of the school and community involvement. KERA establishes learning goals for all students and requires schools to provide ways for all students to successfully meet these expectations. Performance based assessment is provided to determine what students can do with what they know and accountability measures are in place to reward schools in which students perform at high levels and assist schools which do not increase the proportion of their students who meet learner goals. Ten initiatives form the core of Kentucky's educational system. **Assessment** evaluates student learning based on what students can do with what they know and **Accountability** rewards schools in which students perform at higher levels and offers assistance to schools in which students do not meet learner goals. **Curriculum** links the ways teachers teach with the ways students learn. KERA encourages teaching "across the curriculum" (for example writing about mathematics) so students learn to use knowledge in real-world ways. **Extended School Services** provide additional instruction and support for students who are at risk of falling behind in school. Family Resource and Youth Services Centers provide health, social, justice, and education services for students and families. Centers are located in or near schools in which at least 20 percent of the students qualify for free school meals. **Preschool** uses a developmentally appropriate curriculum and related services to prepare at-risk children for learning in primary school. Preschool is available for all 4 year olds from low-income families and three and four year olds with disabilities. **Primary School** features developmentally appropriate curriculum in continuous progress classrooms. Children are assessed on a continuous basis and advance to the fourth grade when they are ready. **Professional Development** provides training opportunities for teachers and other certified employees. Plans are developed at each school to address specific needs. **Regional Service Centers** make expertise and technical assistance more accessible to local districts and schools through eight locations across the state. **School-Based Decision Making** empowers a council of three teachers, two parents, and the principal at each school to adopt policies based on what is best for the school's students. Councils make decisions about instructional materials, school staff, curriculum, extracurricular activities, professional development, and other issues. **Technology** will link 150,000 student workstations, 35,000 teacher stations, 1,400 school management systems, 176 district

administrative systems, higher education campuses, educational television, the state library system and state agencies in a communications, instructional and administrative network.

B Formation of the State Planning Panel and Development of the Plan:

Kentucky proposes to use the Kentucky Board of Education as the state planning panel. This proposal is supported by the Governor and the Commissioner of Education. The members of the Kentucky Board are appointed by the Governor and confirmed by the Senate and House of Representatives of the General Assembly. Seven members represent each of the Kentucky Supreme Court districts and four members represent the state at large. The executive director of the Council on Higher Education serves as an ex-officio non-voting member. The State Board has been directly involved in the planning, development and implementation of reform. To assist the Kentucky Board in its role as the State Panel, and to provide a larger representative group to continue state improvement planning, the Board will appoint an advisory committee which will report regularly to the Board and will serve as the central clearinghouse for both State Education Agency and Local Education Agency activity related to the state improvement plan.

Milestones and activities:

July 1994

Review of initial application and development of strategies to begin implementing the planning process proposed in the application.

August-September 1994

Oversee SEA planning and subgrant process; begin Goals 2000 years 2-5 application development with day long sessions: Day 1 - orientation, briefing, priority setting; Day 2 - finalize priorities, review draft plan; Day 3 - review, revise draft, complete application

October 1994

Present Goals 2000 years 2-5 application to State Board; Submit application to US Department of Education

December 1994

Receive notification from USED

January 1995

Continue oversight of state improvement planning, subgrant procedures and implementation and coordination of related activity; develop applications for each subsequent year of Goals 2000

C Learning Technologies Plan Development and Integration with Goals 2000 State Reform Plan:

The existing Kentucky Master Plan for Education Technology addresses the strategic question of what should be done to bring technology to the schools in ways that will raise

student achievement and school success. The strategic objectives of the Master Plan are directly aligned with those of the Kentucky Education Reform Act. The essence of the plan is the blending of Commonwealth-wide coordinated planning with decentralized local education agency implementation. Funds from Goals 2000 will be used to intensify planning to extend the education communications infrastructure as a learning resource in the community. Today's Master Plan specifies voice, video and data links from the state-wide area network to the district, from the district to the school and within the school to the teacher and student desktops. The plan envisions, but does not specifically detail, the extension of network services to the home for students, teachers, and families and to community stakeholder groups. The Goals 2000 planning priority will be to organize a focus group to develop strategies for extending the education communications infrastructure into the community. Specifically, the group will address three issue areas: technology; public services regulation and rate structures; and information policy. The resulting strategies will be incorporated into the Master Plan for Education Technology and will be used to initiate model community pilot programs. As part of the development of Kentucky's Master Plan for Education Technology, each district in the state of Kentucky completed a District Technology Plan which conforms to architectural standards and policies developed in collaboration with local representatives. To assist districts with plan implementation, the state provides extensive technical assistance, consulting support, state-as-one-customer contracts, dedicated regional staff, an on-going program of professional development for teachers, and a yearly allocation from the Education Technology Trust Fund based on Average Daily Attendance. Equity in access to information and information technologies--to break down barriers imposed by geography, socio-economic factors, and demographics--is a fundamental principle of the Kentucky Education Technology System (KETS). KETS is designed as an open system to facilitate network-based collaboration with higher education, Kentucky educational television, public libraries, workforce development interests, community organizations, and private sector partners and to foster interoperability among hardware, software, and network vendors. The Master Plan addresses 600,000 preschool through grade 12 students, 35,000 teachers, 37,000 classrooms, 1,363 schools, students and teachers in need of assistive/adaptive technology, 687 Family Resource/Youth Services Centers, 69 vocational schools, 176 districts, 8 regional service centers, and the Department of Education. All of these entities are being linked through an instructional network running on the state's integrated communications highway with gateways to national and international information services.

II. DESCRIPTION OF THE SUBGRANT PROGRAM

A Process for Making Subgrants for LEA Improvement Plans:

The priority areas to be addressed in subgrants to LEAs are Public Engagement - Parental Involvement and Community Support, Preservice Teacher Education, and Professional Development. The details of each program for which subgrants are available will be advertised to LEAs and other applicants (consortia, cooperatives, schools) through a Request for Proposal process. Grant applications will be reviewed by a selection committee through a competitive process. Selection committees will include representatives from the advisory committee and recommendations for funding will be

made to the State Board. The projected date by which funds will go to successful applicants is September 15, 1994. A total of \$480,000 is available to support school district grants up to \$30,000 each and individual school grants up to \$3,000 each in the priority area of Public Engagement - Parental Involvement and Community Support. Award decisions will be made within three weeks of receipt of applications. All applications will be screened by a committee comprised of district public information staff, teachers, and parents, plus high school students, state agency personnel, and local district administrators. Model pilot programs supported by subgrants for LEA Improvement will develop public engagement/parent involvement and community support programs or models that will be shared with other districts and schools for improving public support of Kentucky's education reform.

B Process for Making Subgrants for Improvements in Preservice Education Programs:

The goal of the Preservice Teacher Education component of Goals 2000 in Kentucky will be to plan for the implementation of professional development (clinical) sites which will demonstrate exemplary preservice teacher preparation programs promoting advanced student learning based on established standards. No more than ten proposals will be funded at an average level of \$17,000. The proposals must discuss how the local clinical site will provide training in the scoring of writing and math portfolios; use of performance assessments approved by the Education Professional Standards Board for evaluating teacher education students; the use of a continuous assessment program of the institution of higher education for measuring performance by trainees on the New Teacher Standards; link the academic expectations and assessments (KIRIS) to the clinical curriculum; incorporate technology for instruction in the clinical curriculum; integrate field experiences, practicums, and student teaching into the professional development site experience; and link the observation of trainees to the Kentucky Teacher Internship Program instrument. The Education Professional Standards Board (EPSB) will approve the proposals for funding. All proposals received will be screened by a Goals 2000 Preservice clinical site oversight/monitoring group (a majority of which will be classroom teachers and two university/college members). This group will recommend the proposals to the EPSB for funding. The oversight/monitoring group will also make periodic visits to the clinical sites and report to the EPSB on at least one project each quarter.

C Process for Making Subgrants for Continuing Professional Development:

Up to a total of sixteen grants will be awarded for planning model professional development school-based plans and for planning professional development models for improving content skills of teachers in mathematics and performance assessment. The grants will range up to \$12,000 each. The eligible recipients are schools or combinations of schools within a district or a consortium, and consortia of two or more school districts or school district and higher education entities. School districts in excess of 20,000 may submit a proposal without entering into a consortium. A request for proposal and application shall be distributed to all school districts announcing the competitive subgrants with specifications and timelines. All applications within a geographical region shall be read by a panel composed of teachers, school administrators, higher education personnel, state agency personnel, and representatives from professional development organizations.

A score sheet corresponding to each required component of the application shall be used to evaluate the proposals. Recommendations shall be made to the Commissioner of Education who shall announce the subgrants to the chosen grant recipients in each region. Technical assistance and follow-up will be provided by the Professional Development Division, Kentucky Department of Education.

III. GOALS 2000 1994-95 PROPOSED ALLOCATIONS

A	Subgrants	<u>\$822,000</u>
1.	LEA Improvement Plan (Public Engagement)	\$480,000
2.	Preservice Teacher Education	\$171,000
3.	Professional Development	\$171,000
B	State Plan Development	<u>\$547,799</u>
1.	Administrative Costs	\$100,000
2.	SEA Program Costs	\$447,799
C	Technology Plan Development	<u>\$75,000</u>
D	Total Title III Allocation	<u>\$1,369,799</u>
E	Total Goals 2000/Technology Allocation	<u>\$1,444,799</u>

GOALS 2000: EDUCATE AMERICA ACT

STATE PROFILE

STATE: Louisiana
DATE APPLICATION SUBMITTED: July 7, 1994
DATE APPLICATION APPROVED: September 1, 1994
FUNDING: FIRST YEAR: \$1,938,055; SECOND YEAR: \$7,752,220 (estimate);
TECHNOLOGY: \$76,697

I. PROCESS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE STATE PLAN

A Pre-Existing Reform Initiatives:

Since the publication of A Nation At Risk, Louisiana has encouraged a range of initiatives designed to bring about fundamental change in the ways that schools are organized/administered, and students are instructed. State agencies, institutions, businesses, and community groups have provided leadership and staff development for these efforts. Results have been seen in the implementation of numerous school change processes in school systems. These include such initiatives as the following: 1) Accelerated Schools: The Stanford Accelerated Schools Program is designed to increase learning so that at-risk students are able to close the achievement gap and perform at grade level; 2) Effective Schools: This project is designed to assist systems and schools in the development of school improvement plans to bring about improved student outcomes; 3) Quality Schools: School teams comprised of district-level administrators, principals, and teachers receive training through the Administrative Leadership Academy of the SEA, in the leadership/management philosophies of quality proponents such as W. Edward Deming, William Glasser, and Stephen Covey; 4) Site Based Management (SBM): SBM gives greater authority to the principal who then has the option to involve teachers and others in the decision-making process of the school; and 5) Performance Based Education: Performance Based Education encourages educators and community members to identify performance based goals that ultimately determine curricula, instructional strategies, and student learning outcomes. In addition to these school change processes, several other related systemic reform initiatives are currently in place in Louisiana. These include such projects as: 1) Louisiana Goals 2000 Office: Established within the Governor's Office in November 1992, the Louisiana Goals 2000 Office has as its charge the provision of assistance to LEAs and communities as a whole in the development and implementation of school improvement plans to address the National Education Goals; 2) State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education (BESE) Goals: In 1993 the BESE delineated six major goals to serve as the driving force for improving education in Louisiana; 3) Louisiana Systemic Initiatives Program (LaSIP): LaSIP is a five-year systemic initiative to improve mathematics and science education, funded jointly by the National Science Foundation, the BESE, and the Board of Regents; 4) Eisenhower Math and Science Curriculum/Assessment Frameworks: This project is a multi-year effort to develop pre-K through 12 mathematics and science curricular and assessment frameworks that reflect world-class content and assessment standards for the respective disciplines; 5) Louisiana Educational Assessment Program (LEAP): Through the administration of both criterion-

and norm-referenced tests, this program measures achievement relative to both grade-level standards and national content standards in language arts, mathematics, science and social studies; 6) Performance-Based Accreditation Program: School systems and individual schools, with assistance from the SEA, conduct a self-assessment and collaboratively develop and implement comprehensive campus-wide/system-wide improvement plans that include a mission statement and performance-related goals; 7) School-to-Work System: Louisiana is linking applied school-based learning with structured work-based learning for students through the development of a state collaborative that provides funds to local partnerships for work-based learning sites and staff development; 8) Louisiana Alliance for Education Reform: This initiative is aimed at redesigning schools through systemic changes in teaching, learning, curriculum and teacher training, and involves partnerships among university faculty, educators, parents, and community members; 9) Minimum Foundation Program (MFP): In April 1992 the BESE adopted a new MFP formula, the mechanism through which Louisiana distributes state aid to local school systems. The formula was redesigned to address adequacy and equity issues in education and to provide greater flexibility to school systems; 10) Comprehensive School Health (CSH) Program: Based on the belief that education reform enjoys the maximum potential for success when students are optimally healthy and are dealt with holistically, the CSH Program promotes education and health as interdependent systems; and 11) Reorganization of the SEA: The BESE has approved a reorganization plan for the SEA, pending legislative approval, which realigns administrative units within the agency to better function in the promotion of systemic educational change for Louisiana.

B Formation of the State Planning Panel and Development of the Plan:

The Governor and the State Superintendent have jointly selected a broad-based State Planning Panel. This bipartisan panel will function for the duration of the Goals 2000 initiative, with original panel members serving a minimum term of one year. The Panel will establish procedures for extending the terms of its members, to ensure continuity in implementing the plan over time. The Governor and State Superintendent will jointly appoint new members to the panel when vacancies occur.

Timeline and activities:

July 13, 1994

Governor's Office/SEA conducts orientation for Panel members.

July-August 1994

Governor's Office/SEA determines initial subgrant application criteria and procedures.

August 1994

BESE reviews subgrant application process; SEA disseminates subgrant application to LEAs.

August 1994 -ongoing

Panel/SEA staff reviews federal and state funding streams and aligns them with the mission of Goals 2000.

August-November 1994	Panel reviews existing and developing programs, conducts outreach, seeks statewide citizen and professional input.
September 1994	SEA conducts technical assistance work sessions on subgrants throughout the state.
October 1994 - ongoing	Panel and SEA build a statewide infrastructure to support, promote, and accelerate school improvement.
November 1994	SEA awards subgrants to LEAs/consortia of LEAs, higher education, and non-profit organizations. Panel completes initial draft of State Improvement Plan.
April 1995	Panel and SEA establish benchmarks and timelines for State Plan.
April - May 1995	Panel and SEA integrate components into final form for submission to USED with application for year two assistance.

C Learning Technologies Plan Development and Integration with Goals 2000 State Reform Plan:

Several systemic technology initiatives at the local and state levels have already been initiated to promote technology planning and coordination. They include the following:

- 1) The Governor's Telecommunications Task Force: Convened in November 1993 to develop a State telecommunications plan incorporating representation of state and local governmental agencies, telecommunications providers, telecommunications regulatory agencies, and users of technology;
- 2) The Louisiana Systemic Initiatives Program Educational Technology Subcommittee: This is an educational technology planning group for the LaSIP project;
- 3) The Governor's 1992 Transition Team Educational Technology Panel: A panel established to develop a broad action agenda for educational technology;
- 4) The LANET: A statewide computer network established through the State Office of Telecommunications Management which supports access to Internet;
- 5) The Library Automation Project: A project to support automation of university and public library catalogues, acquisition of full-text information services, and computer-networked access via the LANET to these information resources through university and parish public libraries and selected schools;
- 6) The Louisiana Coordinating Task Force for Educational Technology (Task Force): A task force established in 1994 to provide direction for the development and coordination of an integrated State plan for pre-K through 12 and the postsecondary technical institute system. The Task Force is the body responsible for developing the Technology Plan. Selected members of the State Planning Panel will serve on the Task Force to assist in the development of the Technology Plan and

its integration into the State Improvement Plan. The Task Force will also draw upon, and expand on, the collective work of other state efforts currently underway.

Timeline and activities:

August 1994

Governor's Office/SEA provides charge to Technology Task Force to develop a systemic statewide technology plan.

March 1995

State Technology Task Force reports to Panel and SEA: Plan and recommendations.

May 1995

Comprehensive State Plan submitted to USED.

II. DESCRIPTION OF THE SUBGRANT PROGRAM

A Process for Making Subgrants for LEA Improvement Plans:

The SEA will allocate 75% (\$872,125) of the monies stipulated for subgrant awards to support individual school improvement initiatives. It is anticipated that 15-25 competitive grants will be awarded, ranging from \$20,000 to \$50,000. An LEA that has already developed a plan that meets all of the Goals 2000 criteria may be considered for an implementation subgrant during the first year.

B Process for Making Subgrants for Improvements in Preservice Education Programs:

It is anticipated that four grants of \$20,000 each will be awarded. Institutions of higher education will align themselves with individual schools and/or consortia of schools to simultaneously redesign their teacher education programs, while working collaboratively with schools in their reform efforts. These professional development schools will evolve as sites for the continuous improvement of teaching and learning by students, school personnel, and university faculty. The applications for funding will be competitive and a peer review process will be utilized in determining the awards.

C Process for Making Subgrants for Continuing Professional Development:

It is anticipated that eight grants of approximately \$20,000 each will be awarded. The priorities for staff development may include, but not be limited to, the following: school change processes; governance; capacity building for school change; continuous quality improvement; instructional technology; curriculum frameworks and design; instructional strategies; authentic assessment; comprehensive school health; and parental involvement. The competitive peer review process will be utilized in the granting of awards as stated in "B" above.

III. GOALS 2000 1994-95 PROPOSED ALLOCATIONS

A	Subgrants	<u>\$1,162,833</u>
1.	LEA Improvement Plans	\$922,833
2.	Preservice Teacher Training	\$80,000
3.	Professional Development	\$160,000
B	State Plan Development	<u>\$775,222</u>
1.	Direct Expenses for Panel and Plan	\$599,251
2.	Indirect Expenses (9.8%)	\$75,971
3.	SEA Grant Administration	\$100,000
C	Technology Plan Development	<u>\$76,697</u>
D	Total Title III Allocation	<u>\$1,938,055</u>
E	Total Goals 2000/Technology Allocation	<u>\$2,014,752</u>

GOALS 2000: EDUCATE AMERICA ACT

STATE PROFILE

STATE: Maine
DATE APPLICATION SUBMITTED: July 1, 1994
DATE APPLICATION APPROVED: July 29, 1994
FUNDING: FIRST YEAR: \$420,905; SECOND YEAR: \$1,683,620 (estimate);
TECHNOLOGY: \$75,000.

I. PROCESS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE STATE PLAN

A Pre-Existing Reform Initiatives:

Over the past ten years Maine has developed many initiatives designed to increase student achievement. These initiatives include: 1) Maine's Education Reform Act of 1984; 2) Maine's Common Core of Learning which includes: a) The Innovative Education Grant (IEG) Program, b) The Department of Education's School Change Team (eight-member organizational development consulting group, providing on-site systemic change support to IEG districts), c) The Task Force on Learning Results, d) Performance-based Initial Teacher Certification Pilot Project, e) K-8 Technology Grant Program, and f) National Science Foundation's Maine SSI Program; 3) The Maine Educational Assessment Test (designed by Maine classroom teachers); 4) Chapter I; 5) Math and Science Curriculum Frameworks Project; 6) The New Standards Project; 7) Maine's cluster of school-to-work transition programs; 8) The Restructuring Support Project (partnership between the Department of Education, the private Center for Educational Services, and the University of Maine System); 9) Continuing Teacher Certification (local support systems help teachers design recertification plans; peer coaching training a requirement); 10) Maine State Government's Total Quality Management process; and 11) Service-based school/university partnerships in four regions of the state.

B Formation of the State Planning Panel and Development of the Plan:

Maine's Goals 2000 Panel will be the Task Force on Learning Results - a decision supported by the Governor. The Task Force was created as a result of PL Chapter 290, Section 20A, "An Act to Enhance the State Board of Education" (1993). The Act gives the State Board authority for setting education system goals and establishes the Task Force on Learning Results as the group responsible for assisting the State Board in doing so. The Task Force, led by the chair of the State Board of Education, can include no more than 20 members and has two responsibilities: to develop a state plan for Maine - a task completed in February 1994, and to use the Common Core of Learning to specifically identify what all Maine students should know and be able to do by the time they leave school. The Task Force is representative of the geographic regions of the state, the primary education stakeholders, Maine's professional education organizations, Maine's Common Core of Learning Commission, and the Coalition for Excellence in Education. The Commission was appointed by the Governor in 1989 to develop the Common Core of Learning and included business leaders, educators, students, and representatives from the legislature and the executive branch. The Coalition for Excellence in Education is a private organization

developed outside state government in 1990 to develop an independent plan for education in Maine. The Coalition developed 15 goals to reform Maine education. As stated above the state plan was completed in February 1994.

Timeline and activities:

August 12, 1994	Goals 2000 Information Packets distributed to all Districts
August 26, 1994	IEG (Innovative Education Grant)/Goals 2000 district "second chance" application distributed to LEAs
October 20, 1994	Professional Development RFP distributed
October 21, 1994	Goals 2000/IEG grants due
November 4, 1994	Peer review process for Goals 2000/IEG proposals
November 14, 1994	Goals 2000/IEG grants awarded
December 20, 1994	Professional Development RFPs due
February 24, 1995	IEG/Goals 2000 Applications for FY '96 distributed
March 6-8, 1995	Regional Workshops on IEG/Goals 2000 School Improvement Plan Development
May 29, 1995	IEG/Goals 2000 Grant Proposals due
June 12-13, 1995	Peer review process for Goals 2000/IEG proposals
November 11, 1995	Professional Development RFPs distributed
January 1996	Professional Development RFPs due; Submission of State Plan to USED
May 1996	IEG/Goals 2000 applications due
June 1996	Peer Review process of IEG/Goals 2000 applications
July 1, 1996	New support system plan implemented

C Learning Technologies Plan Development and Integration with Goals 2000 State Reform Plan:

The technology planning process will begin with the consultation of three existing planning groups. The combined group includes members of the Task Force on Learning Results and will serve as the Technology Planning Task Force for Goals 2000. The group will develop a request for proposals process to employ an independent contractor who will be responsible for facilitating the development of the state technology plan. The development process will include the following components: 1) Analysis of the data from the needs assessment section of the state's recent K-8 technology grant application will be combined with information to be collected through a secondary-level school survey; 2) The Department of Education's current technological capacity will be assessed and analyzed; 3) A group of 100 educators, parents, students, business and community members with expertise in technology will be convened to develop a shared vision for instructional technology which includes computers, computer peripherals, ITV, satellite, telecommunications, calculators, fax, and assistive technology; 4) A series of forums in the six regions of the state where technology grants were awarded will be held to verify the vision and to begin the development of the plan; 5) Additional opportunities for public input will be determined by the technology task force in cooperation with the contractor; and 6) The plan will be completed by March 1995 for presentation to the Task Force on Learning Results. The technology task force will then disseminate the plan in schools, at local school board meetings, among state-level policy makers, business leaders, and parents' groups. In addition, a portion of the state allocation for technology planning will be used to support the Interactive Television System so it can be used in communication and information dissemination.

II. DESCRIPTION OF THE SUBGRANT PROGRAM

A Process for Making Subgrants for LEA Improvement Plans:

Grants to LEAs in accordance with Section 309 (a) of the Act will be made through the state's existing Innovative Education Grants (IEG) Program. Grant applications for FY '95 have already been received and awarded, so a second, Goals 2000 grant cycle will be held in the fall, and a third in the spring, funded with \$136,000 from the subgrant allotment from Title III. Because Maine's plan development process will extend to 18 months, \$56,000 of this subgrant allotment will be used to fund seven \$8,000 Goals 2000 sites, in support of activities from November 1994 through June 1995. The next regular Innovative Education Grant program funding cycle begins on July 1, 1995, so an additional \$80,000 from the LEA subgrant allotment will be used then to fund eight Goals 2000 sites at \$10,000 each. Goals 2000 applications will be reviewed using the request for federal and state waivers and the stipulations in the legislation. The IEG program requires district self-assessment in every building in the system in five areas: 1) The extent to which there is a shared school-community vision, which includes shared beliefs about teaching, learning and education, and which was developed through a school-community consensus building process; 2) The extent to which a school-community climate supportive of change has been built; 3) How well curriculum, instruction, and assessment are connected to each other and to the locally-developed learning results; 4) The system's ability to connect people,

programs, and resources across grade levels, subject areas, and funding sources to create an environment in which all students can achieve the identified local learning results; and 5) How well the district has been able to design opportunities for professional growth which focus on creating a system-wide community of learners. The district creates a comprehensive action plan based on the self-assessment evidence collected. Seventy-five percent of the faculty in each school must vote in support of the grant application. Each funded district receives the on-site support of a consultant from the department's School Change Team to help them adapt the process to the local situation. At the end of each school year, funded sites are required to submit a portfolio which documents movement toward systemic change. In addition, the Change team reserves time during August of each year to analyze the district applications and the portfolios, searching for patterns of local need. The department is encouraging districts to use the IEG application as the school improvement plan.

B Process for Making Subgrants for Improvements in Preservice Education Programs:

Maine is requesting a waiver from this provision in order to utilize \$24,000 from the Title III subgrant allotment to continue to support an existing performance-based initial certification program begun in 1993. Three partnerships between local schools and teacher preparation programs were selected through a competitive, peer review process. The three partnerships have almost completed the first step in the process - developing a common core of learning for teachers. Their second step is to develop a performance-based assessment system to measure these learning results for teachers. The third is to change the curriculum and instruction offered by teacher preparation programs so that coursework and student experiences will result in the achievement of the identified outcomes. Finally, the three partnerships will jointly develop new initial certification regulations for adoption by the State Board of Education.

C Process for Making Subgrants for Continuing Professional Development:

Maine will design a request for proposals to distribute \$62,558 in subgrant funds to provide practicing teachers with opportunities for rigorous study in and across the disciplines and to help them connect this new knowledge with expanded instructional approaches and results-based curriculum design. Grants will be awarded to partnerships of LEAs, the Education and Arts and Sciences Colleges of the higher education community, and professional education organizations. Activities funded may encompass an entire year of learning, or focus on an intensive summer experience. Proposals may be submitted for any amount within the overall allocation for this subgrant category, but the goal is to fund up to six proposals. Proposals will be evaluated by members of Maine's content area professional groups, with process assistance from the Department of Education. Activities will be funded from January 1995 through December 1995 to allow for summer activities and follow up in the fall.

III. GOALS 2000 1994-95 PROPOSED ALLOCATIONS

A	Subgrants	<u>\$252,543</u>
	1. LEA Improvement	\$136,000
	2. Preservice Pilot Projects	\$24,000
	3. Professional Development	\$62,558
B	State Plan Development	<u>\$168,362</u>
C	Technology Plan Development	<u>\$75,000</u>
D	Total Title III Allocation	<u>\$420,905</u>
E	Total Goals 2000/Technology Allocation	<u>\$495,905</u>

GOALS 2000: EDUCATE AMERICA ACT

STATE PROFILE

STATE: Maryland
DATE APPLICATION SUBMITTED: September 2, 1994
DATE APPLICATION APPROVED: September 29, 1994
FUNDING: FIRST YEAR: \$1,341,545; SECOND YEAR: \$5,366,180 (estimate);
TECHNOLOGY: \$75,000.

I. PROCESS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE STATE PLAN

A Pre-Existing Reform Initiatives:

The genesis of school reform in Maryland can be traced to 1989 when the Governor's Commission on School Performance recommended sweeping changes in the state's education system. Shortly thereafter, Maryland launched *Schools for Success*, which outlined goals that Maryland must work toward for the year 2000. These goals included the six national goals, and added four others. *Schools for Success* is the state's comprehensive school reform effort focused on improving schools through rigorous performance standards and high expectations for the knowledge and skills students should acquire. The principles guiding school reform in Maryland are as follows: all children can learn; all children have the right to attend schools in which they can progress and learn; and all children shall have a real opportunity to learn equally rigorous content. There are nine major statewide initiatives currently existing in Maryland. The Maryland School Performance Program (MSPP), the centerpiece of *Schools for Success*, provides a framework for individual schools to make school improvement decisions designed to increase student learning. As part of this program, each local school has a school improvement team which examines state and local data on student participation and achievement in order to develop school improvement plans. The Maryland School Performance Assessment Program (MSPAP) is a statewide testing program that evaluates the performance of individual schools. MSPAP is a rigorous, criterion reference accountability system implemented in 1990. It is administered in grades 3, 5, and 8 and assesses student understanding in reading, writing, language usage, mathematics, science, and social studies. The MSPAP defines what students should know and be able to do and reports those data in a statewide report card. The Carnegie Corporation's Middle Grade School State Policy Initiative aims at fundamental change in school organization and management, curriculum, instruction, and assessment which impact classroom practices, teacher education, and comprehensive health education and services. Ten Maryland middle grade schools are part of a national network of reforming middle schools. Maryland's Tomorrow brings together the public and private sectors to help keep at-risk students in school, to improve students' basic academic skills and the graduation rate, and to help students transition to employment, further education, or training upon graduation. First established at the high school level, the program has since expanded to middle schools. Maryland has initiated the development of Performance-based High School Graduation Requirements, including the development of a new high school assessment system. Work is currently being done to identify essential content knowledge in English,

mathematics, science, and social studies, and to identify the general skills that are useful in a variety of content areas and settings. Like MSPAP at the elementary and middle school levels, data on student performance derived from the new assessments will help guide school improvement and accountability efforts at the high school level. The Technology Initiative is founded on the premise that improved educational technology will enhance teaching and learning. A committee of 70, representing the business, community, and educational partnerships, has drafted a statewide plan to implement an improved delivery system for staff development and student learning through technology. The Early Intervention and Prevention Services initiative is a coordinated effort of the Maryland State Department of Education and the Governor's Office for Children, Youth, and Families for the purpose of assessing primary programs, creating model preschool/primary programs, interagency collaboration, and family and community involvement. The collaboration between the Governor's Office and MSDE facilitates linkages across agencies, supports prevention/early intervention efforts, advocates for parental involvement in services, and initiates efforts to maximize funding for services in support of children and families. Maryland's Partnership to Create A School-to-Work System is the development of local partnerships or teams for the purpose of recruiting employers and establishing local and state industry clusters. The School-Based / School-Linked Services initiative is the state's approach to the formation of school-based and school-linked services. The focus of this initiative is on the identification of community needs, the development of possible models, potential funding mechanisms, and creating state and local relationships to support the MSDE and Department of Health and Mental Hygiene goals for the year 2000.

B Formation of the State Planning Panel and Development of the Plan:

Maryland's *Schools for Success* statewide initiatives will provide the foundation for the development of the Goals 2000 state improvement plan. The developed plan will build on existing statewide initiatives and goals while simultaneously providing the vision and structure for accomplishing those goals. Future reference to Maryland's educational reform efforts will be referred to as a combined state and federal effort entitled, *Schools for Success/Goals 2000*. Maryland's Schools for Success/Goals 2000 panel is a broad based 54 member panel. The co-chairs are a local school system superintendent and a business executive. Many members of the panel are also part of existing advisory groups and committees involved in state reform issues such as the MBRT, statewide technology and staff development committees. Representatives from the Governor's Office, institutions of higher education, public and non-public schools, parents, students, state and local boards of education, community based organizations, businesses, the state agency and health and social service agencies will contribute to the completion of the plan. The Schools for Success/Goals 2000 panel has met six times during 1994. The charge to the panel is to 1) review the current school reform initiatives; 2) identify the gaps; 3) develop a process to gather information; 4) disseminate information to constituencies for the improvement of elementary and secondary education in the state of Maryland; and 5) connect a statewide, grassroots outreach process that will include collaboration with the reauthorization of Chapter 1 and the Carl T. Perkins Act. The general strategy for completing the development plan has been to assess the required plan components and divide the panel into required component subcommittees for the purpose of the development of an educational reform plan specific to their component area. These subcommittees, or Co-

Chairs Component Workgroups, have been defined as follows: Content Standards; Performance Standards and Assessment; Integration of Academics, Career Education and School-to-Work; Teacher Training/Staff Development; Opportunity to Learn; Drop Out (In) Strategies; Management Governance and Accountability; and Outreach Process. Once individual subcommittees have developed a draft for their component, the subcommittees will meet on an as needed basis to complete their task, while the entire *Schools for Success/Goals 2000* panel plans to meet monthly. The panel will submit the completed reform plan to the State Board of Education prior to submission to USED for possible revision purposes. The projected date for submission to the state board is June 1995 with submission to USED in July 1995.

Milestones and activities:

March 1994	Technology plans vision and strategic plan approved by State Board of Education.
April 1994	Goals 2000 panel members selected and invited to participate.
May 1994	Appointment of Goals 2000 project manager.
June 1994	First meeting of the Schools for Success/Goals 2000 panel.
July 1994	Technology subcommittee plan completed; Planning meeting with co-chairs and project manager and subcommittees identified.
August 1994	Solicit feedback for technology plan; technology expert panel selected; third meeting of the Schools for Success/Goals 2000 panel; subcommittee teams defined and established.
September 1994	Begin process of developing RFP for local subgrants.
October 1994	Release RFP to local school systems; SEA holds technical assistance workshops throughout the state to provide guidance to prospective grant applications; present technology plan to state school board and to the Schools for Success/Goals 2000 panel.
March 1995	Applications from local school systems or

consortia of LEAs in collaboration with IHEs are received; applications reviewed by a peer review panel; announcement of subgrant recipients.

July 1995

State improvement plan submitted to USED for approval; implementation of plan will begin upon approval.

C Learning Technologies Plan Development and Integration with Goals 2000 State Reform Plan:

The State Superintendent of Schools and the Maryland Business Roundtable for Education (MBRT) formed a Blue Ribbon Committee that first met in July 1993 to develop a vision for technology in Maryland education and a strategy to realize this vision. The committee includes members of the Schools for Success/Goals 2000 panel and other representatives of the education community, the business community, and the public at large. While focusing primarily on Maryland's schools, the committee recognized that learning is a lifelong process. Thus, the committee deemed it essential to define learners as individuals of any age or occupation who seek to acquire additional knowledge and skills. The primary goal of the committee's recommendations is to improve the delivery of instruction to all learners through a technology and communication network that will interface seamlessly with daily life and provide universal access to practical knowledge. The current technology plan proposes to be a user-friendly system and based on active learning customized to the student. The technology plan development and implementation currently underway in Maryland will be supported and enhanced with Goals 2000 resources.

II. DESCRIPTION OF THE SUBGRANT PROGRAM

A Process for Making Subgrants for LEA Improvement Plans:

60% of the state Goals 2000 allocation (\$804,927) will be distributed to LEAs or consortia of LEAs in the form of competitively awarded subgrants through the Schools for Success/Goals 2000 Request for Proposal (RFP). Proposals must be based on local data and reform efforts that target one or more of Maryland's priorities for local systemic school reform to improve student achievement. The four priority areas are: Support for Low-Performing Schools; Innovative Programs; Early Intervention and Prevention (K through Grade 3); and Safe Schools. It is anticipated that MSDE will award approximately 8 subgrants in the area of school improvement with grants ranging from \$85,000 to \$120,000. The RFP was drafted by the MSDE project manager. After review and input from the Schools for Success/Goals 2000 panel and other major constituency groups, the RFPs was released on October 31, 1994. Applications will be reviewed by MSDE staff and a selection committee of peers consisting of recommended teachers, principals, parents, representation of IHEs, the business community, and social service agencies. A rank order list of applicants will be created by the selection committee and the project manager. A list of the proposals will be presented to the state superintendent for final consideration. Subgrants will be awarded beginning with the top-ranked applications until

all designated funds are depleted. Projected announcement of subgrant award recipients is April 1995 with written notification to follow.

III. GOALS 2000 1994-95 PROPOSED ALLOCATIONS

A	Subgrants	<u>\$804,927</u>
B	State Plan Development	<u>\$536,618</u>
C	Technology Plan Development	<u>\$75,000</u>
D	Total Title III Allocation	<u>\$1,341,545</u>
E	Total Goals 2000/Technology Allocation	<u>\$1,416,545</u>

GOALS 2000: EDUCATE AMERICA ACT

STATE PROFILE

STATE: Massachusetts
DATE APPLICATION SUBMITTED: August 5, 1994
DATE APPLICATION APPROVED: September 7, 1994
FUNDING: FIRST YEAR: \$1,765,056; SECOND YEAR: \$7,060,224 (estimate);
TECHNOLOGY: \$75,000

I. PROCESS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE STATE PLAN

A Pre-Existing Reform Initiatives:

On June 18, 1993, Governor William F. Weld signed into law a far-reaching education improvement initiative: Chapter 71, the Massachusetts Education Reform Act of 1993. Chapter 71 contains four essential elements for comprehensive reform. The first element of Chapter 71 is Programs and Standards to ensure High Achievement for All Students. The Education Reform Act directs the State Board of Education to develop statewide standards for all public school students. To achieve this, the Board established the Massachusetts Commission on the Common Core of Learning. In June 1994 the Commission reported its findings to the State Board, which then voted to approve the Common Core of Learning at a special meeting in July. Under the Act, Massachusetts is establishing curriculum frameworks, academic standards and a student assessment system. The statewide curriculum frameworks will be interdisciplinary and, at the secondary level, integrate academic and occupational instruction. Frameworks for mathematics and science were issued for public review and comment in the fall of 1994. Frameworks for all other subjects will be issued by February 1995. The assessment system will use authentic assessment tools and environments, including portfolio assessment. The state will conduct individual student assessments annually in grades 4, 8, and 10. The second component of Chapter 71 is A Fair and Equitable System of School Finance. The Education Reform Act establishes a funding mechanism to provide all schools with adequate resources. The Department of Education has identified specific tasks related to foundation school budgets, school spending waivers, school choice reimbursement, adult education funding, and intra-district equity in fund distribution. The Department has also laid out a seven year funding schedule for additional state-level administration and development costs associated with implementing education reform. The third component of Chapter 71 is A New Governance Structure that Encourages Innovation and Accountability at all Levels. Chapter 71 provides mechanisms to promote "bottom-up" reform in local schools and communities through defining new roles, responsibilities and opportunities for involvement for local school communities, superintendents, principals, teachers, students, families, and community members. The fourth component is Standards and Processes that Enhance the Quality, Professionalism and Accountability of Educational Personnel. By establishing new standards, regulations and processes for certifying and recertifying school personnel, the Education Reform Act affords Massachusetts an opportunity to design and develop certification and recertification methods that address the needs and goals of the Commonwealth and the nation. Chapter 71 was written to result in systemic change at the

school, district and state levels. Chapter 71, developed over a two-year period, reflects the intense work by the Legislature, the Governor's Office, the business and education communities, parents and members of the general public to develop a long-range plan to improve public education. Throughout the development process, extensive outreach was conducted by the Joint Committee on Education, Arts and Humanities to ensure broad-based input and support for the proposed reform measures.

B Formation of the State Planning Panel and Development of the Plan:

Given the development and passage of the Massachusetts Education Reform law, the fact that Massachusetts has already developed a State Improvement Plan to implement the provisions of Chapter 71, and its work over the past year, Massachusetts believes that its State Board of Education is the appropriate panel to meet the public participation intent of Goals 2000. Through Chapter 71, the State Board of Education has established a mechanism to ensure broad involvement of external groups and other constituents in the education improvement process. By statute, the Board of Education is now the "umbrella" for receiving advice on education improvement and on Chapter 71 progress by the members of the fifteen mandated Advisory Councils, as well as from the over 20 Commissions and task forces established to work on specific policy issues identified in the Education Reform Act of 1993. Board members and the Commissioner of Education brought over 300 Advisory Council members together for a goal-setting meeting on October 3, 1994. The Councils are scheduled to meet four times a year and will be staffed by the Department of Education. These meetings will enable the Councils to provide input to the Board on a continuing basis.

Milestones and Activities:

August/September 1994

Convene Internal Team; Meet with State Board of Education; Develop Request for Proposals and Plan SEA Goals 2000 Activities; Conduct Regional Technical Assistance Sessions on Subgrants; Complete Analysis Comparing Goals 2000 with Chapter 71; Prepare for Goal-Setting Meeting with the Board's Advisory Councils

October-December 1994

Hold Goal-Setting Meeting for Advisory Councils and Establish Mechanism for Receiving Advice and Input for Goals 2000/Chapter 71 Plan; Receive and Review Subgrant RFPs and Make Recommendations for Funding to Board of Education; Meet with Board of Education; Prepare Draft Goals 2000/Chapter 71 Plan; Initiate SEA Goals 2000 Activities

Council of Chief State School Officers

January-March 1995

Review Input on Goals
2000/Chapter 71 Draft Plan; Meet
with Advisory Councils; Meet with
Board of Education; Finalize Plan
and Submit it to the US Secretary
of Education; Provide Technical
Assistance to Subgrant Recipients;
Continue with SEA Goals 2000
Activities

C Learning Technologies Plan Development and Integration with Goals 2000 State Reform Plan:

Massachusetts has completed work on the development of a comprehensive plan for Education Technology. Chapter 71 requires that a statewide Education Technology Plan, known as the Massachusetts Education-Online (Mass Ed Online), be developed by the Massachusetts Corporation for Educational Telecommunication, (MCET). MCET is a quasi-public agency that was established by the state Legislature in 1982 to address the educational needs of the Commonwealth through the production and delivery of live and interactive educational programs using technology networks, including satellite, computer, and telephone. The statewide Education Technology Plan is to include programs, courses, and capital expenditures including computer hardware and software, networks, television, satellite transmissions, fiber optics cable, calculators and video and audio tapes. Mass Ed Online is the Technological support component of the state's Education Reform agenda. It is a strategic effort to put technology at the service of the public education system. Mass Ed Online will facilitate local school districts' acquisition of computers, networks, and software. It will create professional development programs to help educators and deal with the technical, curriculum orientated, and administrative issues associated with the telecomputing. It will develop electronic reporting systems to ease the paperwork burden associated with education reform. It will establish, in cooperation with other state agencies, a statewide network that will reduce communication costs and connect local schools to both state agencies and the wider world of the Internet. A Mass Ed Online Advisory Committee was created to assist in developing the Plan. The Committee is well represented by all segments of education, as well as other stakeholders of education technology. During the work that was initiated in the 1993-94 school year, the Committee played a critical role in reviewing documents and commenting on upcoming segments of the Plan. As the Plan begins its first steps of implementation, a broad-based Coordinating Council has been convened, the development of an infrastructure has begun, and assistance to school districts for local technology planning is in place. The State Department of Education's staff member overseeing the technology initiative is a member of the internal coordinating team for the Massachusetts Education Reform Act of 1993 and Goals 2000 initiatives. This helps to ensure that technology planning and implementation are tied to the other education reform initiatives.

II. DESCRIPTION OF THE SUBGRANT PROGRAM

A Process for Making Subgrants for LEA Improvement Plans:

Massachusetts allocated \$350,000 to this competitive subgrant program for the 1994-95 school year. Seven first year grants of \$50,000 each were awarded in December 1994. The Massachusetts Department of Education issued a Request for Proposal in September 1994. The RFP integrated the required elements of Section 309(a) with those of Chapter 71 and included a rating form which gave priority as defined in Title III. Massachusetts exercised its authority to add to the required federal elements. Applications were due into the SEA in early November. The proposals were reviewed and rated by an SEA team, which made recommendations to the State Board of Education for final approval in December.

B Process for Making Subgrants for Improvements in Preservice Education Programs:

Massachusetts allocated \$300,000 to this subgrant program for the 1994-95 school year. Grant awards ranged up to \$50,000. In addition to the federal requirements, the Massachusetts Department of Education gave priority to grants that address the following: encouraging an interdisciplinary approach to teaching, especially for individuals training to be secondary teachers; increasing participants' skills in working with a diverse population of learners, including limited English proficient students and students with disabilities; increasing participants' skills in working with families and the community; encouraging innovative performance appraisal practices; and re-examining current teaching methodology and content to address the recently approved Massachusetts Common Core of Learning. The Massachusetts Department of Education issued a Request for Proposal in early September 1994. The applications will be due into the SEA in early November. The proposals were reviewed through a competitive, peer-review process drawing upon the members of the Board's Educational Personnel Advisory Council and others. Recommendations for funding were made to the State Board of Education in December. Seven first year grants, ranging from \$15,000 to \$50,000 were awarded.

C Process for Making Subgrants for Continuing Professional Development:

Massachusetts allocated \$400,000 to this subgrant program for the 1994-95 school year. Grant awards ranged up to \$50,000. The timeline for Request for Proposals and applications is the same as specified in "B" above. The peer review process is the same as specified in "B" as well. In addition to the federal requirements, the Massachusetts Department of Education established priority grants from consortia of LEAs that addressed the following: strategies for creating positive school learning environments for students of diverse languages, cultures, and abilities; strategies for working effectively with families and community partners; strategies for increasing the effective use of time for learning within the school day and year; integrating applied learning in subject matter areas and developing options at the secondary level for increasing school-to-work activities; and implementing the Common Core of Learning and Curriculum Framework standards and practices. Nine first year grants ranging from \$25,000 to \$50,000 were awarded in December 1994.

III. GOALS 2000 1994-95 PROPOSED ALLOCATIONS

A	Subgrants	<u>\$1,059,034</u>
1.	LEA Improvement	\$300 - 400,000
2.	Preservice Teacher Training	\$250,000
3.	Professional Development	\$350 - 400,000
B	State Plan Development	<u>\$706,022</u>
1.	Administrative Costs	\$100,000
2.	Plan Preparation and Implementation	\$606,022
C	Technology Plan Development	<u>\$75,000</u>
D	Total Title III Allocation	<u>\$1,765,056</u>
E	Total Goals 2000/Technology Allocation	<u>\$1,840,056</u>

GOALS 2000: EDUCATE AMERICA ACT

STATE PROFILE

STATE: Michigan
DATE APPLICATION SUBMITTED: June 13, 1994
DATE APPLICATION APPROVED: July 22, 1994
FUNDING: FIRST YEAR: \$3,401,700; SECOND YEAR: \$13,606,800 (estimate);
TECHNOLOGY: \$134,619

I. PROCESS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE STATE PLAN

A Pre-Existing Reform Initiatives:

Michigan has moved aggressively within the past three years to reform its education delivery system. The State Legislature in 1990 approved Public Act 25, which comprises four major provisions: Core Curriculum, School Improvement Planning, the Annual Education Report, and Accreditation. In December 1993 the Legislature passed a number of reform amendments which clarify and enhance Public Act 25. In addition, the legislation allows the establishment of Academy schools. In March 1994 Michigan voters approved a school refinance package which provides a per pupil funding foundation for each school district and begins to close the equity gap among districts.

B Formation of the State Planning Panel and Development of the Plan:

With the clarification by USED Secretary Richard Riley regarding pre-existing plan, Michigan has decided to submit a pre-existing plan based upon the pre-existing framework that has been evolving in Michigan over the last several years. The plan aims at helping all children meet challenging standards at the local school community level. There are several strategies already in place to continue ongoing input, advice and grass root involvement in the Michigan strategy. Generally, all of the developmental work of the Michigan Department of Education is done with input from customers, local educators, university representatives, parents, special populations, content area experts, etc. The process for input includes the use of focus groups, public hearings (formal and informal), referent groups and so on. In addition, review processes for input of customers are done through dissemination and in collaboration with professional organizations and local communities. Through Michigan's restructuring efforts within the Department toward advancing total quality, a cross-department coordination team is working to seek advice and to facilitate implementation of the Michigan Plan for School Improvement: Fostering Change.

C Learning Technologies Plan Development and Integration with Goals 2000 State Reform Plan:

The Governor, in his Plan to Reform Michigan Schools, advocates the use of technology through the creation of the Michigan Information Network in order to access information throughout the world. Michigan's educational reform legislation, Public Act 335 of 1993, provides for the Department of Management and Budget to prepare a state plan for the creation of a Michigan Information Network which will link local and intermediate school

districts, community colleges, public and private colleges and universities, and libraries on an equal basis, with electronic connections for the exchange of video and data communications. The Department has developed an electronic information dissemination system which operates on the Internet. The Gopher Server, known as the MDENET, provides access to educational publications, reports, directories, lesson plans, public domain software, policy documents, and other education related information. The Technology and Telecommunications Planning and Advisory Group (TTPAG) will play an integral part in Michigan's Goals 2000 implementation strategy. The TTPAG developed a Concept Paper on Technology and Educational Reform which was approved by the State Board of Education. This Concept Paper provides the framework for technology in the context of educational reform, suggests priority areas of funding, and recommends specific immediate action for Michigan's state government. As it works to develop Michigan's plan of action, the activities of the TTPAG will be coordinated with the overall implementation of the Michigan Plan for School Improvement: Fostering Change, to ensure that the technology plan is integrated. In addition, the Michigan Department of Education is working with the North Central Regional Educational Laboratory on various policy studies and efforts to support the deployment of technology and telecommunications services in the seven states of the region.

II. DESCRIPTION OF THE SUBGRANT PROGRAM

A Process for Making Subgrants for LEA Improvement Plans:

During 1994-95 Michigan received a federal allocation of approximately \$3.5 million under the Goals 2000 initiative to develop long-term strategies to improve education throughout the state. Of this amount, 60% of the funds totaling approximately \$2.1 million was designated for subgrants to school districts and the remaining 40 % was designated for development of the State Improvement Plan and administration. The grant funds were distributed under a competitive grants process to school districts for initiatives in three priority areas: 1) Development or Expansion of Local School Improvement Plan; 2) Improvement of Educator Preservice Programs; and 3) Professional Development Activities. By the application closing date, the Michigan Department of Education received 108 applications requesting funds totaling \$11 million. With the available grant funds, a total of 24 grants were awarded by the State Board of Education in December 1994. Due to the tremendous interest in the state and the response to the Goals 2000 initiative, the State Board of Education announced a second cycle of grants during 1994-95. The additional funding for these grants, totaling \$850,000, has been identified from the portion of funds designated for the development of the State Improvement Plan. These funds are now available for grants since Michigan has decided to submit a pre-existing plan. This second grants cycle provides additional support to expand the participation of school districts in Goals 2000 activities. In addition, two new components for public school academies have been included to involve and encourage broader participation in the Goals 2000 initiative. All grants during this second funding cycle will be awarded by a competitive application process. It is anticipated that the State Board of Education will take action on these funding recommendations at their September 1995 meeting.

- B Process for Making Subgrants for Improvements in Preservice Education Programs:**
See "A" above.
- C Process for Making Subgrants for Continuing Professional Development:**
See "A" above.

III. GOALS 2000 1994-95 PROPOSED ALLOCATIONS

A	1. Subgrants - First Funding Cycle	<u>\$1,991,865</u>
	a. LEA Improvement	
	b. Preservice Education	
	c. Professional Development	
	2. Subgrants - Second Funding Cycle	<u>\$850,000</u>
	a. Expanding LEA Participation in Goals 2000	
	b. Public School Academies	
B	State Plan Development and Administration	<u>\$559,835</u>
C	Technology Plan Development	<u>\$134,619</u>
D	Total Title III Allocation	<u>\$3,401,700</u>
E	Total Goals 2000/Technology Allocation	<u>\$3,536,319</u>

GOALS 2000: EDUCATE AMERICA ACT

STATE PROFILE

STATE: Minnesota

DATE APPLICATION SUBMITTED: July 6, 1994

DATE APPLICATION APPROVED: August 16, 1994

FUNDING: FIRST YEAR: \$1,282,251; SECOND YEAR: \$5,129,004 (estimate);

TECHNOLOGY: \$75,000.

I. PROCESS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE STATE PLAN

A Pre-Existing Reform Initiatives:

In order to visualize the size and scope of implementing Goals 2000 in the state a preliminary comparison of pre-existing activities versus Goals 2000 activities and objectives was designed and listed by National Goals 1-8. Pre-existing numbers of programs by Goal include: 1) School Readiness - 23; 2) School Completion - 36; 3) School Achievement and Citizenship - 28; 4) Teacher Education and Professional Development - 26; 5) Mathematics and Science - 4; 6) Adult Literacy and Life Long Learning - 22; 7) Safe Schools - 7; and 8) Parental Participation - 9. These will be analyzed by the MDE and prepared for assessment of what is most useful in planning a state reform plan.

B Formation of the State Planning Panel and Development of the Plan:

The comprehensive plan will be developed in Year 1 inclusive of a master plan, elements to be addressed, implementation strategies, timelines and assessment measures. The plan will focus on making progress to achieve the eight national goals and will be designed to coordinate with programs designed under the School to Work Opportunities Act and Perkin's Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act. The Panel will be formed per the requirements of the legislation with selected members to also serve on the Technology Task Force to insure integration of technology with the state's Reform Plan. Fourteen Process Steps and timelines have been developed for all activities and are summarized as follows:

8/15/94 - 12/1/94

- 1) MDE organization of SEA planning and coordination team to support planning Panel including analysis of distribution of workload and preparation of budget for state plan development.
- 2) MDE analysis of pre-existing state reform plans, panels on task forces which may comply with Goals 2000 use.
- 3) MDE analysis of pre-existing state standards, assessment systems which are applicable and useful in the Goals 2000 plan.

10/1/94 - 1/15/95

Solicit and identify potential panel members for

	appointment by 12/15/94 and convene panel and begin work by 1/15/95.
1/15/95 - 4/15/95	Panel completes draft plan with MDE Team assistance.
4/15/95 - 8/1/95	Following review Panel submits plan for MDE review and submission to USED by 8/1/95.
9/15/95 - 11/9/94	Develop and Implement Goals 2000 Public Information System.

C Learning Technologies Plan Development and Integration with Goals 2000 State Reform Plan:

The Technology plan will be developed by a task force established by the MDE that includes experts in the educational use of technology and representatives of the state panel formed under Section 306 to insure integration of the technology plan into the State Improvement Plan.

II. DESCRIPTION OF THE SUBGRANT PROGRAM

A Process for Making Subgrants for LEA Improvement Plans:

A total of 75% of subgrant monies (\$532,012) is being prioritized for LEA reform planning initiatives. The process detailed is in accordance with Section 309(a). A series of eleven steps and timelines to administer the subgrant process is summarized as follows:

8/1/94 - 11/1/94	1) MDE personnel designation to design and administer subgrant program under Section 309(a).
	2) Establish MDE priority for LEA Improvement planning and development (RFP).
	3) Determine and provide technical assistance to LEAs on administering and evaluating/reporting on subgrant programs.
11/01/94	Issue RFPs.
1/15/95 - 8/1/95	1) Conduct peer review by practioners to determine allocation of funds and award subgrants.
	2) Monitor LEAs and receive periodic reports.
	3) Submit year and LEA report 7/1/95.
	4) Report progress to USED 8/1/95.

B Process for Making Subgrants for Improvements in Preservice Education Programs:

A total of approximately 10% of subgrant monies (\$77,338) will be targeted to LEAs and consortia of LEAs with institutions of higher education according to Section 309 (b)A. via a competitive, peer review process using state field practioners divided into panels of 3 members. The steps and timelines are the same as the process for LEA Improvement Plans.

C Process for Making Subgrants for Continuing Professional Development:

A total of approximately 15% of subgrant monies (\$100,000) will be targeted to LEAs and consortia of LEAs with institutions of higher education according to Section 309(b)A. All processes and timelines are the same as indicated for the other two subgrant areas.

III. GOALS 2000 1994-95 PROPOSED ALLOCATIONS

A	Subgrants	<u>\$709,350</u>
1.	LEA Improvement Plans	\$532,012
2.	Preservice Teacher Education	\$77,338
3.	Professional Development	\$100,000
B	State Plan Development	<u>\$472,901</u>
1.	Grant Administration	\$100,000
2.	State Plan Preparation	
a.	State Panel Work	\$50,000
b.	Support Staff	\$172,901
c.	Consultants	\$100,000
d.	Travel	\$50,000
C	Technology Plan Development	<u>\$75,000</u>
D	Total Title III Allocation	<u>\$1,282,251</u>
E	Total Goals 2000/Technology Allocation	<u>\$1,357,251</u>

GOALS 2000: EDUCATE AMERICA ACT

STATE PROFILE

STATE: Mississippi
DATE APPLICATION SUBMITTED: January 23, 1995
DATE APPLICATION APPROVED: February 2, 1995
FUNDING: FIRST YEAR: \$1,254,855; SECOND YEAR: \$5,019,420 (estimate);
TECHNOLOGY: \$75,000.

I. PROCESS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE STATE PLAN

A Pre-Existing Reform Initiatives:

Efforts supported by Goals 2000 will build upon commitments made with the adoption in Mississippi of the 1982 Education Reform Act and subsequent legislation. The Education Reform Act of 1982 created a new educational system. Critical components of the system include: a lay member State Board of Education; an appointed State Superintendent of Education; a mandatory school district accreditation system; a statewide kindergarten program; an assistant reading teacher program in grades K-3; a statewide assessment program including a high school exit examination; a statewide curriculum framework; compulsory school attendance; professional development for teachers and administrators; teacher/ administrator appraisal systems; increased high school graduation requirements; and a performance-based accountability system. These reform initiatives, in place in the fall of 1986, are still impacting Mississippi students.

The National Education Goals were adopted by the Mississippi State Board of Education in 1990. The Public Education Forum, a non-profit organization created by the leaders of the business community, with the approval of the three boards that govern public education (the Board of Trustees for the Institutions of Higher Learning, the Community and Junior College Board and the Mississippi Board of Education) facilitated the development of a strategic plan for Mississippi's commitment to reaching four of the Goals. Governor Kirk Fordice, in collaboration with the Forum, appointed a Mississippi 2000 Steering Committee to develop strategies for Mississippians to achieve the two remaining goals as well as two additional goals, arts education and parental involvement, which are now reflected in the Educate America Act. There are six Mississippi 2000 communities. Over 40 additional communities have taken steps to become Mississippi 2000 communities. Participating communities adopt the National Education Goals, develop a community-wide strategy to achieve them, and design a report card to measure results. In addition, currently, 223 schools are involved in "Onward Toward Excellence." This school-based improvement process, developed by the Northwest Regional Research Laboratory, involves teachers and administrators in research and planning. Other identified efforts include: the school improvement process developed by Dr. James Comer, Core Knowledge, Galef, ABC, Learning Styles, TQM, and Schools for the 21st Century. These grew from local interest and their continued success is due largely to sustained local commitment. In 1994 the Mississippi Legislature enacted and funded significant educational reforms. The Mississippi Accountability and Adequate Education Program Act, the Work Force Education Act, the Mississippi Education Technology Act, and House Bill 327,

establishing the Mississippi Teacher Center, addressed a number of areas pertinent to the Goals 2000 legislation. The scope and nature of the 1994 Legislature positions Mississippi to accelerate systemic educational reform.

B Formation of the State Planning Panel and Development of the Plan:

Mississippi's planning panel will henceforth be referred to as the Support Team for Educational Progress (STEP). The STEP members were jointly appointed by the Governor and the State Superintendent of Education. The 37-member Team represents a state-wide cross section of teachers, administrators, parents, students, business/industry and community representatives, as well as elected officials. The tasks assigned to STEP include reviewing current community and state initiatives, developing strategies for reaching new heights in teaching and learning in Mississippi, setting benchmarks, and supporting and publicizing their work to all Mississippians. The Support Team will produce: (1) the *STEP Report: Giving Voice to Mississippians*, (2) a roles and responsibility matrix that focuses on activities and action strategies Mississippians can take to get involved in education in their local communities and across the state, (3) a student leadership project, and (4) positive public communications regarding Mississippi's Vision: Reaching New Heights. The Office of Innovative Support and the Office of Educational Technology within the Office of Innovations facilitate the development and implementation of educational reform efforts. The Director of Innovative Support and staff provide information, technical assistance and support to the STEP. The Office of Educational Technology supports the work of the Council for Education Technology and facilitates the linkage between the Council and the STEP. Consistent with the Department of Education's management structure that utilizes cross-management teams, the State Superintendent has created a Mississippi Goals Management Team (MGMT). Members of the Team were appointed from across the organizational structure. The MGMT assists the Office of Innovations in supporting the work of the STEP.

Timeline and activities:

January 1995

Application review; approval to submit application to the Secretary of Education; Technology Council Meeting; hire technology consultant; application submission to USED; receipt of funds upon approval

February - April 1995

Regional Technology Meetings; gather input from stakeholders

May 1995

Distribute RFPs for subgrants

June - July 1995

Write Technology Plan draft; present draft plan to Council for Education Technology, Mississippi Board of Education and Mississippi Legislature

July 1995	STEP members appointed; applications for RFPs due
July - August 1995	Review subgrant applications; subgrants awarded; determine second year funding procedures
August 1995	Technology Council meeting; draft revised as needed
September 1995 - March 1996	STEP work sessions; create subcommittees, develop STEP products; solicit public input
October 1995	STEP public input session via video teleconference; Technology Plan submitted to Mississippi Board of Education; Technology Plan approved
November 1995	Technology Plan implementation begins; school districts submit technology plans for funding
November - December 1995	Write draft of STEP Report
February 1996	Gather public comment per state policy
March 1996	STEP Report submitted to Mississippi Board of Education; Board approval; submit Report to USED

C Learning Technologies Plan Development and Integration with Goals 2000 State Reform Plan:

Mississippi's involvement in educational technology initiatives underscores the important role that technology plays in fostering systemic change and improving teaching and learning for all. Current projects span all grade levels and are, in each case, the result of collaboration between and among communities, schools, educational television, business and industry, foundations, universities, multi-state consortia, and state and federal agencies. **Writing to Read**, a cooperative effort of IBM, the state of Mississippi and the Riordan Foundation places Writing to Read computer labs in elementary schools across the state. The **Star Schools** program awarded grants to the Satellite Educational Resources Consortium, the Midlands Consortium, and the TI-IN Educational Network. The involvement of state and local agencies in partnership with Mississippi universities in these

consortia resulted in satellite delivered instruction in all but a few school districts, however in the next few months all counties in the state will have access to distance learning. In many instances, this medium allowed students to receive instruction in foreign languages and advanced mathematics courses. **Fibernet 2000**, the result of a partnership between the South Central Bell Telephone Company, Northern Telecom, IBM, Apple Computer, the Mississippi Authority for Educational Television, the Mississippi Department of Education, Mississippi State University, the Mississippi School for Mathematics and Science and four local school districts, delivers two-way audio and video instruction at the secondary, college and graduate school level. Currently the project is being expanded to 28 additional sites and can interface with satellite, instructional fixed service television and Mississippi Educational Television. Courses from calculus to creative writing are taught over the network to students in all locations. The **Mississippi Instructional Resources Center** at the Mississippi School for the Blind uses Braille computerization to provide learning materials for blind and visually impaired students who attend school in their home communities. In addition, plans are underway at the Mississippi Department of Education to establish an assistive technology center. This center will make hardware, software, communication devices and resources for re-engineering classrooms for assistive technology available to educators on a short and long term loan basis. The **Tech-Prep Program** is placing computer based laboratories in all participating schools in order to afford students technology enhanced education. These computer-based laboratories provide the means for innovative instruction in the areas of career discovery and computer literacy for students in the middle grades through high school. In the Education Technology Act of 1994, Senate Bill 3350, the Mississippi legislature passed landmark technology legislation. This legislation closely parallels and compliments the Goals 2000 legislation. It affirms a commitment to providing all students access to adequate resources and opportunities through strong local involvement. The Bill created a Council for Education Technology. The nine member Council includes five ex-officio members (the State Superintendent of Education, the Executive Director of the Mississippi Authority for Educational Television, the Executive Director of the Mississippi Library Commission, the Executive Director of the State Board for Community and Junior Colleges, and the Commissioner of the State Institutions of Higher Learning) and four appointed members. The State Board of Education and the Mississippi Department of Economic and Community Development each appointed one member and the Governor selected two members as required by the Technology Act. The makeup of the Council is representative of all stake holders within Mississippi such as teachers, administrators, business and industry leaders, parents, university and community college personnel and community members. The Council will function as the technology task force required by the Goals 2000 legislation. The Director and staff of the Office of Educational Technology serve as staff to the Council. In order to provide continuity and coordination between the State Improvement Plan and the Council for Education Technology, at least one member of the Technology Council will serve on the Improvement Plan panel. This vital link will ensure that the technology plan fully supports the Goals 2000 initiatives. The Council has the primary responsibility for coordinating the technology planning process and developing a state educational technology plan.

II. DESCRIPTION OF THE SUBGRANT PROGRAM

A Process for Making Subgrants for LEA Improvement Plans:

The Mississippi Department of Education received 52 subgrant proposals in the areas of LEA Plan Development, LEA Plan Implementation, Preservice, Professional Development, and Cross-Cutting across two or more of the aforementioned areas, requesting over \$3 million in funds. Thirty projects were selected and approved for funding, \$903,913. The breakdown of projects is as follows:

- ◆ Planning: 8 projects, totaling \$269,000
- ◆ Implementation: 6 projects, totaling \$127,000
- ◆ Preservice: 1 project, totaling \$60,000
- ◆ Professional Development: 11 projects, totaling \$330,913
- ◆ Cross-Cutting: 4 projects, totaling \$117,000

Planning is the focus for 14 districts across the state from Poplarville to Marshall County and from Indianola to Newton County. Other districts are working to implement plans that are already in place. For example, Meridian and Tate County are focusing on K-3 school readiness, writing and thinking skills. Stone County is working to close the school to work gap, and Clay County plans to pair new technology with cutting edge professional development. Tunica, Vicksburg/Warren, and Rankin County are concentrating on parent and community involvement; Rankin County's project specifically centers around home visit. North Pike, Biloxi, and West Bolivar are also striving to improve instructional methods and techniques in the basic curriculum areas. Both Laurel and Starkville are developing model professional development centers. Alcorn County, Carroll County, Franklin, and Simpson Counties are similarly working to take staff development to new levels. Many districts are working in partnerships with various colleges and universities such as Mississippi State University, the University of Mississippi, the University of Southern Mississippi, Rust College, and Northwest Community College to improve teaching and learning. Tupelo has developed a project that specifically addresses preservice education needs. Whether planning, implementing plans, addressing preservice, or professional development, districts and consortia of districts in Mississippi are reaching higher and setting standards for excellence in education.

B Process for Making Subgrants for Improvements in Preservice Education Programs:

See "A" above.

C Process for Making Subgrants for Continuing Professional Development:

See "A" above.

III. GOALS 2000 1994-95 PROPOSED ALLOCATIONS

A	Subgrants*	<u>\$752,913</u>
1.	LEA Improvement	
2.	Preservice Teacher Education	
3.	Professional Development	
	<i>*does not include an additional \$151,000 from other sources</i>	
B	State Plan Development	<u>\$501,942</u>
1.	State Administration	\$100,000
2.	Technical Assistance	\$401,942
C	Technology Plan Development	<u>\$75,000</u>
D	Total Title III Allocation	<u>\$1,254,855</u>
E	Total Goals 2000/Technology Allocation	<u>\$1,329,855</u>

GOALS 2000: EDUCATE AMERICA ACT

STATE PROFILE

STATE: Missouri
DATE APPLICATION SUBMITTED: July 7, 1994
DATE APPLICATION APPROVED: August 24, 1994
FUNDING: FIRST YEAR: \$1,578,888; SECOND YEAR: \$6,315,552 (estimate);
TECHNOLOGY: \$75,000.

I. PROCESS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE STATE PLAN

A Pre-Existing Reform Initiatives:

Approximately one year before the Congress enacted Goals 2000, Missouri enacted comprehensive educational reform legislation known as the Outstanding Schools Act (OSA). Although Missouri's legislation was primarily focused on educational funding equity and adequacy, the OSA contains many provisions designed to stimulate systemic reform in curriculum and instruction as well. Many of the major systemic reform initiatives required to be implemented in Missouri by the OSA closely parallel those contemplated by Goals 2000. Both laws provide for: the establishment of high academic performance standards; the development and dissemination of content standards through powerful state curriculum frameworks; the adoption of local curriculum which is congruent with the state frameworks; the development and implementation of a new, substantially performance-based assessment system; and a comprehensive system of preservice education for teachers in preparation and professional development for the current teaching force. Missouri's educational reform legislation is to be implemented by the State Board of Education with the advice of a Commission on Performance, a body representative of the political, business and educational interests in the state. Numerous committees, task groups and other panels have been appointed during the last year to provide broadly based input into the process of implementing the OSA. Missouri expects that Goals 2000 will complement and extend the work already underway by these groups.

B Formation of the State Planning Panel and Development of the Plan:

Many of the committees and other groups formed to assist with the implementation of the OSA were appointed using criteria for representation and selection similar to those in Goals 2000. To ensure complete coordination of the implementation of state reform initiatives and Goals 2000, the Governor and the Commissioner of Education appointed the Goals 2000 State Panel from among the membership of the Commission on Performance and other committees and task forces appointed for the purposes of advising policy makers on education and technology issues and of implementing the OSA and other major state projects. The Governor and the Commissioner of Education intend to appoint a State Panel which meets the statutory requirement for representation from the membership of existing groups. When appointees representing some constituencies were unavailable to serve, the Governor and the Commissioner solicited nominations from the groups to be represented and appointed members from the nominees. Primary support for the work of the State Panel and the Technology Task Force is being provided from funds

available to the State Education Agency (SEA) under Sections 308 and 317. If necessary, the Commissioner of Education will make available additional state funds to support the work of either the Panel or the Technology Task Force. The SEA will establish a goal or target date for completing the comprehensive State Plan and Technology Plan and will encourage the Panel and the Task Force to establish benchmarks for completing major activities. The SEA will also assist the Panel and the Task Force in coordinating the timelines for their work with the timelines already established for completing related projects and tasks required by the OSA. The SEA will provide the Panel and the Task Force with information about major statewide constituency groups and other commissions, committees and task forces working on educational initiatives and reform efforts, and assist the Panel and the Task Force in developing a comprehensive plan for ensuring that their work is coordinated with the work of other groups. In addition, the outreach and consultation plan will include strategies for involving parents, teachers, other local educators, and business and community leaders in the development of the State Plan.

C Learning Technologies Plan Development and Integration with Goals 2000 State Reform Plan:

Both OSA and Goals 2000 recognize the importance of linking technology to educational reform initiatives. The OSA provides categorical funding to LEAs for the acquisition of educational technology for general instructional uses and particularly for meeting the new, higher academic performance standards to be established under the Act. Additional appropriations have been made to provide connectivity for all LEAs to Internet resources for communication, data exchange, and instructional uses. Several committees have been formed to advise the Governor and the Commissioner of Education on technology related matters. The Governor and the Commissioner appointed a separate Technology Task Force to work in collaboration with the State Panel for Goals 2000, and representative of groups such as: The Governor's Commission on Informational Technology, The Video Instructional Development and Educational Opportunity Program Statewide Advisory Committee, The Automation Task Force of the Commission on Management and Productivity, MORENet Executive Committee, and the Missouri Training and Employment Council. The SEA will encourage the Panel and the Technology Task Force to develop a calendar of regular meetings to interact with the education committees of the General Assembly; the Commission on Performance established by the OSA; the State Board of Education; and the Governor and the Commissioner with respect to the development of the comprehensive plans and their relationship to other plans and initiatives.

II. DESCRIPTION OF THE SUBGRANT PROGRAM

A Process for Making Subgrants for LEA Improvement Plans:

The SEA will empanel a committee of educators from local educational agencies which reflect the diversity of the state. The committee will recommend to the State Board of Education priorities, selection criteria and procedures for awarding grants. The SEA expects to make approximately 20 subgrants in amounts ranging from \$20,000 to \$60,000. Upon completion of the State Improvement Plan, the SEA expects to implement a

competitive review process in which each application will be reviewed and rated by educators representative of the school districts of the state. The applications determined through the competitive review process to be of highest quality will be selected for awards. Milestones and activities:

September 1994	Empanel advisory committee
October 1994	Submit administrative rules to the State Board of Education for Consideration of publishing for public comment
December 1994	Adopt administrative rules; develop applicants package
August 1995	Publish and disseminate applicants package; conduct applicant workshops; submit State Improvement Plan to USED
October 1995	Review applications
November 1995	Review and rank applications and award grants
December 1995	Begin grant activities; submit State Technology Plan to USED

B Process for Making Subgrants for Improvements in Preservice Education Programs:

The SEA will empanel a committee of educators from local education agencies and educators from institutions of higher education with approved teacher preparation programs. The committee will recommend to the State Board of Education priorities, selection criteria and procedures for awarding grants. The SEA expects to award four subgrants in amounts averaging \$25,000 for preservice education. Upon completion of the State Improvement Plan, the SEA expects to implement a competitive review process in which each application will be reviewed and rated by educators representative of the school districts and institutions of higher education of the state. The applications determined to be of highest quality will be selected for awards. For the timeline for activities see "A" above.

C Process for Making Subgrants for Continuing Professional Development:

Selection criteria and priorities will be developed as stated in "B" above. The SEA expects to award two subgrants in the amount of \$25,000 each under professional development. Upon completion of the State Improvement Plan, the professional development funds available under Goals 2000 will be augmented with funds from other sources including \$1,500,000 the SEA has set aside from funds available to it under the OSA to establish an infrastructure for professional development to better prepare the current teaching force to meet the challenges of the OSA. Selection of grant recipients will be made according to

a competitive review process, as described in "B" above. For the timeline for activities see "A" above.

III. GOALS 2000 1994-95 PROPOSED ALLOCATIONS

A	Subgrants	<u>\$947,333</u>
1.	LEA Reform	\$800,000
2.	Preservice Teacher Education	\$100,000
3.	Professional Development	\$47,333
B	State Plan Development	<u>\$631,555</u>
1.	Program	\$531,555
2.	Administration	\$100,000
C	Technology Plan Development	<u>\$75,000</u>
D	Total Title III Allocation	<u>\$1,578,888</u>
E	Total Goals 2000/Technology Allocation	<u>\$1,653,888</u>

GOALS 2000: EDUCATE AMERICA ACT

STATE PROFILE

STATE: Nebraska
DATE APPLICATION SUBMITTED: January 11, 1995
DATE APPLICATION APPROVED: January 17, 1995
FUNDING: FIRST YEAR: \$483,027; SECOND YEAR: \$1,932,108 (estimate);
TECHNOLOGY: \$75,000.

I. PROCESS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE STATE PLAN

A Pre-Existing Reform Initiatives:

Nebraska's commitment to educational reform is a collaboration between Governor E. Benjamin Nelson, who chaired the National Educational Goals Panel from August 1992 through August 1993, and the State Board of Education and the Nebraska Department of Education. The *High Performance Learning Model*, adopted by the Nebraska State Board of Education in 1991, identifies three integral components for achieving high performance learning for all students - quality learning, equity, and accountability of schools, communities, and families. The model defines the mission of Nebraska schools. NEBRASKA 2000: A Blueprint for Achieving Quality Education for All Students is Nebraska's process for addressing the state and local community portion (Title III) of the GOALS 2000: Educate America Act. The existing NEBRASKA 2000 initiative for communities will continue as a part of the blueprint process for identifying and supporting those communities that desire such designation.

B Formation of the State Planning Panel and Development of the Plan:

The Governor and Commissioner of Education will jointly appoint a panel that will be called the NEBRASKA 2000 State Panel. The Panel will develop the state plan, incorporating proposals and recommendations to the State Board of Education and the Governor. The State School Improvement Plan developed by the Panel will be submitted to the State Board of Education for approval. Upon approval by the Board, the Commissioner, Governor, and Legislature will be responsible for reviewing and responding to the recommendations of the Panel and for working together to consider any new administrative and fiscal support structures necessary to implement the Panel's recommendations. The Governor and the Commissioner will appoint the NEBRASKA 2000 State Panel so that it is a broadly representative group as designated in the legislation. The current membership of the NEBRASKA 2000 Steering Committee will be utilized as appropriate, in order to coordinate the efforts of NEBRASKA 2000: A Blueprint for Achieving Quality Education for All Students and the existing NEBRASKA 2000 initiative. Professional education representatives will include teachers, school and district level administrators, educational service unit administrators, and higher education professionals. Lay citizen representatives will include students, parents, district patrons, members of local boards of education, and leaders of business and industry. Representation will also include private schools in which students or teachers participate in federal education programs. Policy makers on the panel will include the following:

Governor/designee; Commissioner of Education/designee; Chair of the State Board of Education; and Chairs/designees of state legislative authorizing committees, specifically Education, Health and Human Services, and Appropriations. Assisting the State Panel will be standing and ad hoc task forces. The Panel will be responsible for defining the work of the task forces. The standing task forces will include: Technology 2000; School-to-Work Transition; Community-Based Human Services; NEBRASKA 2000; Goals/Standards; and Assessment/Reporting. The plans and proposals of task forces will be reviewed by the Panel and will be integrated into the overall state plan. The Panel, assisted by the Goals/Standards Task Force, will develop and implement a citizen input and response process for building consensus on broad educational goals. The Panel will also be responsible for developing learner standards identifying the content/skills/applications that should be learned and demonstrated by all students.

Milestones and activities:

December 1994	State Board conducts public hearing/comment on proposed application; Approval of Application by Governor, Commissioner of Education, and State Board of Education; Submission of Application to USED; Solicitation of nominations to Panel by Governor and Commissioner
March 1995	Selection of State Panel by Governor and Commissioner
March/April 1995	First meeting of State Panel
Spring/Fall 1995	Panel develops plan for citizen consensus on general goals and learner goals; Nebraska Department of Education implements subgrant process and awards successful proposals; Nebraska Department of Education develops evaluation plan
Summer/Fall 1995	Implementation of citizen consensus plan by Panel
July 1995	Application for second year Goals 2000 planning funding
December 1995	Panel prepares annual report of activities and results
Fall 1996	Panel submits State School Improvement Plan, including uses for Goals 2000

continuation funding, to State Board

TBA

Based on approval of the State Board,
application for continuing/implementation
funding

C Learning Technologies Plan Development and Integration with Goals 2000 State Reform Plan:

The current Technology Consortium will be reconstituted to serve as the body for coordinating all technology initiatives that affect PreK-12 education. The new Consortium will be responsible for developing and maintaining a plan representing the collaborative efforts of current committees, commissions, and ad hoc groups working in educational and information technologies, including: NEBSAT; Nebraska Commission on Information Technology; Nebraska Association of School Boards Collaborative Plan; Ad hoc committees and groups working on Internet implementation and regional technology infrastructure and educational service units; and "Challenge Nebraska" Six-Point Plan for Technology. The Technology Consortium will be responsible for developing the PreK-12 plan that incorporates and coordinates the appropriate initiatives of other technology groups. The Consortium will also serve as the standing task force on education/information technologies reporting to the Panel (Technology 2000 Task Force).

II. DESCRIPTION OF THE SUBGRANT PROGRAM

A Process for Making Subgrants for LEA Improvement Plans:

In the first year of the plan, \$288,617 is available for subgranting to local districts. The Nebraska Department of Education will develop a plan for subgranting which will include an Application Committee that establishes guidelines, criteria, and processes. The subgrant awards will be reviewed on a competitive basis by a panel of peer reviewers, independent of the Department, that will select those proposals that are recommended for funding. The Review Panel will evaluate the proposals according to the established criteria. Grant awards will be approved by the State Board of Education. The guidelines, criteria, and processes will be complementary to those of the Excellence in Education Council. The guidelines, criteria, and processes will reflect the goals of the NEBRASKA 2000: A Blueprint for Achieving Quality Education for All Students and the existing NEBRASKA 2000 initiative. First year subgrant funding will be distributed as follows: Preservice 10%; Implementation of School Improvement Initiatives 40%; and Professional Development 50%.

B Process for Making Subgrants for Improvements in Preservice Education Programs:

See "A" above.

C Process for Making Subgrants for Continuing Professional Development:

See "A" above.

III. GOALS 2000 1994-95 PROPOSED ALLOCATIONS

A	Subgrants	<u>\$288,617</u>
1.	LEA Reform	\$115,447
2.	Preservice Teacher Education	\$28,862
3.	Professional Development	\$144,308
B	State Plan Development	<u>\$192,410</u>
1.	Panel and Task Force Expenses	\$48,102
2.	School Improvement Team, Staff to Panel and Task Forces, Professional Development of Teams and Department Personnel	\$144,398
C	Technology Plan Development	<u>\$75,000</u>
D	Total Title III Allocation	<u>\$481,027</u>
E	Total Goals 2000/Technology Allocation	<u>\$556,027</u>

GOALS 2000: EDUCATE AMERICA ACT

STATE PROFILE

STATE: Nevada
DATE APPLICATION SUBMITTED: August 18, 1994
DATE APPLICATION APPROVED: September 20, 1994
FUNDING: FIRST YEAR: \$327,336; SECOND YEAR: \$1,309,344 (estimate);
TECHNOLOGY: \$75,000.

I. PROCESS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE STATE PLAN

A Pre-Existing Reform Initiatives:

In response to the Governor's Conference in 1989, Nevada expanded the vision set forth in America GOALS 2000 by adopting the six national goals, and adding six more to address needs specific to the state's diverse student population. The resulting document, *Nevada 2000 Education Goals*, was developed as a grass roots effort coordinated by the Governor. The Nevada State Board of Education has recently revised and adopted *Nevada State Board of Education Goals* that incorporate *Nevada 2000 Education Goals* into the State Board Strategic Plan. The Nevada state legislature has approved initiatives supporting Nevada schools such as mandated class size reduction in at-risk kindergarten, grades 1 and 2, site based decision making and an annual School Accountability report. The Nevada Course of Study, which is mandated by the Nevada State Legislature, has recently undergone three content revisions in the areas of mathematics, science and physical education, utilizing national professional groups in respective areas for content development, and additional updates are planned. In addition, the Nevada State Legislature enacted legislation establishing The Nevada Proficiency Exam in Writing at Grade 8 and The Nevada High School Proficiency Exam in Writing. These assessments measure student performance in writing and are long standing in Nevada schools.

B Formation of the State Planning Panel and Development of the Plan:

On June 27, 1994, the Governor met with all members of the Nevada delegation to the USED GOALS 2000 Orientation Conference. At this meeting the process for nominating, selecting and appointing members of the State Panel was discussed. It was agreed that the Governor and the Superintendent of Public Instruction would jointly appoint all members of the State panel representative of those listed in Section 306 (b)(1). It is anticipated that the chairperson of the State Panel will be appointed by September 1, 1994. All other State Panel members will be appointed by September 30, 1994. The State Panel will be asked to review and analyze the existing initiatives for school reform. Using this information, they will be asked to build upon the best practices and processes to develop an overall plan with a vision which incorporates strategies to improve achievement for all of Nevada's children. The State Panel will be asked to design a five year plan in accordance with GOALS 2000 law. The Comprehensive State Improvement Plan will reflect the *Nevada 2000 Education Goals* and the State Board of Education Strategic Plan. The State Panel will seek public input as outlined in the legislation. Seven teams will be organized to address clusters of the components outlined in Section 306(c-m). A review of these

components indicates that they may be clustered according to content, i.e., Section 306(c) "Teaching, Learning, Standards, and Assessments could be grouped with 306(g) "Making the Improvements Statewide" under a more general category of "Curriculum and Assessment." A team would then be assigned to draft the components of the Comprehensive State Improvement Plan which meet the requirements set forth in the statute for these two sections of the law. Teams would contain representatives from the State Panel, as well as others whose expertise would prove helpful in the plan development. Teams would then draft sections of the Comprehensive State Improvement Plan and State Panel representatives would present the drafts to the entire State Panel for review, revision and approval. A Department of Education staff planning and coordination team has been established to provide technical assistance throughout the planning and implementation of the Comprehensive State Improvement Plan and the local education agency application processes for subgrant funds.

Milestones and Activities:

September 1994

State Panel selected and chairpersons appointed; the Nevada Department of Education's (NVDE) staff planning and coordination team is assembled

October 1994

Contracted positions of State Panel Administrator and State Panel Logistics are selected to work with the State Panel and the NVDE staff planning and coordination team; State Panel begins work on the State Plan through orientation activities

November 1994

Statewide Planning Teams are selected by the NVDE staff planning and coordination team subcommittee

December 1994

NVDE staff planning and coordination team meets to review a competitive subgrant process and to produce a suggested subgrant application format; Statewide Planning Teams meet to write an action plan that includes a needs assessment, a mission statement aligned with the State Panel Vision Statement, Goals and Strategies with timelines and benchmarks; State Panel reviews Statewide Reform and develops a State Vision Statement

January 1995

The State Panel, State Panel Administrator, and the NVDE staff

planning and coordination team will engage in public input sessions via town hall meetings for the creation of the State Plan

February 1995

NVDE staff and coordination team will develop criteria for judging and scoring procedures necessary for the selection of subgrants; subgrant application submitted to the State Panel; Statewide teams report action planning to State Panel; State Panel finalizes Vision Statement; State Panel continues to review educational reform

March 1995

Statewide teams will submit action plans to the NVDE staff planning and coordination team for approval; Subgrant RFPs announced

April-May 1995

Technical workshops for LEAs subgrant applications are held

April 1995

A draft of the State Plan is submitted to the State Panel for review

May 1995

Public input sessions via town hall meetings on the draft of the State Plan; State Panel finalizes State Plan; NVDE's staff planning and coordination team and the Superintendent reviews and approves the final State Plan

June 1995

State Plan is submitted to the State Board of Education; State Plan submitted to USED; Subgrant application due and reviewed

July 1995

NVDE approves and awards the first year subgrants

C Learning Technologies Plan Development and Integration with Goals 2000 State Reform Plan:

The Council on Educational Technology will have the broad-based representation required under Section 317(d)(1)(A). Some members will be from the State Panel to ensure coordination and collaboration between the Nevada School Network Committee and the Statewide Distance Learning Committee. This Council will include members of the

existing statewide committees engaged in technology initiatives including the Nevada School Network Committee, the Statewide Distance Learning Committee, and the Statewide Management of Automated Records Transfer Workgroup. The Council will advise Nevada Department of Education staff, the state board and the legislature regarding the establishment of appropriate educational technology standards, technology enhanced curricula, instruction and student information transfer and data analysis systems. Two key components of the technology plan will include an expansion of the Nevada School Network and the creation of a demonstration technology center. The predominantly rural nature of Nevada places a priority on engineering the expansion of the current system of statewide networking and distance learning in order to maximize technology integration statewide. The Nevada School Network, operating on the backbone of the state university network, Nevadanet, currently provides full Internet access to the two large urban school districts, and four of the fifteen small rural districts in Nevada. This network is projected to be the key link between Nevada's schools and the National Information Infrastructure. The demonstration technology center will serve to link the Nevada Department of Education to the Nevada School Network and to distance learning programs as well as providing a site for the development of interactive and static distance learning programs, and a lab for professional development programs in technology use and integration. The Nevada Department of Education has initiated planning with the Nevada Department of Public Works to begin designing technical components to support the variety of uses envisioned for the demonstration technology center, including shared usage by adult learners after school and or work hours.

II. DESCRIPTION OF THE SUBGRANT PROGRAM

A Process for Making Subgrants for LEA Improvement Plans:

It is the intent of the Nevada Department of Education to utilize the 60% funds available to make subgrants to local education agencies or consortia of local education agencies in accordance with Section 309(a)(1). The grant awards will be made on a competitive basis. Criteria for judging applicants will be developed that are consistent with the priorities established by the State Panel's Comprehensive State Improvement Plan. All applications will be reviewed and rated by a team of peer readers. In order to provide local education agencies with budgetary guidelines in drafting their applications, Nevada has decided to provide maximum amounts to be awarded. These amounts are based upon district wide student enrollment. This is necessary because of the vast differences in school district size in Nevada. The distribution is as follows:

Districtwide Student Enrollment	Subgrant Maximum
60,000 - 160,000	\$75,000
20,000 - 59,999	\$40,000
9,000 - 19,999	\$20,000
1 - 8,999	\$10,000

B Process for Making Subgrants for Improvements in Preservice Education Programs:

The application review process is as described in "A" above for preservice teacher

education and professional development. The maximum amounts to be awarded are related to school district size and are as follows:

Districtwide Student Enrollment	Subgrant Maximum
60,000 - 160,000	\$50,000
20,000 - 59,999	\$25,000
1 - 19,999	\$10,000

- C Process for Making Subgrants for Continuing Professional Development:**
See "B" above.

III. GOALS 2000 1994-95 PROPOSED ALLOCATIONS

A	Subgrants	<u>\$196,200</u>
	1. LEA Improvement	
	2. Preservice Teacher Education and Professional Development	
B	State Plan Development	<u>\$130,773</u>
	1. Plan Development	\$84,600
	2. State Panel	\$28,918
	3. Indirect Costs	\$17,254
C	Technology Plan Development	<u>\$97,690</u>
	1. Technology Planning	\$84,800
	2. Indirect Costs	\$12,890
D	Total Title III Allocation	<u>\$327,336</u>
E	Total Goals 2000/Technology Allocation	<u>\$402,336</u>

GOALS 2000: EDUCATE AMERICA ACT

STATE PROFILE

STATE: New Jersey
DATE APPLICATION SUBMITTED: October 18, 1994
DATE APPLICATION APPROVED: December 13, 1994
FUNDING: FIRST YEAR: \$2,296,200; SECOND YEAR: \$9,184,800 (estimate);
TECHNOLOGY: \$90,870.

I. PROCESS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE STATE PLAN

A Pre-Existing Reform Initiatives:

In December 1992 the New Jersey State Board of Education adopted state goals very similar to the National Goals of Section 101. A broad range of initiatives has been established to address each of the goals. More recently, New Jersey has embarked on a comprehensive educational improvement initiative. On April 13, 1994, the State Board directed the Commissioner to develop a Five-year Plan for the Systemic Improvement of Education in New Jersey. The plan called for by the State Board of Education will be consistent with the requirements of the Goals 2000 legislation, incorporating the following seven elements: high standards for student learning in a safe learning environment; a rigorous program of assessment to determine students' progress toward achieving these standards; a system of rewards and sanctions by which the department can encourage appropriate efforts to schools to achieve standards; professional development policies and programs to assist educators in their efforts to enable students to achieve learning standards; a program by which to engage and inform the public in statewide improvement efforts; the appropriate use of technology to facilitate educational and managerial improvements; and provision for responding appropriately to requirements of federal and state law. In February 1995 the department announced a *Comprehensive Plan for Educational Improvement and Financing*, describing a proposed education funding system that will effectively address a directive of the New Jersey Supreme Court and will assure that all pupils receive a "thorough and efficient" education as mandated in the State Constitution. A series of town meetings and hearings being held to solicit input from all persons involved and interested in education in New Jersey. This process will be completed by fall 1995. The department has also embarked on an extensive process to engage the public, educators and representatives of the collegiate and business communities in a consensus-seeking discussion of new Core Curriculum Standards that already have been developed by eight advisory committees of public school educators.

B Formation of the State Planning Panel and Development of the Plan:

In response to the State Board's request, the New Jersey Department of Education has developed a comprehensive *Strategic Plan for Systemic Improvement of Education in New Jersey*. This *Plan* addresses all of the National Education Goals and the State Board's priorities. It represents the foundation upon which New Jersey's Goals 2000 State Improvement Plan will be developed. The *Plan* includes eleven goals and a set of strategies for achieving those goals. It was presented to the State Board and widely

disseminated in March 1995 in draft form and will be considered and modified by the State Board based upon the wide range of public input received through the Goals 2000 public engagement process. It is anticipated that the State Improvement Plan will be adopted in fall 1995. Through the public engagement process, it is New Jersey's intention to build a consensus around the *Strategic Plan*, and ultimately to submit it to the United States Department of Education as New Jersey's Goals 2000 State Improvement Plan. To assure that the Goals 2000 Plan is developed with broad-based participation of all persons involved and interested in education in the State, and to assure that the input on the *Plan* is elicited in a coherent manner relative to on-going efforts toward systemic reform, the State has requested that the United States Department of Education approve an alternative process to the prescriptions regarding plan development and the Goals 2000 panel described in Section 306 of the Educate America Act. The focal point for the development of the Goals 2000 Plan will be the State Board of Education, the body responsible for the development of education policy in the State. The *Strategic Plan* will serve as the context and starting point for the development of the Goals 2000 Plan. The public will be asked to consider the goals and strategies in the *Strategic Plan*, and to recommend additions, deletions or modifications. Based on that input, the State Board will modify and adopt the Plan and submit it to the United States Department of Education as the State's Goals 2000 Plan by Fall 1995. The State Board will solicit input from all person involved and interested in education at all levels in the system by: (a) holding hearings on the *Strategic Plan*, (b) conducting town meetings and conferences on the development of New Jersey's Core Curriculum Standards, (c) conducting hearings throughout the State on the education funding proposal, (d) requesting written testimony from all education, business and parent organizations regarding the *Strategic Plan*, (e) conducting a State Board of Education "retreat" to which organizations and individuals will be invited to participate in a working session on the development of New Jersey's Goals 2000 Plan. The State is awaiting action of the United States Department of Education on this proposed alternative.

C Learning Technologies Plan Development and Integration with Goals 2000 State Reform Plan:

New Jersey has already made significant progress in planning for instructional technology. A broad-based panel completed its work in the spring of 1993, culminating in a document entitled "Educational Technology in New Jersey: A Plan for Action." The panel will be asked to take the next step, recommending ways to connect technology firmly with each of the elements of the plan. New Jersey will use its instructional technology grant funds to expand the implementation of the existing technology plan by strengthening the Department of Education's support for telecommunications and educational technology activities through the Department's new Office of Technology. Three key areas of reform will be initiated through this office: the development of strategies for the implementation of the education technology plan (already submitted); the development of a state-of-the-art system for data management; and the upgrading of office technology within the department. Activities planned to that end include: implementation of pilot studies in ten districts to create models of exemplary uses of educational technology which advance information-sharing capabilities, distance learning and training; development of an electronic network to link all local school districts to the Department's mainframe; promotion of a statewide fiber optic network for education which will have the capacity

to carry voice, video and data communications throughout the state; promotion and facilitation of the retrofitting of schools to permit the fuller utilization of new technology; providing facilities planning expertise for new construction or renovations to assure the effective use of instructional technology; implementing a clearinghouse in which the educational community will have direct access to information on educational technology resources; and providing full access to the statewide telecommunications network NJ Link.

II. DESCRIPTION OF THE SUBGRANT PROGRAM

A Process for Making Subgrants for LEA Improvement Plans:

New Jersey plans to make subgrants of Goals 2000 funds for local improvement and professional development primarily on a multiple-year basis. This will permit New Jersey to require more comprehensive proposals than would be possible with single-year grants, enabling NJ to leverage the available dollars for a system-wide impact in terms of school improvement. In the second and third years of grant-making a sizable portion of funds will be distributed to continuing projects. Funding for each project will gradually be reduced rather than abruptly ended, making the transition to other funding sources less difficult. The subgrants will be awarded on a competitive basis to local education agencies (LEAs) and various consortia of LEAs. LEAs are encouraged to coordinate these subgrants with other programs currently operating in a school and/or the district. The awards will start in 1995-96, and year one funds will be fully expended by September 1996, year two funds by September 1997, and so on. The 1995-96 Request for Proposals will be issued by summer 1995, with awards made for projects to begin in fall 1995. Over the five-year cycle of Goals 2000, New Jersey expects to devote 75% of subgrant funds to local improvement. The budget, however, shows a much smaller share of subgrant funds (45%) devoted to this purpose for the FY '95 Goals 2000 allotment. This is because New Jersey's planned funding cycle for the local improvement subgrants starts slowly, with the largest commitment in year two of the three-year grants. Local improvement subgrants in the first year will be for planning purposes with modest award levels. Subsequent funding for implementation activities will be contingent upon the approval of local improvement plans in the funded districts. Year two funding will range from \$30,000 to \$70,000 per participating school building. Funding in the final year will be reduced to 50% of the year two level to ease the transition of these projects to other funding sources. Each year a new cadre of districts receiving three-year grants will be added. There will be a total of four cadres of grants over the five years of Goals 2000 funding. All districts receiving grants will be required to form collaborative relationships with institutions of higher education, community based organizations and private non-profit educational organizations as appropriate.

B Process for Making Subgrants for Improvements in Preservice Education Programs:

Recognizing the critical importance of professional development to meaningful systemic education reform, New Jersey plans to integrate the professional development (both pre- and in-service) grant program with the LEA local improvement grant program. That is, there will be a single grant program with multiple components.

- C Process for Making Subgrants for Continuing Professional Development:**
See "B" above.

III. GOALS 2000 1994-95 PROPOSED ALLOCATIONS

A	Subgrants	<u>\$1,378,000</u>
	LEA Improvement and Professional Development	\$1,378,000
B	State Plan Development	<u>\$918,000</u>
C	Technology Plan Development	<u>\$91,000</u>
D	Total Title III Allocation	<u>\$2,296,000</u>
E	Total Goals 2000/Technology Allocation	<u>\$2,387,000</u>

GOALS 2000: EDUCATE AMERICA ACT

STATE PROFILE

STATE: New Mexico
DATE APPLICATION SUBMITTED: July 5, 1994
DATE APPLICATION APPROVED: August 16, 1994
FUNDING: FIRST YEAR: \$651,202; SECOND YEAR: \$2,604,808 (estimate);
TECHNOLOGY: \$75,000.

I. PROCESS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE STATE PLAN

A Pre-Existing Reform Initiatives:

New Mexico has an established history in educational reform. The efforts of New Mexico are illustrated by their establishment in 1974 of the Equalization Guarantee Funding Formula for Education and their recent development of the New Mexico's Children's Agenda: A framework for New Mexico's Services for Children, Youth and Families. Activities and events to highlight select initiatives include: The New Mexico State Board of Education's, "Consolidating Initiatives for Tomorrow's Education" (CITE) put into process broad based participation of the High School Task Force, the Carnegie Middle School Advisory Committee, the State Council on Vocational Education, the State Board's Professional Standards Commission, the Educational Standards Committee and the School to Work Transition Committee. The identification of common goals and objectives found in the state's Children's Agenda, and through the Standards for Excellence and supporting competency frameworks it is evident that the state has adopted content area frameworks based on high expectations for all students from which schools can develop locally based curricula. The Standards for Excellence and the subsequent Standards for Excellence Accreditation Process, which is based on outcomes, are designed to assure that schools are addressing the needs of all children. In addition, the state is participating in the NSF-SSI project, RE-Learning, and Carnegie Middle School. The state is also working with the Rockefeller and Noyce Foundations as well as various business community stakeholders in the redesign of the state's educational delivery system. With the support of the Goals 2000 legislation, state and local restructuring initiatives can be enhanced to attain the high expectations of the state's Standards for Excellence.

B Formation of the State Planning Panel and Development of the Plan:

The State of New Mexico did not have a systemic state improvement plan nor a panel responsible for each and every aspect of the Goals 2000 legislation. Thus, the New Mexico State Department of Education in conjunction with the Governor's office established New Mexico's Education 2000 Panel. The New Mexico State Department of Education will work with the panel as it carries out these charges required by the legislation. The Governor and Chief State School Officer recognized the existence of a significant number of committees, boards, commissions, and made the decision to select, to the extent possible, membership from these groups and still meet the composition requirements of Section 306. The panel was named on August 30, 1994. The length of term for panel members is still to be determined. The panel will be charged to: 1) analyze current reform

efforts; 2) build upon best practices and plans; 3) develop an overall vision which incorporates strategies for improved student outcomes; 4) function in an open and inclusive way; 5) take positive steps to communicate in the planning process with a broad cross section of stakeholder, interest groups and the general public; and 6) to meet in the state improvement plan all subsections under Section 306 (c).

Milestones and Activities:

August 30, 1994	Appointment of State Improvement Plan Panel
October 3-4, 1994	First meeting of NM Education 2000 Panel: Informational only
November 9-10, 1994	Second meeting of the panel: Organization of subcommittees around expectations in the legislation.
December 1994-June 1995	Continue planning work with work groups, preparation of needed information and strategies to complete the State Improvement Plan, submission of the Plan to Governor, Chief and State Board of Education.
June 1995	Submission of State Plan to USED.

C Learning Technologies Plan Development and Integration with Goals 2000 State Reform Plan:

The legislature enacted legislation to establish the Education Technology Bureau in the SEA in 1994 and a Council of Education Technology to serve in an advisory capacity to the SEA, the legislature and the state board. It is the intent of the SEA to use the Council of Technology which has broad-based representation to assist the State Improvement Panel in developing the State Plan. One member of the Council is serving on the State Panel to ensure coordination and collaboration between the two planning groups.

Milestones and Activities:

April -July 1994	Appointment of Council on Educational Technology; monthly Technology Council meetings; Education Technology Bureau staff employed.
November 9-10, 1994	Panel to develop Task Matrix and organize to develop plan and timelines.
April 1995	Draft state plan completed and sent to field for review.
June 1995	State Board of Education approves plan for submittal.

II. DESCRIPTION OF THE SUBGRANT PROGRAM

A Process for Making Subgrants for LEA Improvement Plans:

It is the intent of the NMSDE to utilize 60% of the Title III monies for subgrants under the provisions of Section 309 of Title III. \$270,000 or 42% of the subgrant monies will be used for subgrants for LEA Improvement Grants. The NMSDE will construct a special competitive application packet with the assistance of NM's Education 2000 Panel. The packet will describe selection criteria, timelines, funding levels and due dates. All applications will be reviewed and rated by a team of readers and scored, with the highest being awarded funds. Subgrants to be awarded include: four rural school districts at \$25,000 each; three average sized school districts at \$30,000 each; and two urban school districts at \$40,000 each.

B Process for Making Subgrants for Improvements in Preservice Education Programs:

As indicated for LEA subgrants the NMSDE will develop a special application packet using the same formulation process. However, for both Preservice and Professional Development subgrants a Peer Review Process will be used to read and score applications with awards being made to the highest ranked applications. The NMSDE intends to make available a total of \$120,721 or 18% of the monies available for subgrants for these two subgrant areas.

Milestones and Activities:

November 1994 - January 1995

Mail applications to all eligible districts, etc.;

Deadline for receiving applications - December 1994;

Selection and notification of Grantees- January 1995

March 1995- October 1995

Progress reports from grantees-March-June 1995;

Final evaluation from grantees on progress.

C Process for Making Subgrants for Continuing Professional Development: Process, Milestones and Activities as cited above.

III. GOALS 2000 1994-95 PROPOSED ALLOCATIONS

A	Subgrants	<u>\$390,721</u>
1.	LEA School Improvement	\$270,000
2.	Preservice and Professional Development	\$120,721

B	State Plan Development	<u>\$261,681</u>
1.	Direct Administration	\$96,904
a.	State Panel Costs	\$118,503
b.	Indirect Costs	\$46,274
C	Technology Plan Development	<u>\$73,800</u>
1.	Travel, equipment, and supplies	\$5,400
a.	Contractual	\$66,400
b.	Other	\$2,000
D	Total Title III Allocation	<u>\$651,202</u>
E	Total Goals 2000/Technology Allocation	<u>\$726,202</u>

GOALS 2000: EDUCATE AMERICA ACT

STATE PROFILE

STATE: New York

DATE APPLICATION SUBMITTED: June 30, 1994

DATE APPLICATION APPROVED: August 3, 1994

FUNDING: FIRST YEAR: \$6,729,700; SECOND YEAR: \$26,918,800 (estimate);

TECHNOLOGY: \$266,286.

I. PROCESS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE STATE PLAN

A Pre-Existing Reform Initiatives:

In 1991 the New York Board of Regents adopted the "New Compact for Learning." The Compact is a plan for broad based "Top Down - Bottom Up Reform." The principles are: All Children Can Learn; Focus on Results; Aim for Mastery; Provide the Means; Authority with Accountability; and Reward Success and Remedy Failure. The Compact is a partnership between State and Local authority, wherein the State sets clear goals and high academic standards.

B Formation of the State Planning Panel and Development of the Plan:

New York will build on its current "Compact" agenda and its objectives and programmatic initiatives and describe the Goals 2000 Plan as "The New Compact for Learning Comprehensive Improvement Plan," linking Goals 2000, School-to-Work and ESEA. The Panel will be formed and proceed according to a tentative timeline as follows:

9/94 - 10/94	Form Broad Based Planning Panel.
October 1994	Review current status of reform in New York.
10/94 - 12/94	Consult, solicit and analyze public comment.
January 1995	Assisted by SEA writing team prepare draft of Reform Plan.
February 1995	Panel approval of final report draft and submission to SEA and Governor.
March 1995	Submit State Improvement Plan to Secretary of Education.

C Learning Technologies Plan Development and Integration with Goals 2000 State Reform Plan:

To ensure broad representation and knowledge in the development of the technology plan, a planning and advisory committee will be established, incorporating members from the present statewide and regional technology advisory committees and working groups.

Members of the state technology committee will participate in the work of the overall Goals 2000 State Reform Panel.

II. DESCRIPTION OF THE SUBGRANT PROGRAM

A Process for Making Subgrants for LEA Improvement Plans:

A total of 15% of the 60% (\$4,039,700) allocation for subgrants will be used for request for proposals (RFP's) from LEAs. The applications will be designed by the State Panel with support of SEA staff and distributed in the fall of 1994 to LEAs and consortia of LEAs for the development of local improvement plans. The state agency will provide technical assistance to LEAs interested in submitting applications. A panel of experienced teachers and supervisors will read, review and rate each proposal with preference to LEAs showing the most promise of making substantial progress with the goals of the Compact and Goals 2000.

B Process for Making Subgrants for Improvements in Preservice Education Programs:

A total of 10% (\$430,000) of the 60% (\$4,039,700) allocation for subgrants will be used for this category. The subgrant application design, distribution and review process will be the same as indicated for the LEA Improvement subgrants. Preference will be given to LEAs which collaborate with institutions of higher education having approved teacher preparation programs. A series of regional technical assistance workshops will be held for LEAs interested in making application for preservice subgrants. A return date for grant proposals is planned for November 1994.

C Process for Making Subgrants for Continuing Professional Development:

A total of 75% (\$3,000,000) of the 60% (\$4,039,700) allocation for subgrants will be used for this category. The subgrant process is identical to that of the process and preference priority indicated for preservice education program subgrants.

III. GOALS 2000 1994-95 PROPOSED ALLOCATIONS

A	Subgrants	<u>\$4,039,700</u>
	1. LEA Improvement Plans	\$609,700
	2. Preservice Teacher Education	\$430,000
	3. Professional Development	\$3,000,000
B	State Plan Development	<u>\$2,690,000</u>
C	Technology Plan Development	<u>\$266,286</u>

D	Total Title III Allocation	<u>\$6,729,700</u>
----------	-----------------------------------	---------------------------

E	Total Goals 2000/Technology Allocation	<u>\$6,995,986</u>
----------	---	---------------------------

GOALS 2000: EDUCATE AMERICA ACT

STATE PROFILE

STATE: North Carolina
DATE APPLICATION SUBMITTED: September 6, 1994
DATE APPLICATION APPROVED: September 29, 1994
FUNDING: FIRST YEAR: \$1,934,324; SECOND YEAR: \$7,737,296 (estimate);
TECHNOLOGY: \$76,549.

I. PROCESS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE STATE PLAN

A Pre-Existing Reform Initiatives:

The basic foundation for providing the essential elements of a quality education for all students in the state is the Basic Education Program (BEP), first authorized in 1985 by the General Assembly (GA). The BEP is a proposed framework of curriculum, physical and curricular resources, and personnel needed to ensure that every student receives a quality education. Initially intended to have a seven year implementation schedule, the BEP is still not fully funded. However, the GA gave significant funds to this effort in the '94-95 budget. The State has also made special appropriations for low wealth and small school districts to further ensure the accessibility of an essential education for all students. Many of the directions provided in the Educate America Act are underway in North Carolina. The North Carolina School Improvement and Accountability Act of 1989, amended in 1992 and 1993 by the Performance-Based Accountability Program (PBAP), restructured how decisions are made in schools. Primary components include flexibility from state laws and policies with accountability through the use of student performance goals. Every school district and school building has developed an improvement plan with specified goals and outcomes based on state-wide standards established by PBAP. Districts and buildings may submit waivers for a broad range of statutes and regulations. Teachers and Parents are involved in all aspects of developing and implementing the school improvement plan. The North Carolina Standards and Accountability Commission was established in 1993 to develop graduation standards and related assessments. Also, a preliminary effort in developing high school graduation standards is underway with nine LEAs piloting outcome-based education. Over the last few years, the agency has undertaken major curriculum revisions in the Standard Course of Study based on national standards and incorporating higher order processes.

A leadership reform package was addressed by the 1993 General Assembly and included recruitment, preservice training, and selection and ongoing professional development. The North Carolina Standards Board for Public School Administration was named and will establish standards for the profession and entry-level assessment. A Principal's Fellows Program offers 50 scholarships for Master's level preservice training. The 1995 session of the General Assembly will address consolidated professional development for both teachers and administrators.

Violence prevention and safe schools have also received attention from the General Assembly and the Department of Public Instruction. Funding for safe schools, prevention and early intervention, after school programs, and support personnel are among the

strategies directed to at-risk students. Also, North Carolina has been selected by the National Governor's Association as one of 13 states to serve as a laboratory for restructuring worker training programs.

Efforts in cross-agency collaboration are seen in various ways, including school-to-work initiatives, transition grants for handicapped, state preschool handicapped teams, Chapter 1 preschool and outreach, and student assistance teams in schools working with at-risk students. There are also Family Resource Centers in several counties, funded either through the Department or the North Carolina Department of Human Resources. A more broad-based approach to collaboration among schools, public and private agencies, and citizens was initiated with "Smart Start." This provides competitive grants to communities to develop preschool and comprehensive services for children and families. The Department also sponsored case studies of service collaboration in six counties to examine the barriers and enhancers to effective collaboration among schools and other agencies. The Total Quality Education Project is another collaborative effort. Seven school districts are piloting this approach in cooperation with the Department, the Governor's office, and the North Carolina Business Committee for Education.

B Formation of the State Planning Panel and Development of the Plan:

The North Carolina School Improvement Panel will be charged with writing a state improvement plan that links together current initiatives and provides a comprehensive framework for coordinated efforts the eight national goals, as well as State PBAP goals and priorities for reform. The NC School Improvement Panel will be named in accordance with the criteria in the legislation. The Governor and the State Superintendent will each appoint half of the members, jointly naming the chair. There is consensus that the chair need to have close ties to the State Board of Education and the Department of Public Instruction to avoid adding another separate voice to education planning in North Carolina. The size of the panel will be determined by the number needed to cover representation in all areas, but is expected to have no more than 30 positions. There will be particular attention to those representing children with special needs. The Oversight Committee will be renamed the Coordinating Council and will advise the State Panel on the development of the NC School Improvement Plan. This council, with representation from the four key policy-making areas (Department of Public Instruction, State Board of Education, General Assembly, and the Governor's office), will analyze policy issues and make recommendations to the Panel, as well as serve as a conduit between these areas and the Panel. The council will also make recommendations concerning the terms of appointed panel members. A staggered system is under consideration. Representatives who serve by nature of the positions designated in the federal legislation will change as personnel in the positions change. Replacements for other early departures will be appointed by the Governor or State Superintendent respectively. Each agency or institution related to the NC School Improvement Plan initiatives will designate staff to serve on cross-functional teams to assist in the preparation and implementation of the state plan. These staff will designate portions of their time for the NC School Improvement Plan, with allocation or redistribution of their former work load determined by each agency. This staff time will be in-kind contributions toward the NC School Improvement Plan. The panel will meet monthly during the plan development phase. More frequent meetings may be determined by the panel. Meeting schedules will be determined in conjunction with the Chair of the

panel. There are several broad components in the NC School Improvement Plan development process. 1) Vision for Schooling and Reform: A vision for principles of schooling and restructuring in NC will be developed that all policy groups can support. This vision will guide the development of a plan for continuous school renewal that builds upon current efforts and provides for alignment, monitoring, and adjustments as deemed necessary. 2) Analysis of Current Elements of Reform: The panel will analyze the current status of education and elements of reform in NC against the required plan components and principles for systemic reform reflected in the vision. The panel will prioritize the needs for assuring aligned and continuous school renewal through coordination of existing components and identification of missing elements or additional areas of emphasis. 3) Public Outreach: The Department of Public Instruction's Division of Communication Services, working collaboratively with the North Carolina Association of Government Information Officers, will guide the design of the process for creating awareness, sharing the vision, gaining input, and seeking public validation of the final plan. Collaboration with other groups (Commission on Workforce Preparedness, Commission on a Competitive North Carolina, Standards and Accountability Commission) to promote public awareness and dialogue will be emphasized. 4) Grassroots Reform: Coordination of grassroots strategies with other commissions will be a top priority of the School Improvement Panel. One key source of input into the work of the panel will be communication with the local recipients of the subgrants. As they study issues of focus for the grants, their learnings and recommendations will be shared with the panel. Likewise, the panel will share with the subgrantees its findings and proposals to enhance the local projects. 5) Study of Issues: Identified areas of need and focus will be studied in a variety of ways, including contracted study by experts, graduate students, or SBE's Policy Research Center; study groups of agency staff and panel members; focus groups and hearings; attendance at conferences; and site visitation models. 6) Written Document: The panel staff will use all of the information gathered by the panel to write the plan for continued school improvement in NC. After public review and reaction, the final revision will be submitted to the SBE for approval. 7) Public Validation: The completed plan will be disseminated to the public for review and reaction through many of the channels previously described.

Milestones and activities:¹

September 1994

Submit State Plan to State Board of Education (SBE) for approval; Submit Plan to USED; Begin Development of Criteria for Subgrants

October 1994

Panel named; Complete Criteria for Subgrants and Request for Proposal

¹North Carolina reports that the timeline process may be delayed up to six months. Due to the political conditions in North Carolina and the targeted reduction and reorganization of DPI, attention to convening a state panel has been diverted. This timeline will be reconstructed once decisions have been made in North Carolina regarding the state panel.

November 1994	Funds for Goals 2000 received; Staff selected; Convene Panel - begin orientation; RFP for Subgrants to SBE for approval
December 1994	Public Outreach activities begin; Analysis of current status - study components of reform; Orientation and training for Subgrants
January 1995	Analysis of current status/reforms continued; public outreach activities Grassroots activities begin; Higher Education Summit; Respond to questions re: RFP for Subgrants
February-May 1995	Develop vision of schooling; Continue analysis/develop framework for Plan
March 1995	Subgrant proposals due/Subgrant Review process completed
April 1995	Recommendations for Subgrants to SBE for approval; Awards announced
June-August 1995	Write Improvement Plan
August-October 1995	Disseminate plan/ incorporate feedback
November 1995	Submit State Plan to SBE for information
December 1995	Submit State Plan to SBE for action; Submit Plan to USED

C Learning Technologies Plan Development and Integration with Goals 2000 State Reform Plan:

A major component in renewing the state's schools and in improving student performance is the development of a comprehensive statewide technology infrastructure and the full exploitation of all available technology for both the delivery and support of instruction. The ground work for the design of this infrastructure began in North Carolina as early as 1992 when the State Superintendent convened an Instructional Technology Task Force of state and local educators to study the status of technology in the schools and to recommend needed support. In the fall of 1993 the Governor announced a major initiative, the North Carolina Information Highway, designed to network the entire state. Schools were identified as having priority service on the Information Highway. Of the first announced 106 sites, half were North Carolina high schools. Also in July 1993 the General Assembly

established the North Carolina School Technology Commission with the specific charge to identify instructional needs that can be met using various types of technology and to develop a long-range technology implementation plan for the public schools building on what was already in place, while incorporating the best thinking of the state's education leadership. A draft plan, commissioned by the School Technology Commission and conducted by The Center for Educational Leadership in Technology (CEL T), is scheduled to be completed in August of 1994. The next phase of planning for a statewide comprehensive technology initiative, including LEA planning, will build on and operationalize the Commission's plan. The proposed Goals 2000 plan is both top down and bottom up. For the top, a state-level framework and support system will be developed providing the technology backbone and links to worldwide networks, standards to ensure compatibility and connectivity, and on-going training and support. The state framework/standards will provide maximum flexibility to LEAs and schools for designing local technology systems designed to meet local needs. Each LEA will redesign their existing plan or develop a new one that is compatible with the state plan but with unique designs based on local priorities. In an effort to model the effective use of technology in day-to-day operations, the Department has already taken several major steps toward this end. The agency committed over \$1 million last year enhancing its infrastructure and is completing a strategic plan for making the agency state-of-the-art in a variety of technologies. A comprehensive staff training program will be implemented in the fall, 1994, designed to make every Department employee computer proficient. Electronic mail and bulletin board links are being developed with LEAs and schools.

II. DESCRIPTION OF THE SUBGRANT PROGRAM

A Process for Making Subgrants for LEA Improvement Plans:

North Carolina will distribute 60% of its Goals 2000 allocation in subgrants to LEAs; consortia of LEAs, IHEs, and/or other agencies. North Carolina will offer a merged grant program, as the three categories of school improvement planning and professional development through Preservice and inservice are all intertwined. Applicants will be allowed to focus on one, two, or all three areas. Since the awards will be of sufficient size to carry out significant reform with quality, the number of awards will be limited. It is anticipated that 10 to 15 grants will be awarded. In addition to addressing the legislative criteria for awards and distribution, the Panel and the Department will also review the research on systemic reform and professional development and incorporate essential elements into the criteria. Because of the merged grant program, funds will not be designated in each specific subgrant category. This will allow the Department to be as responsive as possible to the grants received, and to award funds to the most innovative and systemic proposals. The Department will ensure that funds are allocated in all three grant categories in the award process. Once the focus and criteria are finalized, the RFP will be developed, with dissemination in February 1995. The planning group has explored coordination with School-to-Work and other staff development grant programs such as Eisenhower, Strengthening Teacher Education, and Collaboration. It may be possible to align the criteria, focus, and timelines so that LEAs may write one proposal for multiple programs. The review process will follow legislative requirements and NC SBE policy.

All proposals will be reviewed by LEA peers. The best proposals will be identified through the criteria scoring system. The plan, process, or amount of funds may be negotiated. Announcement of final awards is anticipated in June 1995. Local evaluation will be an important aspect of each grant. From the state level, NC is considering a review process by a panel of peers, Department staff, and state panel representatives. The review team will examine evidence of progress and accomplishments based on the goals and objectives of the plan. Grantees will self-assess through this process and make adjustments as appropriate. The Department will communicate to the panel the progress of the grantees and will submit annual reports to USED as required.

B Process for Making Subgrants for Improvements in Preservice Education Programs:

See "A" above.

C Process for Making Subgrants for Continuing Professional Development:

See "A" above.

III. GOALS 2000 1994-95 PROPOSED ALLOCATIONS

A	Subgrants	<u>\$1,160,594</u>
	Merged Grant Program for:	
	1. LEA Improvement	
	2. Preservice Teacher Education	
	3. Professional Development	
B	State Plan Development	<u>\$773,499*</u>
	*Includes Indirect Cost	<u>\$25,000</u>
C	Technology Plan Development	<u>\$76,549</u>
D	Total Title III Allocation	<u>\$1,934,324</u>
E	Total Goals 2000/Technology Allocation	<u>\$2,010,873</u>

GOALS 2000: EDUCATE AMERICA ACT

STATE PROFILE

STATE: North Dakota
DATE APPLICATION SUBMITTED: August 3, 1994
DATE APPLICATION APPROVED: August 22, 1994
FUNDING: FIRST YEAR: \$323,603; SECOND YEAR: \$1,294,412 (estimate);
TECHNOLOGY: \$75,000.

I. PROCESS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE STATE PLAN

A Pre-Existing Reform Initiatives:

In 1988 the first of four major reports was published under the title: Education: North Dakota's Key to Recovery. Prepared via a series of field-based meetings, five categories of recommendations were issued inclusive of curriculum, lifelong learning, student support services, administration, and universities/colleges. In preparation for the 1989 Legislative Assembly, many of the recommendations from Education: North Dakota's Key to Recovery were translated into the Department of Public Instruction's budget proposal. The results of this study were sporadic with many quality recommendations still to be addressed. The Greater North Dakota Association (GNDA) established a Committee of 100 to analyze the needs, project a plan, seek consensus, and accomplish appropriate legislation. The GNDA process invoked was successful and was chosen as a model. Governor George Sinner established the Education Action Commission with the intent that recommendations would be developed and implementation strategies and legislation designed and proposed. Eleven pieces of legislation were proposed. Once again, only limited success was experienced by the Education Action Commission. Governor Ed Schafer's Task Force On Education recently concluded its work by publishing sixteen recommendations which are expected to be addressed in the forthcoming budget and legislative deliberations.

B Formation of the State Planning Panel and Development of the Plan:

The North Dakota Goals 2000 Panel will be jointly appointed by the Governor and the Chief State School Officer. The six panelists who attended the national meeting will be asked to review the nominations and make recommendations to the Governor and the Chief State School Officer. The Panel will correspond to the legislation in terms of representation. North Dakota plans to have a thirty-three member panel. Additionally, a five-member subcommittee of the panel along with two members of the Educational Telecommunications Council will comprise the Technology Subcommittee. The Panel will be appointed by September 1, 1994. Using information from a comprehensive scanning process, the Goals 2000 panel will determine the current status in North Dakota. Following a projection of goals the Panel will define what needs to be done to reach those goals. This determination of strategies to address the needs will become the state's Goals 2000 plan. The following outline provides the initiating structure for the Panel in its year-long planning process: A) Teaching, Learning, Standards, and Assessments: Continuing the development of content and student performance standards, their validation through

field testing, and cyclical updates and revisions; In cooperation with the Mid-Continent Regional Educational Laboratory and the Council of Chief State School Officers, develop and implement valid, reliable, and nondiscriminatory assessments; Working with the North Dakota Curriculum Council, the North Dakota Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, and other appropriate groups, design strategies and processes to align curricula, instructional materials, and state assessments with the standards; Design processes for dissemination. B) Opportunity-to-Learn Standards: Review and, where appropriate, revise the approval statutes and the accreditation standards to reenforce successful bases for teaching and learning; As needed, design procedures leading to the adoption of standards for early childhood education and lifelong learning; Develop implementation strategies premised upon quality, efficiency, and equity. C) Decision making and Staff Development: Outline procedures to successfully implement Sec. 15-29-08.3 by July 1, 1998; Via the Education Standards and Practices Board, the Teacher Center Network, and LEAD (Leadership in Educational Administration), pre and inservice development will be assessed, activities and strategies designed, and implementation procedures defined which address the preparation of teachers and administrators in light of the revised standards. D) Support and Involvement: Continue the networking activities with other state agencies, organizations, and support groups; Participate in the Children's Coordinating Cabinet and assume networking responsibilities; Identify and/or develop community-wide models of involvement such as that offered through Goals 2000, etc.; Establish funding criteria which support a community perspective of education. E) The Education Improvement Process: Continue the involvement of all schools and districts in either the NCA or the State School Improvement Process; Continue the translation of the improvement processes to a balance among inputs, processes, and outputs; Where possible, broaden the topics and programs included in the self-study materials and procedures used by communities as they detail their education improvement; Continue the financial incentives attached to accreditation; Revise the graduation requirements to reflect a variety of options in demonstrating completion of the required knowledge and skills. F) Dropout Strategies: To establish a strong and reliable database concerning dropouts; To assess needs and project optional strategies; Where needed, to suggest revisions in statutes and regulations. G) Coordination with School-to-Work: To further define, develop, and implement Ch. 15-21.2 of the NDCC relating to career guidance and development programs; To integrate the results from the school-to-work grants with the Goals 2000 initiatives; To network the efforts of Carl Perkins, School-to-Work, and Goals 2000. H) Plan Development: To establish criteria for a "bottom-up" reform effort and to assess progress in achieving those criteria; To establish benchmarks of improved student performance with accompanying evaluative criteria; To define follow-up procedures for those schools and districts not making reasonable progress; To establish reporting procedures to inform the general public, educators, etc. Thus far, the North Dakota Goals 2000 Panel will have conducted a scanning process and will have explored the plan requirements listed above. It is anticipated that the first two meetings of the Panel will be consumed in overviewing these efforts and will have been completed by November 1, 1994. From November 1, 1994, through March 1, 1995, the Goals 2000 Panel will seek input directed toward the plan development and components as outlined above. The following groups, among others, will be contacted: the Board of the North Dakota School Boards Association; the Board and the Instruction and Professional Development

Committee of the North Dakota Education Association; the North Dakota Council of School Administrators and its affiliate boards; the Executive Board of the North Dakota PTA; individual members who comprise the Governor's Employment and Training Forum; input from local planning councils and other activated groups; the North Dakota Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development; the North Dakota Teacher Center Network; and the North Dakota University System. As soon as feasible after March 1, 1995 the Goals Panel will finalize this planning phase and assist the Department of Public Instruction in the preparation of the application for the implementation phase.

Milestones and activities:

September 1, 1994	Appointment of Panel by the Governor and the Chief State School Officer
September 12-13, 1994	Organizational Session of the Panel: Draft Work Plan Procedures
November 14-15, 1994	Second Meeting of the Panel: Finalize Work Plan Procedures; Define Input Criteria and Processes; Project Legislative Initiatives
November 16, 1994 - March 1, 1995	Design Input Instruments and Processes; Gather Input and Research Data; Process Data
March 2-3, 1995	Third Meeting of the Panel: Receive Data and Recommendations; Process Recommendations; Confirm Overall Implementation Plan Guidelines
March 3 - May 1, 1995	Implementation Plan Development
May 4-5, 1995	Fourth Meeting of the Panel: Review of First Draft Plan; Confirmation of Continuing Role; Ongoing Assignments
May 6-31, 1995	Final Plan Preparation
June 1, 1995	Submission of Plan to USED

C Learning Technologies Plan Development and Integration with Goals 2000 State Reform Plan:

North Dakota's educational technology initiative was given a significant boost by the creation of the Educational Telecommunications Council and the appropriation of \$5 million in grant funds in 1989. The Council created a long-range plan for establishing educational technology systems and a process for developing several types of technological systems. Computer networks, interactive television, satellite programming, and traditional

educational television were either developed or expanded. The plan developed in 1989 is currently being revised. As the Council began to offer assistance for technology development, it became apparent that local/regional planning was a critical part of developing an effective statewide system. The Council designated eight planning regions and provided a small planning grant to each region for developing a regional technology plan. Results were very uneven depending upon the expertise available in each region. The need for planning and education was apparent but the availability of resources to provide for the regional expertise has been lacking. The North Dakota Department of Public Instruction and the North Dakota Educational Telecommunications are proposing to use the Goals 2000 technology grant to provide technical assistance in technology planning to regional technology planning councils and to local school districts. The second five-year plan of the Educational Telecommunications Council will be used as the basis for the technical assistance provided to the regions.

II. DESCRIPTION OF THE SUBGRANT PROGRAM

A Process for Making Subgrants for LEA Improvement Plans:

Subgrants will be awarded to LEAs for planning purposes only. The rationale is four-pronged. First, previous planning efforts may not reflect Goals 2000. Second, previous planning efforts could not have reflected and supported the state plan. Third, past experience indicates the importance of planning as a critical part of future success. And, finally, it is important to involve all of the key players during a planning year. Responding to the rationale, the state has established the following rank order for funding purposes: LEA Reform; Professional Development (Inservice); and Preservice Training. The projected proportion of funding based upon a total subgrant allocation of \$194,162 is as follows: LEA Reform, 75% for a subtotal of \$145,622; Professional Development, 15% for a subtotal of \$29,124; and Preservice Training, 10% for a subtotal of \$19,416. Ten grants of approximately \$18,000 each will be issued to one consortium in each of the eight planning regions. These recipients will facilitate planning efforts within their respective regions with the intention of informing the statewide planning process. As a part of this facilitation, eight regional panels will be formed with representation similar to that of the state panel. The amount set aside for Inservice will be \$29,124 issued to a maximum of two sites. One Preservice grant of \$19,416 will be issued.

B Process for Making Subgrants for Improvements in Preservice Education Programs:

See "A" above.

C Process for Making Subgrants for Continuing Professional Development:

See "A" above.

III. GOALS 2000 1994-95 PROPOSED ALLOCATIONS

A	Subgrants	<u>\$194,162</u>
1.	LEA Plan Development	\$145,622
2.	Preservice Education	\$19,416
3.	Inservice Education	\$29,124
B	State Plan Development	<u>\$129,441</u>
1.	State Plan Preparation	\$109,441
a.	State Panel Work	\$16,400
b.	Support Staff	\$40,000
c.	Consultants	\$15,785
d.	Travel	\$20,041
2.	Indirect Costs (13.3 %)	\$17,215
3.	LEA Grant Administration	\$20,000
C	Technology Plan Development	<u>\$75,000</u>
1.	Regional Planning Assistance	\$37,500
2.	Travel	\$5,500
3.	Eight Regional Planning Grants	\$32,000
D	Total Title III Allocation	<u>\$323,603</u>
E	Total Goals 2000/Technology Allocation	<u>\$398,603</u>

GOALS 2000: EDUCATE AMERICA ACT

STATE PROFILE

STATE: Oklahoma
DATE APPLICATION SUBMITTED: July 6, 1994
DATE APPLICATION APPROVED: August 25, 1994
FUNDING: FIRST YEAR: \$1,054,049; SECOND YEAR: \$4,216,196 (estimate);
TECHNOLOGY: \$75,000.

I. PROCESS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE STATE PLAN

A Pre-Existing Reform Initiatives:

In 1989 the state of Oklahoma made a commitment to reform public education, not only in the design of the delivery system but also in the funding structure. The process began with the appointment of a citizen's task force that represented the Governor, the legislature, the educational and business community and was demographically representative of the state. The charge to the committee was to think outside the traditional design of inputs and to create an educational system that would be the basis for Oklahoma's competitive edge in the 21st century. The efforts of Task Force 2000: Creating Twenty-first Century Schools were directed toward mapping a program which would lead to substantially improved education results and identify the sources of financial support necessary to achieve them. Similar to the requirements of Goals 2000 legislation, necessitating grassroots input from throughout the state, Oklahoma's Task Force 2000 held public hearings statewide. A concerted effort was made by the Task Force to encourage public attendance at the hearings. There are two recurring themes in the Report of Task Force 2000 -- results and accountability. In pursuit of the goals of educational excellence set forth by Task Force 2000 for Oklahoma students, the state legislature enacted House Bill 1017 in 1990. The bill was ratified by the citizens of Oklahoma on a statewide ballot in 1991. The Education Reform and Funding Act mandated significant educational reforms which include: funding equity; accreditation standards; graduation requirements; reduced class size; early childhood education; optional extended school year; mergers and consolidations; increased minimum salary schedule; and alternative certification for teachers. H.B. 1017 called for the formation of the Oklahoma Curriculum Committee whose primary purpose was to make recommendations to the State Board of Education concerning curriculum standards for the public schools. This committee was charged with the responsibility of identifying desired levels of competencies for students in the public schools and suggesting how those competencies might be centered upon various skills and knowledge rather than constrained by traditional course unit structures. Standard IV of the new accreditation standards addresses the core of the educational process. It links accreditation and curriculum more closely than in the past. It is the heart of the school reform process embodied in H.B. 1017 and related legislation. The curriculum approved by the State Board of Education is called Oklahoma *Priority Academic Student Skills (P.A.S.S.)*. Standard IV requires that the curriculum must be designed to prepare all students for employment and/or postsecondary education. Standard IV is the core of Oklahoma's school reform effort which makes better student learning our overarching goal.

Another important result of the 1989 legislative session was Senate Bill 183. Adopted and signed by the Governor, this important piece of legislation put in place Oklahoma's own educational goals. Along with the initiatives of House Bill 1017, the goals of Senate Bill 183 closely parallel the National Education Goals. In July 1989 the Oklahoma State Board of Education confirmed the responsibility of the State on behalf of the people of Oklahoma to establish, maintain, and continually improve the schools of Oklahoma by adopting the goals outlined in SB 183, the Oklahoma 2000 Education Challenge Act. In December 1991 the Oklahoma State Board of Education passed a resolution supporting and adopting the National Education Goals. The State Board also noted its support of the inclusion, within the objectives, of parental involvement and the arts.

B Formation of the State Planning Panel and Development of the Plan:

A state panel between 50 to 60 persons will be appointed by the Governor and the State Superintendent. Membership will follow the requirements of the legislation. The work of the panel will be divided into the ten subcommittees representing the eight National Goals, technology, and school-to-work. The activities of the executive committee will be supported by a staff liaison and a State Department of Education Goals Team. Each of the subcommittees will have a representative from higher education, vo-tech, and common education. An executive committee with a chair and co-chair selected by the Governor and the State Superintendent will coordinate the work of the state panel. The executive committee will be made up of the five appointees to the Goals 2000 Orientation Conference in Washington and the chairperson of each subcommittee.

C Learning Technologies Plan Development and Integration with Goals 2000 State Reform Plan:

As Oklahoma prepares for Goals 2000 implementation, the Technology Task Force will play an important role in helping plan and implement technology to achieve the outcomes. Members of the Technology Task Force, which will be a subcommittee of the Goals 2000 panel, will be solicited for their knowledge and vision for education through the use of technology. A five-member state panel of technology professionals that participated in the Secretary's Conference on Educational Technology will serve as the core of the Technology Task Force. Other members of the panel will include participants from the Oklahoma Data Processing and Telecommunications Advisory Committee, the board of ONENET (Oklahoma's statewide network), the State Department of Vocational and Technical Education, the Telephone Company Association, the cablevision industry, the Oklahoma State PTA, the Oklahoma State Chamber of Commerce, and the Oklahoma Medical Association.

II. DESCRIPTION OF THE SUBGRANT PROGRAM

A Process for Making Subgrants for LEA Improvement Plans:

60% of the state grant (\$600,000) is to be used for subgrants to LEAs or consortia of LEAs for LEA improvement and preservice teacher education and professional development. 25% or less of the grant funds are to be used for the development of a local improvement plan. 75% or more of the grant funds are to be used to support school improvement

initiatives, professional development and preservice teacher education. Subgrants are to be awarded through a competitive, peer-reviewed process to a local education agency, or a consortium of local education agencies, in cooperation with institutions of higher education, nonprofit organizations, or any combination thereof.

B Process for Making Subgrants for Improvements in Preservice Education Programs:

See "A" above.

C Process for Making Subgrants for Continuing Professional Development:

See "A" above.

III. GOALS 2000 1994-95 PROPOSED ALLOCATIONS

A	Subgrants	<u>\$650,000</u>
1.	LEA Improvement	\$550,000
2.	LEA Reform, Professional Development for Preservice and In-service using a one grant format	\$100,000
B	State Plan Development	<u>\$404,049</u>
1.	Administrative Costs	\$100,000
2.	Total SEA Expenses	\$304,049
C	Technology Plan Development	<u>\$75,000</u>
D	Total Title III Allocation	<u>\$1,054,049</u>
E	Total Goals 2000/Technology Allocation	<u>\$1,129,054</u>

GOALS 2000: EDUCATE AMERICA ACT

STATE PROFILE

STATE: Oregon
DATE APPLICATION SUBMITTED: August 5, 1994
DATE APPLICATION APPROVED: September 20, 1994
FUNDING: FIRST YEAR: \$949,176; SECOND YEAR: \$3,796,704 (estimate);
TECHNOLOGY: \$75,000.

I. PROCESS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE STATE PLAN

A Pre-Existing Reform Initiatives:

In response to A Nation at Risk, the state of Oregon developed an Action Plan for Excellence which was adopted in June 1984 following extensive conversations in communities statewide. The Essential Learning Skills and Common Curriculum Goals were developed soon after and articulated basic skill expectations for students and local schools. In 1987 the Oregon State Legislature enacted the School Improvement and Professional Development Act to develop lighthouse schools throughout the state that would be engaged in innovation while creating their own solutions to educational problems. The simultaneous "top down and bottom up" character of this program is a successful example of how state and school sites can work in concert to bring about school improvement and fundamental change. Since 1987 approximately half of the schools in Oregon have participated in this program of local school site innovation. In 1989 the Oregon State Legislature enacted the 21st Century Schools Program permitting waivers of statutes, rules and contracts that inhibit progress toward school improvement. With the approval of the local teachers' bargaining unit and the local school board, a school may undertake programs restructuring school operations and professional relationships. The school improvement plan developed by the local school council, is then reviewed by the 21st Century Schools Advisory Committee and recommended to the State Board of Education. Waivers are subject to annual review and progress toward intended goals is assessed. In 1991 the Oregon Educational Act for the 21st Century greatly expanded the use of waivers giving schools the support mechanism necessary for creating system-wide change that clearly responds to local need. In June 1991 the Oregon Legislative Assembly, by an overwhelming vote and following extensive public hearings, enacted the Oregon Educational Act for the 21st Century. This Act requires nothing less than the transformation of the entire educational system and serves as the keystone for the legislative framework that supports the Oregon State Plan for systemic school improvement. Also in 1991 the Oregon Progress Board published the Oregon Benchmarks, the work of six steering committees and thousands of Oregon citizens that established a 20-year strategic vision for Oregon. This vision includes the integration of economic development with education reform. Enactment of the Workforce Quality Act in 1991, a companion to the Oregon Educational Act for the 21st Century, established the Workforce Quality Council in fifteen regions. In 1993 the Workforce 2000 Act provided funding and required agencies to administer workforce, education and training resources through a coordinated strategy. To translate the blueprint of the Oregon Educational Act

for the 21st Century into a state plan of equally compelling implementation strategies, the State Board of Education and the Superintendent of Public Instruction launched an eighteen month statewide planning effort involving citizens, parents, students, education professionals and members of the business and social service communities. The resulting representative Task Forces made recommendations on implementing key elements of reform in the following areas: Certificate of Initial Mastery, Certificate of Advanced Mastery, Site-Based Decision Making, Non-Graded Primary Education, Middle Level Education, Alternative Learning Environments, School Choice, Integration of Social Services, Extended School Day/Year, and Employment of Minors. Following the broad-based Task Force process, Oregon "brought to scale" the systemic vision of the Oregon Educational Act as implementation plans and accompanying state policies were developed. Building on earlier work on the Common Curriculum Goals developed in response to the Oregon Plan for Excellence, high content and performance standards are in the process of development and will serve as the foundation of the Certificates of Initial and Advanced Mastery. A companion statewide performance based assessment system with models and demonstration sites is also in the process of design and implementation.

B Formation of the State Planning Panel and Development of the Plan:

The 21st Century Schools Advisory Committee is an ongoing committee, established in 1991, to oversee the entire Oregon school improvement effort. The Committee has been designated to serve as the Oregon Goals 2000 State Panel. Members of this group represent a variety of constituencies from across Oregon including: elementary and secondary teachers, individuals with disabilities, students, parents, administrators, school board members, community colleges, universities, preservice training programs, school-to-work programs, unions, business and industry, and community services. Members serve two year terms and may be reappointed. They represent all geographic regions of Oregon and various ethnicities. The processes and membership of the 21st Century Schools Advisory Committee are being further reviewed to assure compatibility with Goals 2000 guidelines and to evaluate representation of constituencies and collaboration with state agencies and organizations. The activities of the 21st Century Schools Advisory Committee are coordinated by the Oregon Department of Education, Office of the Assistant Superintendent for 21st Century Schools. This office also coordinates all school improvement efforts statewide as well as the design and development activities required to implement the State plan. The Committee reports to the State Board and the Superintendent of Public Instruction, which direct all public education efforts and communicate with other state agencies, the Governor, Legislature and public. In addition to the annual review processes mandated by state law, Oregon's Goals 2000 first year application, approved September 30, 1994, initiated an on-going system review in order to: assess the current status of the development and implementation of the State Plan; determine the areas needing improvement to support the further development and implementation of the State Plan at the local district and classroom level; and align the State Plan and state standards with the National Goals. On October 20, 1994, the first step was taken in the design of this system review process with a meeting of various constituency groups at the Oregon Department of Education. Representatives of parent groups, children with special needs, technology, ethnic diversity, and the Oregon Goals 2000 State Panel reviewed Oregon's Goals 2000 first year application and subgrant process

and made recommendations for outreach activities and community involvement that will provide the foundation for the system review and ensure continued participation in Oregon's State Plan.

Milestones and activities:

August 1991	21st Century Schools Advisory Committee appointed (Goals 2000 State Panel)
December 1991	Rules adopted for early childhood programs
July 1992	Development of public school choice programs; Common Curriculum Goals (CCG) and Essential Learning Skills (ELS) reviewed as curriculum frameworks developed
September 1992	One school council established in each district with more than one building
January 1993	Task Force reports and plans for implementation submitted to State Legislature
September 1994	All school districts have at least one school site with a 21st Century School Council for participatory decision making
October 31, 1994	Oregon's state improvement plan is submitted to the Secretary for approval
December 16, 1994	Oregon submits application to become an educational flexibility partnership demonstration state.
December 1994 - January 1995	Oregon Peer Review of plan and approval
February 15, 1995	USED Secretary approves Oregon's plan as a pre-existing state plan
February 20, 1995	USED Secretary announces Oregon as the first educational flexibility partnership state
September 1995	Every school site has a 21st Century Council

C Learning Technologies Plan Development and Integration with Goals 2000 State Reform Plan:

The challenge of implementing Oregon's statewide improvement plan led State Superintendent Norma Paulus to commission a review of rapidly changing technology and the preparation of a plan to address current and future needs. From interviews with ODE and district personnel, this study - *The Role of Technology: A Plan to Support ODE and 21st Century Schools* released in February 1992 - identified a series of recommendations addressing: data collection and reporting standards, technology standards, the replacement and upgrading of hardware and software, a statewide electronic communication system, an ODE management information system, leadership training and staff development, and funding. Overall, a fundamental realization was the need to merge developing administrative and instructional technology systems. During this same period, a collaborative of special interest technology cluster groups has emerged representing local, state and federal governments, private industry, and citizen/community groups. Representatives of these technology cluster groups now form a statewide Core Group for Telecommunications Planning and include the following cluster groups: Education, Rural and Public Access, Health Care/Human Services, Business/Economic Development, Library Services Government, and Infrastructure/New Technologies. This collaborative is similarly represented at the state level by members of the Governor's appointed Telecommunications Roundtable. In addition to these groups, the 21st Century Schools Advisory Committee, a statewide representative body established in 1991 by the Oregon Educational Act for the 21st Century, has, as its legislated charge, oversight of the implementation of school improvement statewide. This includes the integration of technology with curriculum, instruction and assessment into all levels of the performance based learning system. Grass roots efforts in concert with facilitation by ODE staff have been most effective in the initial steps of linking local educational agencies with one another. The resulting Oregon Public Education Network (OPEN) connects local schools and community colleges to Internet. OPEN capitalizes on the existing technology capacities of 18 local Education Service District Regions which provide the needed network for user access to the Internet. An aggressively expanding group, OPEN users have merged administrative and instructional technologies, providing technical assistance through three loosely organized groups concerned with policy, connectivity, and instructional practice. The participation of schools and districts in the development and implementation of a statewide technology system requires that local districts develop a technology plan that meets the highest possible level of interoperability or systems compatibility and open systems design. The Oregon Department of Education currently facilitates the Oregon Educational Computer Consortium (OECC), supporting group purchases and identifying standards for administrative and instructional technologies. In addition, content area specialists throughout the Department offer programs and resources on the integration of technology into instructional practices that will enhance student performance.

Timeline and activities:

August 30, 1994

21st Century Schools Advisory Committee

	(State Panel) expanded to include technology representative, appointment approved and meeting schedule determined
by September 9, 1994	A Technology Task Force is formed to act in advisory capacity to the State Panel; 2 members of the Technology Task Force will attend State Panel meetings and provide link to technology groups
September 16, 1994	Oregon Goals 2000 Subgrant process including a technology component is finalized and applications sent to all LEAs
September 15, 1994 - July 1, 1995	Process for the design of a technology plan finalized, timelines established and activities implemented
September 30, 1994	Oregon Statewide Technology Plan is approved for Goals 2000 funding
October 31, 1994	Oregon's state improvement plan is submitted to the Secretary for approval with a component included for technology plan development
July 1, 1995	Statewide technology plan finalized

II. DESCRIPTION OF THE SUBGRANT PROGRAM

A Process for Making Subgrants for LEA Improvement Plans:

The first year of the Oregon Goals 2000 Subgrant program supports local districts in their efforts to develop and implement the comprehensive school improvement plans required under the Oregon Educational Act for the 21st Century. The Certificate of Initial Mastery Plan submitted by all school districts to the Oregon Department of Education on January 1, 1995, is the local school improvement plan that provides the foundation for the Oregon Goals 2000 Subgrant Application. Specifically, these funds will support action-research projects in which educators working at the classroom level focus on high content and performance standards and strategies to provide all students with the opportunity to meet them. Projects must include professional development activities for participating teachers, administrators and preservice educators. In cooperation with public and private institutions of higher education, local school districts or consortia of local districts may apply for Oregon Goals 2000 subgrants. Applicants are encouraged to build upon existing partnerships that may also include one or more of the following: Educational Service Districts (ESDs), regional Workforce Quality Committees, public and private non-profit

organizations, education associations, other state government agencies, business and industry, or parent and community groups. Each local school district, institution of higher education or other partner is eligible to participate in more than one subgrant. The local school district will serve as the fiscal agent on behalf of one or more schools serving children in kindergarten through grade 12. An ESD may serve as the fiscal agent for a rural district or a consortia of local districts. A total of \$569,505 of Oregon's first year Goals 2000 funds (FY 94) has been allocated for subgrant awards. Awards may range in amount from \$39,400 - \$50,000 each. A total of 12 grants have been awarded. The funding period for this program is 17 months, from January 31, 1995, through June 30, 1996.

Timeline and activities:

September 19, 1994	Applications sent to all school districts
October 3-28, 1994	Technical assistance offered
December 16, 1994	Applications due at the Department of Education
January 26, 1995	Subgrant awards announced
January 31, 1995	Subgrant funds distributed to recipients
September 30, 1995	Mid-term progress report due
June 30, 1996	Funding cycle ends. Final progress report due within 30 days.

B Process for Making Subgrants for Improvements in Preservice Education

Programs:

See "A" above.

C Process for Making Subgrants for Continuing Professional Development:

See "A" above.

III. GOALS 2000 1994-95 PROPOSED ALLOCATIONS

A	Subgrants	<u>\$569,505</u>
	1. LEA Improvement Plan	
	2. Preservice Teacher Education	
	3. Professional Development	
B	State Plan Development	<u>\$379,671</u>

C	Technology Plan Development	<u>\$75,000</u>
D	Total Title III Allocation	<u>\$949,176</u>
E	Total Goals 2000/Technology Allocation	<u>\$1,024,176</u>

GOALS 2000: EDUCATE AMERICA ACT

STATE PROFILE

STATE: Pennsylvania
DATE APPLICATION SUBMITTED: June 24, 1994
DATE APPLICATION APPROVED: July 25, 1994
FUNDING: FIRST YEAR: \$3,822,147; SECOND YEAR: \$15,288,588 (estimate);
TECHNOLOGY: \$151,258.

I. PROCESS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE STATE PLAN

A Pre-Existing Reform Initiatives:

Pennsylvania has developed a systematic school reform process to help all students meet challenging standards. The basic elements of this reform process are regulatory review and strategic planning. Regulatory review enables a locally-based school reform process through a series of new regulations currently being implemented. The new regulations require both an LEA and SEA process for developing and adopting teaching and learning standards, assessment, and the integration of vocational-technical education. The elements of the reform process, regulatory review, strategic planning, and related activities will be integrated into the Goals 2000 framework.

Pennsylvania's system of school governance, accountability, and management is largely decentralized providing both authority and flexibility for LEAs. Substantial authority is provided to local elected and appointed officials as opposed to those at the state level resulting in a stronger locally developed system for reform. This approach establishes local ownership of reform, a hallmark of school reform in Pennsylvania.

Over a period of six years the Strategic Planning Process will plan and implement the integration of all school programs. LEAs in Phase I of strategic planning have been planning in the school year 1993-94 and must submit a plan by September 1994. Those in Phase II and III must submit a plan in September of 1995 and 1996 respectively. An in-progress review is scheduled for each LEA in the third year.

B Formation of the State Planning Panel and Development of the Plan:

The State Improvement Plan Panel (SIPP) will be appointed by the Governor and the Secretary of Education during the first year and will be determined by the Governor to be broadly representative. An expanded Pennsylvania 2000 Board will serve as the SIPP. The Pennsylvania 2000 Board currently consists of representatives of business, political, education, community, and other diverse groups. The primary factor in developing the State Improvement Plan will be to build on the Strategic Planning Process already underway. The process is largely a decentralized one given the nature of the system of governance in Pennsylvania and the vital need for local ownership of reform. A major LEA planning effort is underway in Pennsylvania and the state plan which enabled that process is codified in regulation and implemented through the Pennsylvania Strategic Planning Process. The Pennsylvania Department of Education will provide the administrative, logistical, and staff support to the SIPP. The panel will develop a State Improvement Plan, provide opportunity for public comment and submit the State plan to

the State educational agency for approval. After approval of the State plan by the Secretary, the panel, in close consultation with teachers, principals, administrators, school boards, advocacy groups, advocates of children with disabilities, and parents in local educational agencies and schools receiving funds under this title, will monitor the implementation and effectiveness of the State plan.

Milestones and Activities:

September 1994

Initial Meeting of the State
Improvement Plan Panel (SIPP)

August 31, 1995

Draft Statement of the State
Improvement Plan

C Learning Technologies Plan Development and Integration with Goals 2000 State Reform Plan:

Several successful statewide initiatives have been undertaken in the past, such as, the ACCESS PA automated library system, the Penn Link statewide communications network, and the Teleteaching distance learning project. Building on this success, the State Improvement Plan Panel, in coordination with the Technology Task Force, will develop a plan for systemic approach to technology in education. Many members of the State Technology Task Force will also be members of the State Improvement Plan Panel to assure thorough coordination. Members of the Technology Task Force will be selected from among the recommendations of technology business interests, librarians, distance learning experts, and chiefs of existing technology programs, such as Penn Link.

II. DESCRIPTION OF THE SUBGRANT PROGRAM

A Process for Making Subgrants for LEA Improvement Plans:

The Pennsylvania 2000 reform effort led to the emphasis on LEA strategic planning and the implementation of a Strategic Planning Process for reform in three phases. In Phase I, about one third of LEAs have developed strategic plans. In Phases II and III the remaining LEAs will develop their strategic plans. This approach means that LEAs will be dealing with the planning of preservice and professional development issues both singly and in concert with local reform activities associated with their strategic plan. Therefore, the organization of the LEA subgrant process must have one program of competitive awards which may be made for all three subgrant areas: local reform, preservice education, and professional development. The Pennsylvania Department of Education currently plans to make subgrants for the following specific amounts: \$250,000; \$100,000; \$50,000; \$25,000; and \$10,000. LEA proposals will be subjected to a peer review process. The peer review panel will develop a recommended funding list and submit it to the Commissioner for Elementary and Secondary Education for approval. LEA proposals will be funded from this approved list until funds are exhausted.

- B Process for Making Subgrants for Improvements in Preservice Education Programs:**
See "A" above.
- C Process for Making Subgrants for Continuing Professional Development:**
See "A" above.

III. GOALS 2000 1994-95 PROPOSED ALLOCATIONS

A	Subgrants	<u>\$2,293,290</u>
	1. LEA Improvement	
	2. Preservice Education	
	3. Professional Development	
B	State Plan Development	<u>\$1,528,857</u>
	1. State Use Funds	\$1,375,972
	2. Program Administration	\$152,885
C	Technology Plan Development	<u>\$151,258</u>
D	Total Title III Allocation	<u>\$3,822,147</u>
E	Total Goals 2000/Technology Allocation	<u>\$3,973,405</u>

GOALS 2000: EDUCATE AMERICA ACT

STATE PROFILE

STATE: Rhode Island

DATE APPLICATION SUBMITTED: August 18, 1994

DATE APPLICATION APPROVED: September 1, 1994

FUNDING: FIRST YEAR: \$358,762; SECOND YEAR: \$1,435,048 (estimate);

TECHNOLOGY: \$75,000.

I. PROCESS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE STATE PLAN

A Pre-Existing Reform Initiatives:

The main themes of the Goals 2000 legislation have been addressed in all major reports on education developed in Rhode Island in the past several years. Two reports of significance were the work of two commissions established by executive orders of the Governor. The 21st Century Commission and the Skills Commission were charged with studying and reporting on several aspects of education in the state. The 21st Century Commission focused on the issues of equity, excellence and efficiency. The Commission's findings were outlined in the report *Educating Our Children*, March 1992. The report of the Skills Commission, *Rhode Island's Choice: High Skills or Low Wages - An Initiative to Act*, was produced in May 1992. The report focused on the necessity of high performance organizations and schools that give all students the required high level skills in order to create the productive improvement that is needed to improve living standards. As a result of these Commission reports and executive orders promulgated by the Governor, the Board of Regents for Elementary and Secondary Education formally adopted five major priority areas which formed the basis for a Departmental reorganization and established the fundamental philosophy of the Rhode Island education reform effort. The Board priorities are: 1) Statewide Learner Goals, Content Frameworks and Assessment; 2) School Improvement with Decentralization and Accountability; 3) Professional Development and Teacher Preparation; 4) Integrated Social Services; and 5) Equitable Financing of Schools. During this period of time, additional factors also affected the Rhode Island education landscape. Three school districts challenged the fairness of the current state educational funding formula in court. In response to the challenge, the Rhode Island Department of Education, at the direction of the Board of Regents, developed a comprehensive legislative package that incorporated the Regent's strategic agenda. As part of that legislative package, the section on equity of financing proposed a complete restructuring of the funding system for education. The legislation was entitled "The Education Reform Act of 1994: A Guaranteed Student Entitlement." The legislation was not passed but some interim gains were made. In addition to a healthy discussion of the issues, the state appropriated an additional \$49 million in state funding for education to be distributed among the poorest Rhode Island school districts.

B Formation of the State Planning Panel and Development of the Plan:

To begin the implementation of the Goals 2000 legislation, the Rhode Island Department of Education has convened a twenty-eight member Goals 2000 Internal Planning and

Internal Support Team. The members of this team represent the three program centers in the Department - Instruction, School Improvement and Special Services. This planning group has been charged with preparing the first year application, integrating Goals 2000 with existing Department initiatives, serving as a resource for Goals 2000 awareness activities, serving as staff support for the Goals 2000 state panel, and providing input on State Panel selection. This team has been meeting on a regular basis since June 1994. In addition, a stakeholders group that represented the state at the US Department of Education Goals 2000 Conference in late May 1994 has also been meeting on a regular basis. The team members represent the Governor's Office, business, labor, administrators, parents and higher education officials. This team has agreed to provide input to the State Panel selection, serve as the public involvement/support for the initial design work and the first application of funds, and serve as a catalyst to ensure broad public involvement in Goals 2000 with specific emphasis on developing strategies to increase support from the executive and legislative branches of government. The Internal Planning team and the stakeholders team, in consultation with the Governor's Office, will have input into the formation of the State Panel. The composition of the panel will meet the specifications of the legislation. The Governor and the Commissioner of Education will jointly appoint the members of the panel. They will also jointly select the panel's chairperson(s) and private school representative. Panel members will be selected from existing panels or advisory groups and/or professional organizations such as the 21st Century Commission, Skills Commission, School to Work Task Force, Superintendents Association, School Committee Association, and several other organizations. The Goals Panel was to be appointed in October 1994. However, in September, the governor was defeated in the primary election. With the election of a new governor in November, who would not assume office until January, the appointment of the Goals Panel was postponed. It is expected that the Goals panel will, at a minimum, meet on a bi-monthly basis to review the work of the plan development, monitor the work of subcommittees, confer with the state education agency on the local education agency subgrant process and ensure that the development of the Goals 2000 state improvement plan is aligned and supports the work of state initiated reform efforts currently underway. The work of the Panel will be supported by SEA staff (primarily the internal planning team) through professional and logistical help.

Milestones and activities:

June/July 1994

Internal Team convened and meets on a regular basis; Stakeholders Team meets on a regular basis with the Commissioner; Develop Request for Proposals (RFPs) for Goals 2000 Subgrant process; Develop the first year application for Goals 2000 funding; Complete analysis of Goals 2000 with existing reform reports

August/September 1994

Begin awareness sessions; Finalize Goals 2000 initial application and submit to USED; Begin deliberation on selection process for the State Panel in consultation with the Governor's Office; Commissioner

	and Department staff begin selection process for the Technology Task Force; Analysis of current technology efforts begins; Dissemination of RFPs for LEA subgrants and provide technical assistance sessions
October/November 1994	Receive and review subgrant submissions and make final selection for funding
December 1994 - January 1995	Forward grant awards to all subgrantees; initiate discussions with the Governor's policy staff and transition staff regarding panel appointments
February/March 1995	Finalize panel appointments in consultation with the Governor's Office
April/May 1995	Technology Task Force is appointed and holds initial meeting, reviews work plan and sets milestones; Goals Panel is appointed
June 1995	Convene State Panel for orientation session, goal setting process and public outreach plan; submit a status report on Rhode Island reform activities 2nd year funds
July/October 1995	Gather input on RI's education reform and Goals 2000 activities
November/December 1995	Solidify statewide vision on RI's comprehensive reform plan
January/February 1996	Prepare and distribute first draft of Goals/IASA plan for review and input to a wide range of stakeholders; begin public hearings on draft plans
March/April 1996	Consideration and incorporation of public comments to reflect broad-based consensus on plans; plans are finalized; Goals Panel and Governor sign off and approve Comprehensive Improvement Plan for Goals 2000/IASA

C Learning Technologies Plan Development and Integration with Goals 2000 State Reform Plan:

Rhode Island's efforts in the area of technology during the past five years have been varied and include: 1) Participation in the successful Massachusetts Corporation for Educational Telecommunications (MCET) Star Schools proposal which resulted in satellite receiving stations and programming for five middle school sites which are still being used; 2) Assisted in the acquisition of GMI instructional programming via satellite receiving dish for East Providence enabling the delivery of math and science instruction; 3) Funding and grants to Rhode Island districts: a) "Writing to Read" grant from the Riordan Foundation which provided networked classroom labs using IBM's *Writing to Read* software for 30+ classrooms in Rhode Island elementary grades, and b) Champlin Foundation grants providing computer or other technology to every district in Rhode Island for the past three years; and 4) The Rhode Island Department of Education established a telecommunications network connecting the Northern and East Bay Collaboratives to the national Chief State Science Supervisors' Network. In addition the Department works with the Cable Advisory Commission, the Department of State Library Services (DSLIS) which is sponsoring the Ocean State FreeNet, the Office of Higher Education Committee on Telecommunications and the Rhode Island Network Committee to coordinate telecommunications efforts within the state. The Rhode Island Network Committee has evolved from an informal group of the DSLIS, the Public Telecommunications Authority (Channel 36), the Rhode Island Department of Education, the University of Rhode Island, and Brown University to develop RINet. RINet provides toll free access points and account authentication for K-12 classrooms to connect to educational resources within the state such as higher education, libraries, museums, public television, other schools and the Internet. Rhode Island will form a Technology Task Force, appointed by the Commissioner of Education, that will include experts in the educational use of technology, members of the State Panel, and other stakeholders within the Rhode Island business, government, and educational communities. The Technology Task Force will be a subcommittee of the Goals 2000 State Panel. The Technology Task Force was appointed in April 1995. The meetings of the task force will be scheduled to align with those of the State Panel, to the degree feasible. The Technology Plan will recommend a plan of action to inform all Rhode Island Department of Education offices of the value of technology in regular and special needs instruction, assessment, preservice, inservice, and professional development activities to ensure that all federal and state monies awarded in these areas include opportunities to incorporate technology into the projects when possible. The Technology Plan will be integrated with and submitted as part of the State Improvement Plan. For milestones and activities see "B" above.

II. DESCRIPTION OF THE SUBGRANT PROGRAM

A Process for Making Subgrants for LEA Improvement Plans:

The Rhode Island Department of Education plans to distribute 60% (\$215,203) to LEAs in a competitive subgrant process as follows: 1) LEA Reform: \$105,000 (49% of total subgrant funds); 3 to 20 grants ranging from \$5,000 to \$30,000 will be awarded; 2) Professional Development: \$85,000 (39% of total subgrant funds); 7 to 10 grants ranging from \$8,000 to \$15,000 will be awarded; and 3) Preservice Education: \$25,257 (12% of total subgrant funds); one subgrant will be awarded. Applications will be reviewed by a broadly representative group of Department of Education staff, representing the offices of Instruction, Assessment, School Improvement, Professional Development, and Finance. Final decisions will be based on ranking, availability of funds, and legislative requirements. The professional development and preservice applications will be reviewed by a peer review panel appointed by the Commissioner. There will be representation from teachers/practitioners, public and private institutions of higher education, superintendents, principals, professional organizations, state associations of AFT (American Federation of Teachers) and Department staff.

Milestones and activities:

September 1994

Letter from Department sent to all Superintendents, Principals, Deans of Education, and Presidents of professional organizations which describes the subgrant process.

November 1994

Distribution of subgrant application with guidelines describing all the opportunities and requirements in the areas of LEA reform, professional development, and preservice education; Applications due to RI Department of Education

December 1994

Award date for all subgrants

B Process for Making Subgrants for Improvements in Preservice Education Programs:

See "A" above.

C Process for Making Subgrants for Continuing Professional Development:

See "A" above.

III. GOALS 2000 1994-95 PROPOSED ALLOCATIONS

A	Subgrants	<u>\$215,203*</u>
1.	LEA Improvement	\$105,000
2.	Preservice Teacher Education	\$25,257
3.	Professional Development	\$85,000
B	State Plan Development	<u>\$143,469</u>
1.	Supporting the Goals Panel	\$33,000
2.	Development and Refinement of Major Reform Components	\$71,969
3.	SEA Administration Costs	\$38,500
C	Technology Plan Development	<u>\$75,000</u>
D	Total Title III Allocation	<u>\$358,672</u>
E	Total Goals 2000/Technology Allocation	<u>\$433,762</u>

*The RI Department of Education supplemented the Goals allocation in the categories of LEA reform, \$77,243, and Professional Development, \$81,903. Projects were also funded with state funds in two additional categories as described in the first year plan: Mentor Programs for Beginning Teachers, \$68,961, and Performance Assessment for Beginning Teachers, \$29,708.

GOALS 2000: EDUCATE AMERICA ACT

STATE PROFILE

STATE: South Carolina
DATE APPLICATION SUBMITTED: January 20, 1995
DATE APPLICATION APPROVED: January 27, 1995
FUNDING: FIRST YEAR: \$1,171,896; SECOND YEAR: \$4,687,584 (estimate);
TECHNOLOGY: \$75,000.

I. PROCESS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE STATE PLAN

A Pre-Existing Reform Initiatives:

South Carolina's first report on progress toward the national goals - Reaching for Higher Standards 1991 - suggested several possible data trends which indicated the need for a comprehensive, systemic plan to improve student performance. On January 21, 1994, Governor Carroll A. Campbell, Jr. created the South Carolina Education Goals Panel to establish state goals within the framework of the national education goals and to develop state strategies for their achievement. The ten member panel, consisting of representatives from the business community, higher education, the legislature and state agencies, was charged with reviewing, monitoring, and reporting on South Carolina's progress toward the goals, establishing state goals that reflect state-specific priorities, identifying policy changes required to meet the goals, and developing a coordinated plan to effect those changes. Other initiatives have also placed South Carolina squarely in the forefront in the race to meet the national goals. Key legislation, including the Early Childhood Development and Academic Assistance Act and the School-to-Work Transition Act, have focused the state's attention on improving the quality of education for all children. Development of curriculum frameworks in all the disciplines and implementation of the Statewide Systemic Initiative in mathematics and science have made South Carolina a leader among the 50 states in comprehensive, system-wide educational improvement. In 1993 the South Carolina General Assembly enacted Proviso 33, directing the Department of Education to prepare by January 1995 a statewide plan to meet the national goals. The proviso called on the report to include, among other elements: a review of the Education Finance Act and a Defined Maximum Program; a review of the Education Improvement Act and Target 2000; identification of resources and reallocation of funds and revenue to meet the national education goals; accountability measures for state agencies, local school districts, and local communities; a system to connect funding costs with school performance effectiveness; a system to coordinate interagency funds to support health, social, and education services to children and families; and a system to coordinate funds with technical colleges and higher education to support lifelong learning. As development of the Department's plan was underway, the U.S. Congress approved the Goals 2000 legislation.

B Formation of the State Planning Panel and Development of the Plan:

In August 1994 Governor Campbell and the State Superintendent of Education expanded the South Carolina Education Goals Panel to include a broad-based panel of education

stakeholders, including parents, business leaders, civic leaders, teachers, administrators, representatives from state agencies, representatives from higher education, and many other groups, and to ensure that South Carolina's plan to meet the national goals represents the broad-based consensus of the many partners involved in the delivery of quality education, as required by Goals 2000 and the South Carolina General Assembly. The South Carolina Education Goals Panel met on six occasions from September through December of 1994 to produce the recommendations in their report entitled, *Putting Children and Families First: South Carolina's Plan to Reach the National Education Goals*. They began their work with the following tasks in addition to those established under Proviso 33 and Goals 2000: to identify additional objectives for each national goal which may be unique to South Carolina; to set benchmarks for each year from now until the year 2000 and beyond for expected progress toward the goals; to conduct a comprehensive review and evaluation of existing education reform recommendations; to highlight actions and strategies to help achieve the national goals; and to support and publicize the plan throughout South Carolina. The Goals Panel developed a number of strategies to support South Carolina - specific objectives under each of the national goals. While the strategies are detailed and specific to particular objectives, they share several common characteristics: 1) In the belief that all efforts must be interconnected and coherent to produce effective results, the strategies listed involve all agencies and offices of government, all education organizations, community organizations, and the private sector, forming a systemic approach to coordinating interagency funds to support health, social, and education services to children and families; 2) The strategies require new coordination of effort among all agencies of state government that serve children and families in ways that improve support, focus on results, and maximize resources; 3) The strategies assign specific accountability for each objective and strategy to a lead organization, whether at the state or school district and community level or within the private sector; and 4) The strategies reverse the tradition of state mandates with no clear responsibility, focusing instead on local decision-making and local accountability. The South Carolina Business Education Partnership for Excellence in Education is a crucial partner in South Carolina's attainment of Educational Excellence for ALL students in the state. The South Carolina Education Goals Panel, Governor's Office, and the State Superintendent of Education have invited the Partnership members to join them in co-hosting public meetings in six regions of the state for the purpose of sharing *Putting Children and Families First: South Carolina's Plan to Reach the National Education Goals*. The regional meetings will take place during February of 1995 and will focus on awareness and orientation to the National Education Goals and Objectives, South Carolina specific objectives, and indicators of progress and will solicit feedback from attendees concerning the plan. As the strategies and indicators of progress are refined following the public awareness sessions, the Goals Panel and Partnership will continue to work together to further publicize legislative proposals, governance proposals, funding structure, and accountability proposals which will result from the Goals Panel's report.

Milestones and Activities:

January 1995

Putting Children and Families First: South Carolina's State Plan to reach the National Education Goals distributed.

February 1995

Public Outreach Meetings to review State Plan.

March 1995	South Carolina Education Technology Plan distributed statewide for review; Goals Panel convenes to review results of public outreach meetings; begin awarding subgrants to LEAs with approved District Strategic Plans and School Renewal Plans.
April 1995	Public Awareness sessions held regionally and via telecommunications to solicit review and input of South Carolina Technology Plan; Educational associations and community organizations begin regional delivery of professional development for School Renewal Planning and District Strategic Planning teams on the planning process and the use of quality indicators.
May 1995	State Goals Panel ad hoc committee meets with representatives from the Technology Initiatives Committee to revise the State Plan to include clear technology integration.
October 1995	Complete awarding of subgrants to LEAs with approved District Strategic Plans and School Renewal Plans; Revised State Plan submitted for implementation grant approval to USED.

C Learning Technologies Plan Development and Integration with Goals 2000 State Reform Plan:

Technology planning funds will be used to integrate the South Carolina Educational Technology Plan with the *Putting Children and Families First: South Carolina's Plan to Reach the National Education Goals*. The state technology plan was released in draft form on January 18, 1995, and is now ready for extensive public review. Public review and input into the plan will be held in the thirteen regional HUBS for the purpose of awareness and refinement of the plan prior to South Carolina's submitting a comprehensive implementation plan to reach the national education goals. The remaining technology planning funds will be used to support local and district integration of a technology component into their School Renewal Plans and District Strategic Plans. Technical assistance in the form of teleconferences and regional conferences for educational technology planning will comprise the majority of the activities under the technology planning component of South Carolina's Goals 2000 grant.

II. DESCRIPTION OF THE SUBGRANT PROGRAM

A Process for Making Subgrants for LEA Improvement Plans:

With the enactment of the Early Childhood Development and Academic Assistance Act

(Act 135) in 1993, South Carolina put in place a process of School Renewal Planning that aligns with the aims of Goals 2000: Educate America. Each school and district in the state is completing a strategic plan to describe the local education agency's five year plan for systemically focusing the resources of the school and district on meeting the needs of all students in their care. As districts and schools submit their plan for approval, an extensive peer review process takes place. The Peer Review team follows a planning checklist to develop a set of questions to be used during an on-site visit. The State Department of Education proposes to award Local Education Agency planning and professional development subgrants to all schools and districts with approved School Renewal Plans. The subgrants are designed to accomplish two purposes. Each school and district School Renewal Plan will be reviewed and aligned with Putting Children and Families First: South Carolina's Plan to Reach the National Education Goals and will place emphasis on how each school and district's professional development and technology components make the achievement of the goals in the School Renewal Plan possible. Schools and districts may use a portion of the subgrant to begin implementation of the professional development component of their Renewal or Strategic Plan. It is anticipated that second year implementation grants will be awarded upon approval of the revised School Renewal Plan. Awards will be made of \$20,000 - \$40,000 to districts with completed District Strategic plans and School Renewal Plans for the purposes outlined in the section of this proposal on LEA subgrants. Sufficient funds are available to award approximately 35 subgrants.

B Process for Making Subgrants for Improvements in Preservice Education Programs:

See "A" above.

C Process for Making Subgrants for Continuing Professional Development:

See "A" above.

III. GOALS 2000 1994-95 PROPOSED ALLOCATIONS

A	Subgrants	<u>\$703,137</u>
	1. Systemic Planning	
	2. Technology Planning	
	3. Professional Development	
B	State Plan Development	<u>\$468,759</u>
	1. Public Outreach	\$68,759
	2. Performance Standards completion	\$100,000
	3. Technical Assistance through Professional Association Partnerships	\$150,000
	4. Preservice Education Standards Revision	\$100,000
	5. Activities of State Goals Panel and Administration of Subgrants	\$50,000

C	Technology Plan Development	<u>\$75,000</u>
	1. Public review of State Technology Plan	\$25,000
	2. Integration of State Technology Plan and Putting Children and Families First	\$5,000
	3. +Technical Assistance for LEA Technology Planning	\$45,000
D	Total Title III Allocation	<u>\$1,171,896</u>
E	Total Goals 2000/Technology Allocation	<u>\$1,246,896</u>

GOALS 2000: EDUCATE AMERICA ACT

STATE PROFILE

STATE: Tennessee
DATE APPLICATION SUBMITTED: August 5, 1994
DATE APPLICATION APPROVED: September 7, 1994
FUNDING: FIRST YEAR: \$1,565,414; SECOND YEAR: \$6,261,656 (estimate);
TECHNOLOGY: \$75,000.

I. PROCESS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE STATE PLAN

A Pre-Existing Reform Initiatives:

In 1992 the Tennessee General Assembly enacted and funded the 21st Century Schools Program. The education reforms were a response to the President's Education Summit in 1989 and represented an effort to address in comprehensive terms the issues of standards, management, accountability and equalized funding. The 21st Century Schools legislative proposal was drafted and introduced by Governor Ned McWherter after the Governor and his Cabinet conducted more than 500 public meetings across Tennessee. A consistent theme of flexibility and local control was expressed in the public hearings and subsequently reflected in the 21st Century Schools reforms. The repeal of more than 3700 state rules and regulations has unleashed creative new programs in dozens of schools that are beginning to explore the opportunities of site-based management. This creativity has been enhanced by the ability of local school boards to exercise almost total discretion over the allocation of state education funds. The freedom to establish local funding priorities has been made more meaningful by a record 49% increase in state funding over the last three budgets. In essence, Tennessee has fashioned an historic contract between the education community and the people of Tennessee: Adequate resources and more flexibility in return for higher standards and greater accountability. The implementation of broad policy changes in the 21st Century Schools program has been accompanied by an equally important commitment to modernize the resources of Tennessee classrooms. In the program's first two years more than 4200 "21st Century Classrooms" have been equipped with state-of-the-art technology.

B Formation of the State Planning Panel and Development of the Plan:

The Governor and the Commissioner of Education will appoint a 21st Century Schools Panel in accordance with Section 306. The Panel will represent educators, business leaders, policy makers and parents who have been active in the development and implementation of Tennessee's 21st Century Schools program. Because Tennessee already has completed an extensive process of public input and planning for comprehensive education reform, it would not be the Panel's purpose to reexamine the value judgments and policy decisions contained in the 1992, 21st Century Schools legislation. The Panel will focus its energies on strategies to incorporate the aims of Goals 2000 into the implementation of the 21st Century Schools program. Among the items appropriate to this effort will be an assessment of opportunity-to-learn standards, a meaningful correlation of the performance goals contained in Goals 2000 and the 21st Century Schools program, and

the development of a communications network for disseminating information among schools seeking to implement reforms.

C Learning Technologies Plan Development and Integration with Goals 2000 State Reform Plan:

The Governor and the Commissioner of Education will appoint a Technology Advisory Committee to develop strategies to improve student learning through the use of technology. The Advisory Committee will include technology coordinators from local school systems and higher education, members of the State Board of Education Technology Advisory Council and representatives from the 21st Century Schools Panel. The Committee's composition and objectives will be consistent with the requirements of Section 317(c) and will be integrated into the state improvement plan as noted in Section 306. The Committee's recommendations will be submitted to the State Board of Education for inclusion in the Board's Technology Plan.

II. DESCRIPTION OF THE SUBGRANT PROGRAM

A Process for Making Subgrants for LEA Improvement Plans:

The Department of Education will make grants available to local school systems on a competitive basis. In an effort to maximize the impact of the Goals 2000 funds, at least 90% of the available funds will be earmarked for distribution to local systems. The Department will extend preference to those systems that have established the management reforms required by 1996 in the 21st Century Schools legislation. These management reforms include the existence of an appointed superintendent of schools selected by a popularly elected school board. Approximately one-half of Tennessee's 139 systems currently meet this criteria. The grants will be awarded on the basis of a system's response to one or both of two criteria:

1) An effort to develop innovative approaches to learning that take advantage of the flexibility offered by the 21st Century Schools program. Each proposal will be designed specifically to address one or more goals in Goals 2000 or the 21st Century Schools programs. Special consideration will be given to systems that propose a plan for expanding school based decision making.

2) An effort to enhance the professional development of teachers by seeking innovative ways to incorporate the technology provided by the 21st Century Schools program. Special consideration will be given to those systems that seek a collaborative project with teacher training institutions of higher education. The focus of staff development proposals will be an improvement of K-12 student achievement. The proposals shall include, but not be limited to, progress indicators for math and language arts.

The Commissioner of Education will make final decisions regarding grant awards in accordance with the requirements of Section 309 (a) and (b). Upon approval of Tennessee's Goals 2000 Year One application by USED, Requests for Proposals will be sent to each of the 139 local school systems. Awards will be announced within 30 days of the RFP deadline.

B Process for Making Subgrants for Improvements in Preservice Education Programs:

Grant proposals submitted for the purpose of improving preservice teacher education will be evaluated by a peer review panel consisting of a program management team from the Department of Education, and respective members from the state Teachers, Principals, Supervisors and Superintendents study councils. Recommendations from this peer review panel will be submitted to the Commissioner of Education for final approval.

C Process for Making Subgrants for Continuing Professional Development:
See "A" above.

III. GOALS 2000 1994-95 PROPOSED ALLOCATIONS

A	Subgrants	<u>\$1,408,857</u>
1.	LEA Reform	
2.	Preservice Teacher Education	
3.	Professional Development	

B	State Plan Development	<u>\$176,557*</u>
1.	Goals 2000 Panel	\$97,029
2.	Goals 2000 Plan Development	\$57,028
3.	LEA Grant Administration	\$10,000
4.	LEA Grant Evaluation	\$12,500

*Includes: Goals 2000 Title III: \$156,557 and State Contribution: \$20,000.

C	Technology Plan Development	<u>\$75,000</u>
----------	------------------------------------	------------------------

D	Total Title III Allocation	<u>\$1,565,414</u>
----------	-----------------------------------	---------------------------

E	Total Goals 2000/Technology Allocation	<u>\$1,640,414</u>
----------	---	---------------------------

GOALS 2000: EDUCATE AMERICA ACT

STATE PROFILE

STATE: Texas
DATE APPLICATION SUBMITTED: September 16, 1994
DATE APPLICATION APPROVED: November 7, 1994
FUNDING: FIRST YEAR: \$6,841,850; SECOND YEAR: \$27,367,400 (estimate);
TECHNOLOGY: \$270,760

I. PROCESS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE STATE PLAN

A Pre-Existing Reform Initiatives:

The state panel will develop the improvement plan on the basis of education improvement activities established by the Texas State Board of Education, the Texas Education Agency, and the Governor's Office. These initiatives include: 1) The State Board of Education Long-Range Plan for Public Education: The board has established long-range goals for Texas public education since 1986 and is currently updating the state's education goals and developing results for public education for the years 1995-99; 2) Texas Tomorrow: The Governor's Office has developed a strategic plan for Texas state government. The plan includes performance measures for elementary, secondary, and post-secondary education covering school readiness; school completion; passing rates on the state assessments; literacy rates; teacher salaries; education funding; and participation in post-secondary education; 3) State Board of Education Policy Initiatives: The State Board of Education has established policies for professional development; early childhood/elementary, middle and high school education; and education for students with disabilities. These policies state best practices rather than mandates, and establish broad goals for education, educator preparation, and family and community support; 4) Raising Expectations to Meet Real-World Needs: The State Board of Education appointed the State Panel on Student Skills and Knowledge to direct an extensive grass roots effort to determine what Texas high school students should know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school. This initiative was carried out through more than 1,034 Real-World Forums attended by more than 25,000 Texans across the state. The essential skills and knowledge articulated through these forums will become an important part of the development of content and student performance standards; 5) The Long-Range Plan for Educational Technology, 1988-2000: The State Board of Education first adopted a Long-Range Plan for Technology in 1988. Planning elements address statewide initiatives in telecommunications, instructional materials, and professional development, local funding, research and development and dissemination of instructional technologies and model programs; and 6) State-Wide Professional Development Networks: The Texas Education Agency and teacher training institutions have established a number of collaborative grass roots educator preparation and professional development initiatives, involving campuses and school districts, regional education service centers, teacher training institutions, and community institutions.

B Formation of the State Planning Panel and Development of the Plan:

The panel will be appointed jointly by the Governor and the Commissioner of Education, in consultation with the State Board of Education. The panel will first meet in early 1995 and will hold its last meeting to approve the state education improvement plan by November 1995. The panel will develop the plan through a series of meetings, public hearings, and interactive conferences. Panel meetings will focus on the current status of public education in Texas, specific issues and elements to be included in the plan, and the overall development of the Texas Goals 2000 plan. Public hearings will consist of public and invited testimony. One- and two-way teleconferencing, produced through T-STAR, the Texas School Telecommunications Access Resource, will provide the panel greater access to public and professional opinion. In addition to the meetings, hearings and teleconferences, outreach activities of the panel will include: a Texas Goals 2000 bulletin board on TENET, the electronic Texas Education Network, to inform educators and the public on the development of the state improvement plan and to solicit public input; presentations on the state educational telecommunications network; participation in professional conferences of educators, community and business leaders, and social service professionals; and contributing to state professional association magazines and newsletters. The state education improvement plan will be approved by the Commissioner of Education and State Board of Education prior to submission to the Secretary of Education.

Milestones and activities:

September 1994

State Board of Education Approves Texas Goals 2000 participation; First Year Application Submitted; Benchmark data available from Integrated Accountability System

September 1994 -

Begin revision of state curriculum frameworks and development of content standards in English language arts, mathematics, social studies, health, fine arts, foreign languages, and career technology education

January 1995

Issue Goals 2000 Subgrant Application

February 1995

Establishment of Texas Goals 2000 TENET bulletin board

March 1995

Governor, Commissioner of Education appoint state panel; State Board of Education approves panel membership; first meeting of the panel; begin development of work series; Subgrant applications reviewed

April 1995

Subgrants awarded to collaborative

partnerships

September 1995

1995 data available from Integrated Accountability System

November 1995

Final meeting of the panel

January 1996

Commissioner's review and recommendation of the plan

February 1996

State Board of Education review and recommendation of the plan; Transmittal to USED

C Learning Technologies Plan Development and Integration with Goals 2000 State Reform Plan:

The Goals 2000 technology initiative will build on the Texas Long-Range Plan for Educational Technology, 1988-2000, adopted by the State Board of Education in 1988. Initiatives in that plan include: 1) Technology Equipment Allotment - A state-funded technology allotment, based on district average daily student attendance, was called for in the plan and established by the Texas Legislature in 1991. The purpose of the allotment is to provide all students and educators with access to information resources, computer-based learning tools, and emerging educational technologies. The allotment was initiated at \$30 per student in the 1992-93 school year; 2) Texas Education Network (TENET) - TENET provides telecommunications services to public educators through an information network that includes on-line library catalogs, public databases, instructional multimedia libraries, and access to the Internet. TENET allows for the exchange of administrative, instructional, and curricular information between system users. More than 28,000 users in 98 percent of the state's school districts have accounts on the TENET system; 3) Texas School Communications Access Resource (T-STAR) - T-STAR, an integrated telecommunications system, is a statewide network which provides one-way video and two-way audio communication services for school districts, regional education service centers, and the Texas Education Agency. By 1995 the T-STAR studio will have the capacity to broadcast six hours of professional development programming per week. T-STAR sites are established in approximately half of all school districts in the state. Districts without current access will have T-STAR equipment installed by the end of the 1994-95 school year; and 4) Texas Center for Educational Technology - The Texas Center for Educational Technology is a university-based research center with the mission of promoting partnerships between the information and technology industries and educators, in order to better integrate technology into the public schools and to provide all students access to technology. The center sponsors applied research projects that seek to increase technological expertise on campuses across the state. Every school district in Texas is a member of the center.

II. DESCRIPTION OF THE SUBGRANT PROGRAM

A Process for Making Subgrants for LEA Improvement Plans:

Texas Goals 2000 subgrants will combine campus and school district planning, the development of content and student performance standards, and professional preparation and development. First year subgrants will focus on local planning and training aimed at improving student achievement to reach the national education goals. The subgrants will be awarded to school districts and collaborative partnerships led by school districts that include school districts, regional Education Service Centers (ESCs), teacher training institutions, and community organizations. A school district will be designated as the fiscal agent for each subgrant. Goals 2000 subgrants will be awarded to school districts and collaborative partnerships that: build upon emerging core content and student performance standards with local curriculum planning and instructional development; develop opportunity-to-learn strategies that address local and regional conditions; and plan and develop professional preparation and ongoing development programs that address the content and performance standards and opportunity-to-learn strategies. The Texas Goals 2000 subgrant application will be streamlined and modeled after the state application in order to promote maximum participation and ensure local flexibility. The Request for Applications will be issued in February 1995. Applications will be reviewed by Texas Education Agency staff in March 1995. Awards will be made in April 1995.

Successful applicants for first-year grants will establish coordinated local and regional education improvement plans that address student performance in basic academic skills and include strategies and benchmarks of professional development. The amount of each award will depend upon the quality of the application. It is anticipated that 20 subgrants, one in each ESC region, will be awarded. The average amount of the award, based on an anticipated 20 awards, will be \$205,000. At least 75 % of the subgrant funds will support planning and development activities of the campuses and school districts participating in the application.

B Process for Making Subgrants for Improvements in Preservice Education Programs:

See "A" above.

C Process for Making Subgrants for Continuing Professional Development:

See "A" above.

III. GOALS 2000 1994-95 PROPOSED ALLOCATIONS

A	Subgrants	<u>\$4,100,000</u>
	1. LEA Improvement	
	2. Preservice Education	
	3. Professional Development	
B	State Plan Development	<u>\$2,741,850</u>

C	Technology Plan Development	<u>\$270,760</u>
D	Total Title III Allocation	<u>\$6,841,850</u>
E	Total Goals 2000/Technology Allocation	<u>\$7,112,610</u>

GOALS 2000: EDUCATE AMERICA ACT

STATE PROFILE

STATE: Utah

DATE APPLICATION SUBMITTED: October 5, 1994

DATE APPLICATION APPROVED: December 2, 1994

FUNDING: FIRST YEAR: \$619,406; SECOND YEAR: \$2,477,624 (estimate);

TECHNOLOGY: \$75,000.

I. PROCESS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE STATE PLAN

A Pre-Existing Reform Initiatives:

In 1987 the Utah State Board of Education appointed a Strategic Planning Commission to review progress in educational reform since *A Nation at Risk*. The following year the Commission delivered a report entitled *A Shift in Focus*, which provided the fundamental themes for subsequent public discussion of education in Utah. The Utah State Office of Education promoted this report, and, by January 1990, the Utah State Legislature had created a broadly representative task force of 44 people, known as the Education Strategic Planning Committee, to review the literature on educational reform and assemble for invited presentations from individuals prominent in contemporary educational reform efforts. In August 1990 the Committee, with the aid of a planning consultant, created the *Utah State Education Strategic Plan, 1992-97*. The Utah State Board of Education immediately adopted the *Plan* by a unanimous vote. The Committee established policies as "boundaries within which the system will operate"; objectives as "specific, measurable outcomes by which progress toward fulfilling the mission can be monitored"; and, finally, eleven strategies as "the system's broadly-stated ways and means of deploying its resources toward accomplishing the objectives." The Committee then established eleven Action Planning Teams, one for each of the strategies. Teams consisted of approximately 20 people carefully selected to reflect a broad range of educational stakeholders and expertise. The eleven strategies, fully elaborated in action plans and together with other state planning and implementation initiatives, address all of the elements of the "state improvement plan" consistent with the *Goals 2000: Educate America Act*. The eleven strategies are: 1) Redesign the organization of education, its laws and funding to accomplish the mission; 2) Develop a world-class curriculum; 3) Attract and retain the best and brightest educators; 4) Empower schools to create and achieve their missions; 5) Train school communities to achieve their missions; 6) Employ technology to restructure education and its delivery; 7) Install a system for retrieving information on the progress of each student; 8) Inform all stakeholders about the mission and objective of public education; 9) Personalize education for each student; 10) Support research and development at the local level; and 11) Expand partnerships between schools and business. In November 1991 the Committee convened a final time to affirm complete consensus and, in January 1992, it presented the *Utah State Education Strategic Plan* to the State Legislature. The State Legislature, in February 1992, passed the *Utah Strategic Planning Act for Educational Excellence*, giving the force of law to principles contained in the *Plan*. In 1993 the Legislature enacted the *Centennial Schools Program*, designed "to facilitate

strategic planning for educational excellence at the school level as detailed" in the *Plan*. As of September 1994, 189 of Utah's 716 public schools were participating in the 1993 legislative program to facilitate local planning. Utah hopes to have all 716 schools successfully engaged in educational reform by the year 2000.

B Formation of the State Planning Panel and Development of the Plan:

At the time the Legislature passed the *Utah Strategic Planning Act for Educational Excellence*, it also created a Task Force on Strategic Planning for Public and Higher Education "to monitor and evaluate the progress of ...education...make an annual report...[and suggest] modifications in the state's strategic plan." The Task Force will act as the state panel described in the Goals 2000 legislation.

C Learning Technologies Plan Development and Integration with Goals 2000 State Reform Plan:

In 1990 the State Legislature enacted the Educational Technology Initiative (ETI). Since then, the Legislature has allotted \$57 million through the ETI to assist public schools and colleges of education in acquiring computer hardware and software and training educators in the use of instructional technologies. Legislative appropriations have been matched almost one-to-one by business donations and vendor discounts and by support and budgetary allocations from the school districts and colleges themselves. A 15-member committee established by statute oversees implementation of the ETI. The ETI director, integrated into the organizational hierarchy of the State Office of Education under the director of Curriculum and Instruction, supervises the work of specialists with responsibility for technology-intensive areas of the curriculum. Districts and colleges must submit proposals to receive ETI funds, which are equitably distributed. Districts are expected to emphasize curricular applications, measurable academic outcomes, the integration of intended purchases into existing systems, and teacher inservice. Colleges are expected to emphasize the training of prospective teachers and to support the inservice goals of districts in their service regions. A Technical Review Committee under the direction of the ETI Project Office reviews proposals and negotiates modifications. In February 1994 Governor Michael Leavitt released a proposal detailing his initiative, Technology 2000. The proposal calls for the creation of UtahNet, the "largest wide area network of its type in the world, with the capacity for interactive, full-motion video, audio, graphics and data", and the development of a "governance structure to ensure that all government entities are cooperating and avoiding the duplicative expenditures and redundant networking." In 1994 the Utah State Legislature allotted \$5 million to the Utah Education Network (UEN) to connect all school district offices and secondary schools to UtahNet in a project called Utah Link. The UEN, whose work is overseen by a 17-member interagency steering committee, is the joint public and higher education component of the state technology governance structure. Planning for Utah Link is ongoing and, in October 1994, the first schools will be connected to UtahNet, which includes access to the Internet among other electronic resources.

II. DESCRIPTION OF THE SUBGRANT PROGRAM

A Process for Making Subgrants for LEA Improvement Plans:
Information not available.

B Process for Making Subgrants for Improvements in Preservice Education Programs:

Utah will fund a single proposal from a local education agency or consortium of local education agencies, in collaboration with one or more institutions of higher education, on a competitive basis for a project involving preservice teacher education and professional development activities with a grant of \$75,000. Local education agencies or consortia which desire funding will be required to submit to the State Office of Education a Preservice Teacher Education and Professional Development Application. Preference will be given to applications showing evidence of strong and mutually beneficial ties between schools and colleges.

C Process for Making Subgrants for Continuing Professional Development:

Utah will fund proposals from schools on a competitive basis for professional development projects with grants ranging from a minimum of \$10,000 to a maximum of \$50,000 up to a total of \$482,466. Schools which desire funding will be required to submit to the State Office of Education a Goals 2000 Strategic Plan Implementation Application. In addition to describing their proposed professional development projects, applicants must also put those projects into the context of educational reform by addressing past restructuring accomplishments, local needs identified by prior or ongoing strategic planning, student performance goals, student performance evaluation, personalized student planning, site-based decision making, technology integration, interagency collaboration, and business partnerships.

III. GOALS 2000 1994-95 PROPOSED ALLOCATIONS

A	Subgrants	<u>\$619,406</u>
	1. Professional Development	\$482,466
	2. Consortium for Preservice Education	\$75,000
B	State Plan Development	<u>\$61,940</u>
C	Technology Plan Development	<u>\$75,000</u>
D	Total Title III Allocation	<u>\$619,406</u>
E	Total Goals 2000/Technology Allocation	<u>\$694,406</u>

GOALS 2000: EDUCATE AMERICA ACT

STATE PROFILE

STATE: Vermont
DATE APPLICATION SUBMITTED: August 10, 1994
DATE APPLICATION APPROVED: August 22, 1994
FUNDING: FIRST YEAR: \$324,041; SECOND YEAR: \$1,296,164 (estimate);
TECHNOLOGY: \$75,000.

I. PROCESS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE STATE PLAN

A Pre-Existing Reform Initiatives:

In 1990 Vermont joined with education reformers at the federal level and became an American 2000 state. To reach the goals, Vermont has established a vision. The vision is described in the Green Mountain Challenge, and in short is "very high skills for every student: no exceptions, no excuses." The vision describes what Vermont's transformed education system will look like when all the strategies are in place. To implement the vision and reach the goals, Vermont focuses on eight strategies: Establish standards for what students should know and be able to do; Transform learning experiences so that all students meet the standards; Hold the system accountable for student learning; Manage for high performance at the state and local levels; Reshape education finance and governance; Improve professional development; Engage public support for the changes that are needed; and Provide children and their families the support they need to succeed. These strategies are described in the Green Mountain Challenge. The actions to implement the strategies are based on the ideas of hundreds of authors and are changed and modified annually based on the experiences of thousands of practitioners around the State. Vermont has been developing and implementing a comprehensive plan for systemic education reform for more than five years. There is a close fit between the eight strategies and the key components of the Goals 2000 plan. Vermont plans to use the Green Mountain Challenge as their Goals 2000 plan.

B Formation of the State Planning Panel and Development of the Plan:

The Goals 2000 panel will have 23 members and will represent all of the constituency groups mentioned in the legislation. The Governor and Commissioner of Education are working together to ensure that the panel members have a deep commitment to the need for systemic change and a track record of getting things done. The panel will consist of many people who have been involved in state and local reform for years as well as some new faces. Many of the panel members are the people who have carried the most weight in developing Vermont's local and state reform efforts from the beginning. The Governor and the Commissioner have developed a long list of potential panelists. The opportunity to participate was announced to educators, professional organizations and parent organizations through a letter from the Commissioner, the State Board of Education newsletter and a three hour interactive television session as a follow-up to the Goals 2000 training session in May 1994. The Chairs of the Education committees in the legislature are fully informed and have committed to active participation on the panel. The State

Board has discussed the panel and the Chair of the State Board will serve as a panelist. The Governor and the Commissioner have agreed to jointly appoint all members of the panel as a strong signal of the solidarity between the Department of Education and the Governor's Office on this work. The Panel will be established through Executive Order from the Governor as a signal of strong commitment from the Governor's Office. The dates for the formal appointments and the meetings have not been scheduled at this time. It is anticipated that once established, the Panel will meet at least quarterly and that the work charge for the panel will be: "...to ensure that Vermont derives from the full benefit of the extraordinary opportunity created by the Goals 2000 legislation. The Panel will examine the Green Mountain Challenge, which is Vermont's strategic plan for education reform, and make improvements as needed so that the plan fully meets the provisions for a state-wide reform plan as defined by the Goals 2000 legislation. The Vermont Goals 2000 Panel will also inform the public of the importance of comprehensive education reform and will engage as many citizens as possible in the effort." Key staff involved in the Green Mountain Challenge initiatives will interact frequently with the Goals 2000 panel to help orient them and to support them as they complete their charge of developing a state plan. Staffing assignments will be made by the Department internal management team to ensure that adequate staffing is available. The Governor and the Commissioner agree that the Green Mountain Challenge is the basis for the new Goals 2000 plan. It has gaps and the panel will be called upon to fill in those gaps in consultation with the Department of Education and the many other partners who helped develop the Green Mountain Challenge. The panel will be expected to use the same approach--broad consultation--to develop the rest of the plan.

C Learning Technologies Plan Development and Integration with Goals 2000 State Reform Plan:

The main purpose of technology is to support educational transformation. The Vermont State Technology Council (VSTC) in collaboration with the Vermont Educational Telecommunications Consortium (VETC), and the Vermont Institute of Science, Math and Technology (VISMT) have worked together to develop Vermont's technological capacity in ways that support education transformation. VSTC and VETC developed a guide linking technology to reaching Vermont's goals. VSTC, VETC, and VISMT developed a proposal describing how to develop a state systemic information technology plan. The plan is based on the work they have done linking Vermont's goals to information technology and it will also be based on learnings from the Apple Classrooms of Tomorrow (ACOT) program that is operating in the 39 National Alliance Schools in the state, and the technology sites sponsored by the VISMT in Vermont.

II. DESCRIPTION OF THE SUBGRANT PROGRAM

A Process for Making Subgrants for LEA Improvement Plans:

The Commissioner will announce the Request for Proposal (RFP) through a letter to the field and at a regularly scheduled interactive television session. A wide audience will be invited to the session including higher education, business and community groups, parents, and educators. The RFP application and process will be based on Vermont's experience

with selecting schools to participate as National Alliance for Restructuring Education locations. Applicants will be asked to describe their current state and desired state in the areas of standards and assessments; learning environments; high performance management; community services and supports; and public engagement. Proposals will be independently reviewed by a cross-section of Vermonters, all who have a deep understanding of systemic change and present no conflict of interest. Reviewers will include practitioners and representation from business and higher education ratings will be done against specific criteria and applicants invited to an interview will be identified. Prospective candidates will be invited to make a presentation to the reviewers. The purpose of the interview is to provide further information and validate the information provided in the application. The Department of Education will make the final determination of awardees based on the input from the review panel. Applicants for subgrants in professional development and preservice education will also be asked to submit their strategic plan and documentation of success in implementing their plan. The same review panel will make recommendations for selection for all applicants.

Competitive subgrants (\$5,000 - \$15,000) will be made to consortia of local school districts (in Vermont called supervisory unions) for the purpose of developing and implementing systemic improvement plans in some or all of the school districts in the supervisory union. The plans will be developed to coordinate with the current Green Mountain Challenge. These subgrants will be targeted at schools that do not currently have comprehensive plans in place but that are motivated and have the capacity to go through a comprehensive planning process. Vermont will build on the knowledge and resources it has accumulated as partners in the National Alliance for Restructuring Education. Local comprehensive plans will be developed focused on the same five Design Tasks as the Alliance (standards and assessments, learning environments, high performance management, public engagement, and community services and supports). Strategic plans will be developed using the Alliance framework and rubric. Since Vermont has 39 schools in 14 locations around the state that helped develop, field test, and fine tune this approach, it makes sense to capitalize on their experience and capacity to help other schools and districts. This will also ensure clear, focused, coordinated state and local efforts, and a common language of reform being used across the state.

B Process for Making Subgrants for Improvements in Preservice Education Programs:

\$40,000 in Goals 2000 funds will subgranted competitively to supervisory unions that, in consultation with higher education, will work together to improve the quality of preservice teacher education and develop a system for providing the professional development needed to implement local strategic plans which are in support of the state strategic plan. Successful subgrantees would address both preservice education and professional development of existing staff. The subgrants would be based on the successes that some Vermont schools have already had in developing professional development schools in conjunction with the University of Vermont. These funds will be targeted at schools already implementing a comprehensive strategic plan and that want to work with a higher education institution to meet their teacher preparation and professional development needs by developing teaching schools that are analogous to teaching hospitals. The funds would support the establishment of four new "professional development schools"; public schools

that have as a part of their mission the professional development of preservice, beginning, and practicing educators. They will be the places where "best practices" are developed, modeled, and become institutionalized, and where inquiry, research, and reflection are the norm.

- C Process for Making Subgrants for Continuing Professional Development:**
See "A" and "B" above.

III. GOALS 2000 1994-95 PROPOSED ALLOCATIONS

A	Subgrants	<u>\$200,000</u>
	1. LEA Improvement	\$160,000
	2. Preservice Teacher Education & Professional Development	\$40,000
B	State Plan Development	<u>\$124,041</u>
C	Technology Plan Development	<u>\$75,000</u>
D	Total Title III Allocation	<u>\$324,041</u>
E	Total Goals 2000/Technology Allocation	<u>\$399,041</u>

GOALS 2000: EDUCATE AMERICA ACT

STATE PROFILE

STATE: Washington
DATE APPLICATION SUBMITTED: July 7, 1994
DATE APPLICATION APPROVED: July 29, 1994
FUNDING: FIRST YEAR: \$1,470,789; SECOND YEAR: \$5,883,156 (estimate);
TECHNOLOGY: \$75,000.

I. PROCESS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE STATE PLAN

A Pre-Existing Reform Initiatives:

Washington has been involved in reforming its education system since the early 1980s. The "first wave" of reform measures, however, had little effect on the delivery of instruction or the operation of schools. The "second wave" of reforms came in the mid '80s and focused on teacher preparation and the development of pilot model restructuring programs at the local level. Funding for these activities was channeled through the "Schools for the 21st Century program", which was designed to develop innovative, school wide models. In 1991 the Governor's Council on Education Reform and Funding was established to work on recommendations for statewide education reform. The Council focused on the change from a "time-based" to a "performance-based" education system. In 1992 the legislature passed the Engrossed Substitute House Bill 5953 which contained three major components: creation of a Commission on Student Learning, a local control provision allowing greater flexibility and decision-making authority for local school boards, and additional changes and review of the requirements for teacher preparation and certification. By the end of the 1993 legislative session, Engrossed Substitute House Bill (ESHB) 1209 became law. ESHB 1209 added to ESHB 5953 by 1) placing the student learning goals in statute; 2) establishing the timelines for the assessment and accountability systems; 3) increasing the size of the Commission from nine to eleven members; 4) establishing a Certificate of Mastery requirement, which would be required for graduation; and 5) establishing a legislative group to review all K-12 laws to identify those which might inhibit implementation of the performance-based student learning system. Following ESHB 1209, the Commission on Student Learning created Subject Advisory Committees (SACs) to develop essential academic learning requirements (EARLs). The membership of the SACs includes educators, parents, business and interested citizens. The first four SACs focused on reading, writing, communications and mathematics. By spring of 1994 the four SACs drafted the first four sets of EARLs titled, "High Standards: Essential Learnings for Washington Students." At present, new SACs are being developed for science, health and fitness, social studies and arts.

B Formation of the State Planning Panel and Development of the Plan:

Governor Mike Lowry and State Superintendent of Public Instruction Judith Billings, with the concurrence of the Secretary of Education, agreed that several current and pre-existing panels fulfill the requirements of the legislation. The state panel to be appointed by the State Superintendent of Public Instruction will be a coordinating council composed of the

chairperson or designee of the Commission on Student Learning; the State Board of Education; the Governor's Task Force on School to Work Transition; the Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board; the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges, and the Higher Education Coordinating Board; educators serving on the African American Affairs Commission, the Asian American Affairs Commission, and the Hispanic Affairs Commission; a Native American school representative; a Dean of a College of Education; and representatives of the Washington PTA; school principals, administrators, school directors, and teacher and school employee unions.

In terms of plan development, the initial work of the panel will be to clarify and focus its purpose and mission. The development of the plan will begin with a thorough examination of state and local education reform initiatives. This analysis will describe the existing efforts supported by ESHB 1209 and other significant legislation and state policy and appropriations act measures. The products of the first year of work will be the state education reform initiatives analysis; summaries of public hearings and meetings; and a detailed outline of the proposed state improvement plan, indicating what areas and broad topics are currently being adequately addressed and what holes or gaps exist.

The timeline for the above listed activities is as follows:

July 1994	Filing of state planning grant application
August 1994	Presentations and discussion of state application Pre-planning for panel membership Pre-planning for staffing for Goals panel Hiring of Goals 2000 staff
From grant award:	Information to school districts as school year begins Development of communication/information plan Finalization of plan for use of technology support Development of RFPs for subgrant competitions
September 1994	Public awareness effort begins Information on subgrants provided to school districts via bulletin Technical assistance effort begins
October 1994	Analysis on existing initiatives Estimated work on plan development - 18 months
November 1994	Subgrant applications due approximately six weeks after RFPs are distributed
December 1994	Panel Appointments; Subgrants awarded Panel begins to meet
January 1995, or six months after grant award	Preliminary report on State Goals 2000 effort relationship to state and local systemic school improvements

C Learning Technologies Plan Development and Integration with Goals 2000 State Reform Plan:

Washington will continue development of a systemic statewide plan to increase the use of state-of-the-art technologies that enhance elementary and secondary student learning and staff development. This development will leverage current technology initiatives and extend state-level planning to accomplish the purposes outlined in Section 316 of the Goals legislation. A draft of the state technology plan is currently under public review. The focus for Washington's technology planning under Goals 2000 includes four major areas: 1) Public, education and business/industry recognition of and support for the critical role technology and telecommunications play in the improvement of student learning and in performance-based assessment; 2) Removal of regulatory, constitutional or statutory barriers which currently inhibit schools from effectively implementing technology in schools; 3) Improving student learning through the effective use of technology-based instructional strategies in Washington classrooms; and 4) Increase electronic access to information for students, educators, parents, and community members.

II. DESCRIPTION OF THE SUBGRANT PROGRAM

A Process for Making Subgrants for LEA Improvement Plans:

The purpose of the subgrants to school districts is to support the development of the state improvement plan by illustrating how parallel processes may evolve at the local level. Competitors will be asked to propose a process for the development of a local, comprehensive plan for improvement that addresses the same areas and issues to be examined in the state plan. Highly-rated proposals will be those that show the relationship between state supported Student Learning Improvement Grants, locally supported restructuring funding, and other federal and state programs.

At least 60% of the total Title III Grant, or \$882,553, will be made available for subgrants as described in Section 309 (a) and (b). Of that amount 78%, or \$682,553, will be used to award subgrants to local education agencies to develop or refine local improvement plans in accordance with Section 309 (a).

The requests for proposals (RFPs) for each subgrant process will support and be consistent with ongoing state initiatives in local improvement grants and awards will be selected for applicants that show a defined relationship with the Student Learning Improvement Grants for staff development and planning funded under state ESHB 1209.

B Process for Making Subgrants for Improvements in Preservice Education Programs:

Of the \$882,553, 11%, or \$100,000, will be used to award a subgrant to a consortia of LEAs, in cooperation with institutions of higher education and/or nonprofit organizations, to improve preservice teacher education. (B and C) grants will be awarded to applicants that show defined relationships to existing preservice and inservice teacher education initiatives, such as the state's Student Learning Improvement Grants and teacher assistance program.

- C Process for Making Subgrants for Continuing Professional Development:**
Of the \$882,553, 11%, or \$100,000, will be used to award a subgrant to a consortia of LEAs, in cooperation with institutions of higher education and /or nonprofit organizations, to support continuing professional development of educators, school administrators or related services personnel in accordance with Section 309 (b). The RFPs for professional development subgrants will be developed in consultation with LEAs, who have produced exemplary Student Learning Improvement Grants during the first year of implementation, and the State Board of Education.

III. GOALS 2000 1994-95 PROPOSED ALLOCATIONS

A	Subgrants	<u>\$882,553</u>
	1. LEA Improvement Plans	\$682,553
	2. Preservice Education	\$100,000
	3. Professional Development	\$100,000
B	State Plan Development	<u>\$588,236</u>
C	Technology Plan Development	<u>\$75,000</u>
D	Total Title III Allocation	<u>\$1,470,789</u>
E	Total Goals 2000/Technology Allocation	<u>\$1,545,789</u>

GOALS 2000: EDUCATE AMERICA ACT

STATE PROFILE

STATE: West Virginia
DATE APPLICATION SUBMITTED: August 29, 1994
DATE APPLICATION APPROVED: November 7, 1994
FUNDING: FIRST YEAR: \$687,147; SECOND YEAR: \$2,748,588 (estimate);
TECHNOLOGY: \$75,000.

I. PROCESS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE STATE PLAN

A Pre-Existing Reform Initiatives:

West Virginia has been engaged in reform since 1982 when it became the first state to have its system of funding education declared unconstitutional. The Recht decision provided that the state had just ninety days to reconceptualize its system of education under the twin principles of **excellence and equity**, and to rewrite policies and standards by which the school systems of the state were to operate. In the furor that followed, the leadership of the business community, state legislature and the executive office joined with the education community to design a series of initiatives that would build a foundation upon which a new and invigorated school system could be established. For the past twelve years the attention of these parties has been focused upon improving educational opportunities for the citizens of the state. In 1983 the nation's first statewide educational microcomputer system (WVMEN) was initiated, as was the West Virginia Education Fund. A non-profit private sector group that awards small grants to teachers and provides monetary awards (\$5,000) to recognize outstanding performances by teachers and/or principals, the Fund began the process of forming partnerships between schools and businesses. Currently, 87% (780) of all state schools are engaged in business partnerships. In response to critics' assertions that parents were not fully informed consumers, a **School Report Card** was developed. Since 1986 the Department of Education has published and disseminated this document statewide, giving performance data for each school. To strengthen the linkage between what is to be taught and the capacity of classroom teachers to deliver those curricula, pre-professional and content specialization tests were developed with minimum or "cut" scores established for students in teacher education programs. West Virginia continues to be engaged in aggressive systemic educational reform, exemplified through educational goals and policies that establish a vision for change and address in particular the factors critical to the systemic improvement of mathematics, science and technology. Through an organizational structure that links program definition, delivery, administration, and assurance components of the educational system, curriculum frameworks serve as a catalyst for systemic changes upon adoption by the State Board of Education. It is the curriculum frameworks that serve as the central focus around which all other elements are organized. In 1988 legislation was passed requiring the development of criterion-referenced testing for students. It was during this legislative session that a performance-based system of school accreditation was initiated with authority given to the Department of Education for direct intervention in a local district. The focus of school reform shifted somewhat in 1989 with the creation of the School Building Authority (SBA) to oversee the

construction of new schools and the refurbishing of older facilities. Concurrent with the SBA initiative, a major computer-assisted instruction program in the basic skills was begun. To date, approximately seventy million dollars has been invested with a resultant growth from 100 computers in classrooms (October 1990) to 11,951 computers in K-4 classrooms (June 1994). In 1990 the reform movement again added a new dimension--this time site-based management was the principal focus as the legislature required and funded the establishment of **faculty senates** in every school; **local school improvement councils**, including representatives from the business community, parents and educators; and **school curriculum teams** to evaluate the effectiveness of the school's instructional program and modify it as necessary either through waivers from state policies/regulations or through redesigning the program. In 1992 a statewide personnel evaluation system was developed, adopted and implemented. The state code was revised to enlarge the definition of state adopted instructional materials to include interactive computer programs, laser disks, video materials and "hands-on" kits. In anticipation of the use of alternative assessment procedures that provide a closer alignment with curriculum frameworks being developed at the national level, West Virginia joined the State Collaborative on Assessment and Student Standards (SCASS), organized under the auspices of the Council of Chief State School Officers. In 1994 a cooperative relationship was forged between Bell Atlantic and the Department of Education that will result in all West Virginia schools receiving through its **World School**, direct high speed access to Internet with over 9,000 data bases, electronic books, research and communication capabilities.

B Formation of the State Planning Panel and Development of the Plan:

In preparation for the development of a state improvement plan to attain higher standards for all students, the State of West Virginia identified Dr. Barbara Jones, the Executive Assistant to the State Superintendent, to take a leadership role by serving as the state Point of Contact for Goals 2000. The senior management team for the Department of Education comprises the staff planning and coordination team that will assist and provide resources to the state Goals 2000 Advisory Panel. To ensure that the state Goals 2000 initiative was broad-based from its inception, the Governor and the State Superintendent of Schools collaboratively selected a team to attend the Goals 2000 meeting in Washington, DC. These individuals were named to the Goals 2000 Advisory Panel. To further support the work of the Panel, the State applied and was accepted into the National Governor's Association Policy Academy on Systemic Change in Education. Except for the Department of Education staff who served as resources to the Panel, the members of the "travel team" to the Policy Academy were also named to serve on the Advisory Panel for Goals 2000. This group served as the "travel team" and the full Advisory Panel served as the "home team." Together, they collected and organized data to guide and shape further reform efforts in West Virginia. The first session of the Policy Academy was August 7-11, 1994, immediately prior to the selection of the members of the full Advisory Panel. The Governor and the State Superintendent solicited the names of nominees in forums across the state. Following announcement of the passage of the Educate America Act, many individuals wrote personal letters of application. Others nominated staff, parents, teacher educators, business men and women, community leaders, and students. Presentations on Goals 2000 were made in every area of the state. From this talented pool, the requirements for membership as defined by the legislation were met. On November 30, 1994, the

Governor and the State Superintendent announced the full membership of the group who comprise the Advisory Panel. The Panel convened for its first organizational meeting in November. Reform efforts of the previous decade were presented with data assessing the level of implementation and the degree of success accomplished. Eight town meetings are scheduled for the Panel to solicit participation by citizens across the state. Responsibilities of the state Department of Education include statewide press releases prior to each meeting; the development of informational brochures; and the logistics of planning and coordinating each meeting of the Panel, the town meetings, and the Policy Academy sessions. Upon conclusion of the town meetings, Department staff will compile and present a summary of concerns and recommendations expressed to the Panel. In a series of meetings, the Panel developed a draft of the state improvement plan. By working from a draft of the state improvement plan under Goals 2000, the team will coordinate and maximize the monies from the federal government and the state monies to achieve the optimum results. Based on that plan, the grant application for the second year's funding under Goals 2000 will be prepared. The application will be submitted for review to the West Virginia Board of Education at its regularly scheduled meeting on July 13, 1995. Upon the completion of the Board's review, the application and the Board's comments, if any, will be sent to USED for consideration.

C Learning Technologies Plan Development and Integration with Goals 2000 State Reform Plan:

West Virginia has underway a massive statewide effort to increase the use of state-of-the-art technologies to enhance student learning. A partnership with Bell Atlantic will bring every school in the state on line with Internet and the **World Schools** within the next two years. Some 12,000 computers are in place in the K-4 program. A toll-free statewide electronic bulletin board with 9,000 users averages 5,000 calls per month. At least 7,500 educators have received staff development in using technology to improve teaching and learning. A process is underway to develop a statewide technology plan in keeping with the Goals 2000 legislation. Members of the Technology Advisory Panel include staff from the Department of Education, the Office of the Governor, representatives from business and industry, regional education service agency personnel, local district coordinators, and teachers. Central to the development of the plan is the continued emphasis and effort to provide high quality professional development for all teachers in the use of technology. The anticipated impact of the statewide plan will be to coordinate the efforts of different agencies in providing staff development; ensure the maximum use of the technology already in place; and prevent duplication of the use of limited resources. The Technology Advisory Panel will present its findings and recommendations for the implementation of the statewide technology plan to the Goals 2000 Advisory Panel for action. The Department of Education will establish through the West Virginia Education Information System (WVEIS), an interactive electronic network between the Department and all schools in the state, a format for uniformly reporting Goals 2000 evaluation data. These data will be collected on at least an annual basis, evaluated by the Goals Panel for districts' effectiveness in meeting the goals and objectives established in their applications, summarized and disseminated to USED, the West Virginia Board of Education, district school systems and the general public.

II. DESCRIPTION OF THE SUBGRANT PROGRAM

A Process for Making Subgrants for LEA Improvement Plans:

Following the development of a comprehensive state improvement plan, the Department of Education staff solicited competitive applications through Requests for Proposals (RFPs) in amounts up to \$25,000 for projects that incorporate the goals and priorities developed by the Goals 2000 Advisory Council and approved by the West Virginia Board of Education with the requirements of the Educate America Act. The RFPs require the district applicant to, in addition to the requirements of the legislation, establish baseline data developed from a needs assessment; describe the procedures they will follow to inform local schools of the opportunities available under Goals 2000; provide technical assistance to ensure local school improvement councils have the resources to apply for funds; and establish clearly stated, measurable goals. The RFPs require local districts to use the monies granted to them for the planning process to involve the public in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of strategies to attain the goals of the reform initiative. Applications for planning grants were solicited from local school districts following the receipt of Goals 2000 monies from the federal government and the completion of the technical assistance workshops provided through each of the regional educational service agencies (RESAs). These grant applications were evaluated by a committee selected by the State Superintendent and were presented with a recommendation to fund/ not fund each project to the Board of Education. The number and dollar amount of these grants, up to \$25,000, was determined by the Goals 2000 Advisory Panel during the course of their development of the state improvement plan.

B Process for Making Subgrants for Improvements in Preservice Education Programs:

To make subgrants to local school districts, consortia of local districts, RESAs, and/or institutions of higher education in order to provide for preservice teacher education, and professional development activities for inservice educators, the Department of Education developed a competitive process through RFPs that addressed the requirements of the Educate America Act and further required that the applicant include a data base that informs the reader of the specific needs in the content and pedagogy knowledge base of the preservice or inservice teacher that will, by being addressed, assist in achieving the goals and priorities established by the Advisory Panel in consultation with the State Board of Education. These applications were evaluated by a panel of outstanding teachers appointed by the State Superintendent. Recommendations for funding/ not funding will be presented to the State Board of Education for action in June 1995.

C Process for Making Subgrants for Continuing Professional Development: See "B" above.

III. GOALS 2000 1994-95 PROPOSED ALLOCATIONS

A	Subgrants	<u>(No information provided)</u>
B	State Plan Development	<u>(No information provided)</u>
C	Technology Plan Development	<u>\$75,000</u>
D	Total Title III Allocation	<u>\$687,147</u>
E	Total Goals 2000/Technology Allocation	<u>\$762,147</u>

GOALS 2000: EDUCATE AMERICA ACT

STATE PROFILE

STATE: Wisconsin
DATE APPLICATION SUBMITTED: August 19, 1994
DATE APPLICATION APPROVED: November 23, 1994
FUNDING: FIRST YEAR: \$1,570,588; SECOND YEAR: \$6,282,352 (estimate);
TECHNOLOGY: \$75,000.

I. PROCESS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE STATE PLAN

A Pre-Existing Reform Initiatives:

Groundwork in many areas outlined in Goals 2000 has been ongoing for years in Wisconsin. The groundwork includes: 20 Standards for Education Excellence (1985); Curriculum guides in all academic areas (1985-present); Integrated Computer Education Curriculum (1986); Family Involvement/Participation in School and Community (1987-present); Developmental Guidance Model (1985-present); Parker Project 1981-85; Education for Employment (1985-present); School-to-Work Legislation including Tech Prep and Youth Apprenticeship (1991-present); Joint WBVTAE/DPI Task Force on Implementing Occupational Options (1991); The Governor's Commission on Schools for the 21st Century (1991); The Governor's Commission for a Quality Workforce (1991); Wisconsin's Educational Goals (1992-93); Wisconsin Student Assessment System (1992-93); Connecting the Curriculum (1993-present); Frameworks Integrating Science and Mathematics (1993-present); Integrated Information Literacy Guidelines (1993); Village Partnership (State-level collaboration, 1992-present); State Superintendent Benson's Initiatives: Bright Beginnings Equity, Urban Initiative, Finance, and State Agency Restructuring (1993-present); and Wisconsin's School-to-Work Initiative.

B Formation of the State Planning Panel and Development of the Plan:

Governor Thompson and State Superintendent Benson will agree on the State Goals 2000 Panel's chair and private school representative; will select the full panel membership so that it meets the representation requirements; and will frame the charge to the panel and set a timeline for the Goals Panel work. A joint appointment letter will be a tangible sign to the State Goals 2000 Panel members of the Department of Public Instruction's and Governor's commitment to work cooperatively on this effort. The Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (WDPI) realizes that the expertise and resources of the state education agency will need to be focused and mobilized to support the efforts of the State Goals 2000 Panel. The WDPI will use Goals 2000 administrative funding to hire one full-time Goals 2000 education administration consultant and one .5 FTE program assistant. The WDPI will be responsible for the development of the LEA subgrant processes and for coordinating all federal and state programs in the agency with Goals 2000.

C Learning Technologies Plan Development and Integration with Goals 2000 State Reform Plan:

The goal of the Integration of Technology Plan is to infuse technology into the comprehensive state plan in order to integrate instructional and telecommunications technologies into curriculum and staff development. An important part of this goal will be to include a plan for statewide, equitable access to the Internet for Pre K-12 schools and public libraries. To accomplish this task, State Superintendent Benson will ensure that 1-3 persons on the State Goals 2000 Panel are also members of the technology task force he will appoint in February 1995. The technology task force will come from all regions of the state and will consist of members from all facets of the education community, as well as business and industry partners. Members will include classroom teachers, library media specialists and librarians, school district and building level administrators, school board members, community learning specialists, members from the university and technical college systems, parents and students and private entrepreneurs. Individuals with expertise in using computers, modems, optical disc technologies, two-way and one-way distance learning technologies, and the Internet will be sought from these groups. Staff from the Division for Libraries and Community Learning will provide this task force with staff assistance and logistical support.

II. DESCRIPTION OF THE SUBGRANT PROGRAM

A Process for Making Subgrants for LEA Improvement Plans:

The WDPI envisions two categories for the subgrants: local improvement planning grants for LEAs, which must include professional development activities and grants to LEAs and IHEs and/or nonprofit organizations for preservice training and extended professional development opportunities for new and existing teachers, administrators and support staff. The WDPI will allocate approximately two-thirds of the subgrant funds to LEA improvement planning grants and one-third for LEA and IHE and/or nonprofit organizations' preservice and professional development grants. The subgrant process will be competitive for both categories. It is expected that the LEA improvement planning grants would be in the range of \$5,000-\$20,000.

B Process for Making Subgrants for Improvements in Preservice Education Programs:

Preservice and professional development in Wisconsin are in the process of being combined into a career-long teacher preparation program. Grants awarded under this category will be selected to further this effort. Specifically, the state has a plan to move from an input driven licensing and license renewal system to a more accountable performance-based approach. In order to implement this systemic change, LEA and IHE cooperation is essential to define competencies, create valid and reliable measurement systems and pilot authentic assessment techniques. The model for preservice change is based on the latest effort to establish national standards for the profession of education.

The work of the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education and the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) of the Council of Chief State School Officers will serve as a focus for the Wisconsin redesign of teacher education. In addition, state and national goals for education will become the agenda for license renewal requirements. See "A" above for funding allocations and review process. The LEA subgrants of approximately \$50,000 each for preservice and professional development will focus on systemic change; it is expected that three to four of these model projects may be funded during the first year. In both cases, the WDPI will use peer review panels to review and evaluate the LEA grant applications.

C Process for Making Subgrants for Continuing Professional Development:
See "A" and "B" above.

III. GOALS 2000 1994-95 PROPOSED ALLOCATIONS

A	Subgrants	<u>\$942,400</u>
	1. LEA Improvement Planning	\$792,500
	2. Preservice Teacher Education and Professional Development	\$150,000
B	State Plan Development	<u>\$628,200</u>
C	Technology Plan Development	<u>\$75,000</u>
D	Total Title III Allocation	<u>\$1,570,588</u>
E	Total Goals 2000/Technology Allocation	<u>\$1,645,588</u>

GOALS 2000: EDUCATE AMERICA ACT

STATE PROFILE

STATE: Wyoming
DATE APPLICATION SUBMITTED: June 19, 1995
DATE APPLICATION APPROVED: June 20, 1995
FUNDING: FIRST YEAR: \$288,285; SECOND YEAR: \$1,153,140 (estimate);
TECHNOLOGY: \$75,000.

I. PROCESS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE STATE PLAN

A Pre-Existing Reform Initiatives:

In the late 1980s the Wyoming Board of Education implemented new performance-based teacher certification standards centered on approval of teacher preparation programs in institutions of higher education. The teacher certification standards reflect the need for high standards for incoming teachers and the general assumption that the state (with wider educator and public involvement) should protect its children by setting standards that every educator must meet. In 1990 the State Board of Education adopted new student performance-based school accreditation standards that reflect the assumption that curriculum decisions and setting of student performance standards are best addressed at the local district and school level. As a state whose 105-year-old Constitution forbids state involvement in textbook selection, the Board's accreditation standards reflect the strong tradition of local control of educational decisions. Wyoming law and the accreditation standards give local boards total discretion as to curriculum content, assessment procedures, and teaching methodologies. Additional support for change in Wyoming's educational system came from the 1990 Wyoming Legislature. House Enrolled Act 50 requires statewide goals which include: a) maintenance of a teacher-pupil ratio ranking among the top ten percent nationally; b) establishment of a Core Curriculum developing basic learning and thinking skills and maintenance of a curriculum available to all students which encourages students to pursue traditional, technical or vocational post-secondary educational opportunities and trains them for employment in a highly technical and global economy; c) provision for ensuring parental and community involvement in establishing and implementing goals for Wyoming public schools; d) maintenance of high standards and compensation for public school teachers; e) establishment of an accountability program which measures student progress, reports progress to individual school district residents and allows valid comparisons of progress between school districts within the state and between state public schools and schools nationally; f) establishment of programs addressing at-risk children and maintenance of a dropout rate ranking among the lowest ten percent nationally; and g) maintenance of teacher salary levels at among the top ten percent in the nation. Since 1990 Wyoming has directed its efforts toward implementing the certification program, the accreditation program, and addressing the provisions of House Enrolled Act 50. In further reform activities, Wyoming, in 1993, applied for and received a developmental grant under the School-to-Work Opportunities Act. The Wyoming school-to-work program operates as a multi-agency effort governed by a management team made up of representatives of the Department, the Department of

Employment, the Community College Commission, the State Council on Vocational Education, the Department of Commerce, and private business. The Department serves as fiscal and administering agent for the project. The school-to-work program is the largest cross-disciplinary, partnership-based, interagency education reform effort in the state. Change models and joint efforts under the Act and the School-to-Work Opportunities Act will contribute a new coherence to Department and local reform efforts.

B Formation of the State Planning Panel and Development of the Plan:

The Superintendent of Public Instruction has identified six priorities to guide the activities of the Department under Goals 2000. These priorities will be included in the charge to the Wyoming School Improvement Panel to be established pursuant to Section 306. The priorities include: 1) Develop a state plan for education technology to promote high standards for all students; 2) Support school district technology plans and purchase of needed technology; 3) Assist school districts to improve student performance in basic skills; 4) Develop accountability and measurements to monitor learning results; 5) Create partnerships among school districts and higher education to improve teacher preparation and teacher staff development; and 6) Create partnerships between school districts and businesses to improve education through the use of technology. The panel will be appointed by the Governor and the State Superintendent of Public Instruction with each appointing one-half of the panel members. Membership of the panel will be geographically representative of the state and will reflect the diversity of the state with regard to race, ethnicity, gender and disability characteristics. In order to facilitate effective and efficient functioning of the panel, the panel will be kept as small as feasible, while guaranteeing full representation. The panel will be appointed by September 1, 1995. The panel will assist with developing a comprehensive, written state plan for education with special emphasis on using technology as a tool for helping Wyoming students meet recommended standards. The three primary charges for the panel are 1) to develop a statewide technology plan which, through improved instruction, addresses district established student standards to promote higher student achievement, 2) establish a competitive grant process for distribution of Goals 2000 funds which emphasizes the use of technology, and 3) research and establish resources, support, and direction which will enable the state and districts to pursue technology in education. By September 15, 1995, the State Superintendent of Public Instruction will appoint an internal Department of Education coordinating group to assist the panel. It will identify staff resources, respond to requests from the panel and assure coordination of Department efforts. The Goals 2000 coordinator will chair the group which shall meet monthly after each panel meeting to develop internal action plans to support the panel.

Milestones and activities:

August 15, 1995

Select a Department School Improvement Coordinator to administer activities under the Act and to assist the panel in state plan development.

September 1, 1995

Identify Department personnel resources or contracted services to

	be requested from or through the Department as needed to develop action plans leading to development of the comprehensive state plan for school improvement.
September 28, 1995	Adopt panel bylaws and internal operating procedures.
September 1 - October 30, 1995	Hold regional forum meetings which will allow discussion on the state strategic plan.
November 30, 1995	Submit the action plans to USED as evidence of substantial progress for release of second year funds.
December 1, 1995	Develop the LEA subgrant process which meets all criteria of the Act and recommend it to the State Superintendent of Public Instruction.
February 1, 1996	First subgrant awards given to districts with emphasis on technology.
April 10, 1996	Develop and recommend a draft comprehensive, written state plan to the State Superintendent.
May 1, 1996	Hold a statewide video teleconference or public meeting to highlight basic elements of the plan and obtain further public input.
May 15, 1996	Submit the comprehensive, written strategic state plan for school improvement to the U.S. Secretary of Education, including the State Superintendent's comments.

**C Learning Technologies Plan Development and Integration with Goals 2000 State Reform Plan:
See "B" above.**

II. DESCRIPTION OF THE SUBGRANT PROGRAM

A Process for Making Subgrants for LEA Improvement Plans:

The panel will establish criteria, based on new or existing school district improvement plans and individual school improvement efforts for the required competitive grant process. It will determine funding to be set aside for the competitive grant process in each of the three areas required by Section 309 (a). The panel will be asked to make its criteria and application procedures known to local districts by February 1, 1996, and to establish a review process, including peer review, where necessary, which will enable the Department to issue grant awards to local districts by April 15, 1996.

B Process for Making Subgrants for Improvements in Preservice Education Programs:

See "A" above.

C Process for Making Subgrants for Continuing Professional Development:

See "A" above.

III. GOALS 2000 1994-95 PROPOSED ALLOCATIONS

A	Subgrants	<u>\$172,971</u>
	1. LEA Improvement	
	2. Preservice Teacher Education	
	3. Professional Development	
B	State Plan Development	<u>\$115,314</u>
	1. Planning	\$40,000
	2. Administrative	\$75,314
C	Technology Plan Development	<u>\$75,000</u>
D	Total Title III Allocation	<u>\$288,285</u>
E	Total Goals 2000/Technology Allocation	<u>\$363,285</u>

GOALS 2000 STATE CONTACTS

ALABAMA

Feagin Johnson
Assistant State Superintendent
Alabama Department of Education
50 North Ripley Street
Montgomery, AL 36104-3833
334-242-9716
334-242-9708

ALASKA

Ms. Peggy Cowan
Science Specialist
Alaska Department of Education
801 West 10th Street, Suite 200
Juneau, AK 99801-1894
907-465-2826
907-465-3396
rmpe@tundra.alaska.edu

AMERICAN SAMOA

Mr. Lui Tuitele
Program Director
American Samoa Department of Education
Utelei, American Samoa 96799
684-633-1246
684-633-5184

ARIZONA

Ms. Jane Hunt
Deputy Associate Superintendent
Arizona Department of Education
1535 West Jefferson
Phoenix, AZ 85007
602-542-5138
602-542-3013

CALIFORNIA

Mr. Paes Griffin
Director, Regional Programs & Special
Projects Division
California Department of Education
721 Capitol Mall
P.O. Box 944272
Sacramento, CA 94244-2720
916-657-2516
916-657-5457; mvargo@cde.ca.gov

COLORADO

Ms. Jan Silverstein
Goals 2000, Coordinator
Colorado Department of Education
201 East Colfax
Denver, CO 80203-1799
303-866-6635
303-830-0793

CONNECTICUT

Mr. Benjamin Dixon
Deputy Commissioner of Education
Connecticut Department of Education
P.O. Box 2219
Hartford, CT 06145-2219
203-566-4185
203-566-8964

DELAWARE

Ms. Lisa Hicks
Goals 2000 Contractor
Delaware Department of Public Instruction
P.O. Box 1402
Dover, DE 19903
302-739-4601
302-739-4654
BALesley@AOL.COM

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Ms. Bettye Topps
Executive Assistant
District of Columbia Public Schools
415 12th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20004
202-724-4222
202-727-1516

FLORIDA

Mr. Wayne Largent
Director, Office of Special Federal
Education Programs
Florida Department of Education
Florida Education Center, Room 522
325 West Gaines Street
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0400
904-488-6547
904-921-9059

GEORGIA

Mr. Mike Walker
Executive Director of School Improvement
Georgia Department of Education
1766 Twin Towers, East
205 Butler Street
Atlanta, GA 30334-5001
404-657-8763
404-657-7096

GUAM

Ms. Nerissa Bretania-Shafer
Administrator-Research, Planning &
Evaluation
Guam Department of Education
P.O. Box DE
Agana, Guam 96910
671-472-2241
671-477-3407

HAWAII

Ms. Patricia A. Sasaki
Acting Director, Planning and Evaluation
Office of the Superintendent
Hawaii Department of Education
1390 Miller Street
Honolulu, HI 96813
808-586-3285
808-586-3440

IDAHO

Mr. Darrell K. Loosle
Associate State Superintendent
Idaho Department of Education
P.O. Box 83720
Boise, ID 83720-0027
208-334-2111
208-334-2228

ILLINOIS

Mr. Thomas Kerins
Assistant Superintendent
Illinois State Board of Education
100 North First Street
Springfield, IL 62777
217-782-0322
217-782-6097

INDIANA

Ms. Linda Cornwell
Project Coordinator
Indiana Department of Education
Room 229, State House
Indianapolis, IN 46204-2798
317-232-9177
317-232-9121
lcornwell@ideanet.doe.state.in.us

IOWA

Mr. Marcus J. Haack
Chief, Bureau of Instructional Services
State Department of Education
Grimes State Office Building
East 14th & Grand Streets
Des Moines, IA 50319-0146
515-281-8141
515-242-6025

KANSAS

Mr. Ken Gentry
Team Leader, Kansas State Board of
Education
Kansas State Board of Education
120 SE 10th Avenue
Topeka, KS 66612-1182
913-296-2306
913-296-7933
pkelly@smtpgw.ksbe.state.ks.u

KENTUCKY

Mr. Joe Clark
Director, Division of Program Resources
Kentucky Department of Education
500 Mero Street
Frankfort, KY 40601
502-564-3141
502-564-5680

LOUISIANA

Raymond G. Arveson
State Superintendent of Education
Louisiana Department of Education
P.O. Box 94064
Baton Rouge, LA 70804-9064
504-342-3603
504-342-7316

MAINE

Ms. Heidi McGinley
Goals 2000 Manager
Maine Department of Education
State House Station #23
Augusta, ME 04333
207-287-5986
207-287-5927

MARYLAND

Ms. Phyllis Bailey
Coordinator of School Improvement
Strategies
Maryland Department of Education
200 West Baltimore Street
Baltimore, MD 21201
410-767-0520
410-333-0714

MASSACHUSETTS

Ms. Carole S. Thomson
Executive Director
Massachusetts Department of Education
350 Main Street
Malden, MA 02148
617-388-3300
617-388-3396

MICHIGAN

Ms. Theresa Staten
Chief Deputy Superintendent
Goals 2000
Michigan Department of Education
P.O. Box 30008
Lansing, MI 48909
517-373-3354
517-335-4565

MINNESOTA

Ms. Stephanie Parson
Education Specialist
State Coordinator Goals 2000
Minnesota Department of Education
550 Cedar Street
602 Capitol Square Building
St. Paul, MN 55101
612-296-1429
612-297-2845
sparsons@inet.educ.state.mn.us

MISSISSIPPI

Ms. Suzanne Ulmer
Director, Office of Innovative Support
Mississippi Department of Education
P.O. Box 771
Jackson, MS 39205
601-359-2561
601-359-2040

MISSOURI

Mr. Craig Rector
Assistant Director of Goals 2000
Missouri Department of Elementary and
Secondary Education
P.O. Box 480
205 Jefferson Street
Jefferson City, MO 65102-0480
314-526-3232
314-751-9434

MONTANA

Ms. Nancy Coopersmith
Administrator
Department of Accreditation and
Curriculum Services
Montana Office of Public Instruction
State Capitol
P.O. Box 202501
Helena, MT 59620-2501
406-444-5541
406-444-3924

NEBRASKA

Ms. Polly Feis
Assistant Commissioner
State Department of Education
P.O. Box 94987
301 Centennial Mall South
Lincoln, NE 68509-4987
402-471-5025
402-471-4433
pfeis@nde4.nde.state.ne.us

NEVADA

Mr. Roy Casey
Nevada Department of Education
Federal and Related Programs Branch
400 West King Street
Capitol Complex
Carson City, NV 89710
702-687-3187
702-687-4499

NEW JERSEY

Ms. Anne O'Dea
Goals 2000 Coordinator
New Jersey Department of Education
CN 500
Trenton, NJ 08625
609-984-7992
609-292-1645

NEW MEXICO

Ms. Denise Johnston
Director, Goals 2000 Unit
New Mexico Department of Education
300 Don Gaspar
Santa Fe, NM 87501
505-827-1230
505-827-6696

NEW YORK

Dr. Zelda Holcomb
Goals 2000
New York State Education Department
EBA 979
Albany, NY 12234
518-486-7155
518-518-7336

NORTH CAROLINA

Ms. Carolyn Cobb
Director
Division of Innovation and Development
North Carolina Department of Public
Instruction
301 North Wilmington Street
Raleigh, NC 27601-2825
919-715-1351
919-715-1204

NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. Ron Stastney
Assistant Superintendent
North Dakota Department of Public
Instruction
600 East Boulevard Avenue
Bismark, ND 58505-0440
701-255-4373
701-224-2461

OHIO

Mrs. Gene T. Harris
Assistant Superintendent of Public
Instruction
Ohio Department of Education
65 South Front Street, Room 810
Columbus, OH 43215-4183
614-728-5865
614-644-5960
sdea_harris@ode.ohio.gov

OKLAHOMA

Ms. Clarita Goodwin
Assistant State Superintendent
Oklahoma Department of Education
2500 North Lincoln Boulevard
Oklahoma City, OK 73105-4509
405-521-4513
405-521-2971

OREGON

Ms. Joanne Flint
Assistant Superintendent
Oregon Department of Education
Public Service Building
255 Capitol Street, NE
Salem, OR 97310-0203
503-378-8004
503-373-7968

PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. Gene F. Heyman
Goals 2000
Pennsylvania Department of Education
333 Market Street
Harrisburg, PA 17126-0333
717-787-7372
717-787-6900

PUERTO RICO

Ms. Janet T. Santana
Special Assistant to the Secretary
Puerto Rico Department of Education
P.O. Box 190759
Hato Rey, PR 00919-0759
809-753-1123
809-765-8845

RHODE ISLAND

Mr. Loreto Gandara
Goals 2000 Liaison
Rhode Island Department of
Elementary/Secondary Education
22 Hayes Street
Providence, RI 02908
401-277-3124
401-277-6178

SOUTH CAROLINA

Ms. Pamela P. Pritchett
South Carolina Department of Education
1429 Senate Street
Rutledge Building
Columbia, SC 29201
803-734-8277
803-734-6142

SOUTH DAKOTA

Ms. Margo Heinert
Department of Education and Cultural
Affairs
Office of the Secretary
700 Governors Drive
Pierre, SD 57501-2291
605-773-4699
605-773-6139
margoh@deca.state.sd.us

TENNESSEE

Ms. Amy Bearman
Executive Assistant to the Commissioner
Tennessee Department of Education
6th Floor Gateway Plaza
710 James Robertson Parkway
Nashville, TN 37243-0375
615-741-2731
615-741-6236
abearman@mail.state.tn.us

TEXAS

Ms. Chriss Cloudt
Executive Associate Commissioner
Policy Planning and Technology Services
Texas Education Agency
1701 North Congress Avenue
Austin, TX 78701-1494
512-463-9701
512-475-3499

UTAH

Mr. Bruce Griffin
Associate Superintendent
Utah State Office of Education
250 East 500 South
Salt Lake City, UT 84111
801-538-7760
801-538-7521
bgriffin@usoe.k12.us.us

VERMONT

Mr. Robert McNamara
External Manager of School Development
Vermont Department of Education
120 State Street
Montpelier, VT 05620
802-828-2752
802-828-3140
BOBMNAS@AOL.COM

VIRGIN ISLANDS

Mr. Hugh Smith, Jr.
Goals 2000 Contact
Federal Programs Director
44-46 Kongens Gade
St. Thomas, VI 00802
809-774-8315
809-776-5678

WASHINGTON

Mr. Hugh Walkup
Director, Goals 2000
Office of Superintendent of Public
Instruction
Old Capitol Building
P.O. Box 47200
Olympia, WA 98504-7200
360-753-3223
360-664-3314
H.WALKUP@INSPIRE.OSPI.WEDNET.
EDU

WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. Teddi Cox
Education First Coordinator
West Virginia Department of Education
Building 6, Room 252
1900 Kanawha Boulevard East
Charleston, WV 25305
304-558-2699
304-558-0882

WISCONSIN

Ms. Pauline Nikolay
Assistant Superintendent
Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction
125 South Webster Street
P.O. Box 7841
Madison, WI 53707-7841
608-266-3361
608-267-1052