

Govt Approps

SENATE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

MEMBER	CONTACT	ADDRESS	PHONE #	FAX
✓ 1 Mark Hatfield (OR) - Chair	Mark Landauer	711 Hart	224-3753	224-0276
2 Ted Stevens (AK)	Jane Rosenquist	522 Hart	224-3004	224-2354
3 Thad Cochran (MS)	Doris Dixon	326 Russell	224-5054	unpublished
← 4 Arlen Specter (PA)	Michael Kulis	530 Hart	224-4254	224-1893
← 5 Pete Domenici (NM)	Brian Jones	328 Hart	224-6621	unpublished
6 Phil Gramm (TX) - Bush Key	John Cerisano	370 Russell	224-2934	228-2856
7 Christopher Bond (MO)	Leanne Jerome	293 Russell	224-5721	224-8149
← 8 Slade Gorton (WA)	Peggy Jackson	730 Hart	224-3441	224-9393
← 9 Mitch McConnell (KY)	Robin Bowen	120 Russell	224-2541	224-2499
10 Connie Mack (FL)	Jamie Brown	517 Hart	224-5274	224-8022
11 Conrad Burns (MT)	Patty Deutsche	183 Dirksen	224-2644	224-8594
12 Richard Shelby (AL)	Phyllis Holman	509 Hart	224-5744	224-3416
✓ 13 James Jeffords (VT)	Pam Devitt	608 Hart	224-2962	unpublished
14 Judd Gregg (NH)	Alyssa Hamilton	393 Russell	224-3324	224-4952
← 15 <u>Robert Bennett (UT)</u>	Corine Larson	241 Dirksen	224-5444	224-6717

Subcommittees
Hatfield
Stevens
Cochran
Specter
Domenici

UPDATED: 02/14/95

SENATE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

MEMBER	CONTACT	ADDRESS	PHONE #	FAX
1 Robert Byrd (WV)	Leslie Staples	311 Hart	224-3954	unpublished
2 Daniel Inouye (HI)	Mavis Masaki	722 Hart	224-3934	224-6747
3 Ernest Hollings (SC)	Eddy Moore	125 Russell	224-6121	224-4293
4 J. Bennett Johnston (LA)	Amy Levin	136 Hart	224-1521	224-2952
5 Patrick Leahy (VT)	Maggie Whitney	433 Russell	224-4242	224-3595
6 Dale Bumpers (AR)	Mary Ann Chaffee	229 Dirksen	224-4843	224-6435
7 Frank Lautenberg (NJ)	Sander Lurie	506 Hart	224-4744	224-9707
8 Tom Harkin (IA)	Bev Schroeder	531 Hart	224-3254	228-2923
9 Barbara Mikulski (MD)	Anita Harwood	709 Hart	224-4654	224-8858
10 Harry Reid (NV)	Kim Bengtson	324 Hart	224-3542	224-7327
11 Bob Kerrey (NE)	Patty Sedon	303 Hart	224-6551	224-7645
12 Herb Kohl (WI)	Amy Barber	330 Hart	224-5653	224-9787
13 Patty Murray (WA)	Genie Fernald	111 Russell	224-2621	224-0238

COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND STAFF

APPROPRIATIONS

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT

SD-131 (ZIP: 20510-6030) 224-7260

Pete V. Domenici, NM, Chairman.

Mark O. Hatfield, OR
 Thad Cochran, MS
 Slade Gorton, WA
 Mitch McConnell, KY
 Robert F. Bennett, UT
 Conrad Burns, MT

J. Bennett Johnston, LA
 Robert C. Byrd, WV
 Ernest F. Hollings, SC
 Harry Reid, NV
 J. Robert Kerrey, NE
 Patty Murray, WA

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FOREIGN OPERATIONS

S125 CAPITOL (ZIP: 20510-6031) 224-7251

Mitch McConnell, KY, Chairman.

Arlen Specter, PA
 Connie Mack, FL
 Phil Gramm, TX
 James M. Jeffords, VT
 Judd Gregg, NH
 Richard C. Shelby, AL

Patrick J. Leahy, VT
 Daniel K. Inouye, HI
 Frank R. Lautenberg, NJ
 Tom Harkin, IA
 Barbara A. Mikulski, MD
 Patty Murray, WA

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERIOR

SD-127 (ZIP: 20510-6033) 224-7233

Slade Gorton, WA, Chairman.

Ted Stevens, AK
 Thad Cochran, MS
 Pete V. Domenici, NM
 Mark O. Hatfield, OR
 Conrad Burns, MT
 Robert F. Bennett, UT
 Connie Mack, FL

Robert C. Byrd, WV
 J. Bennett Johnston, LA
 Patrick J. Leahy, VT
 Dale Bumpers, AR
 Ernest F. Hollings, SC
 Harry Reid, NV
 Patty Murray, WA

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION

SD-184 (ZIP: 20510-6034) 224-7230

Arlen Specter, PA, Chairman.

Mark O. Hatfield, OR
 Thad Cochran, MS
 → Slade Gorton, WA
 Connie Mack, FL
 Christopher S. Bond, MO
 → James M. Jeffords, VT
 Judd Gregg, NH

Tom Harkin, IA
 Robert C. Byrd, WV
 Ernest F. Hollings, SC *els*
 Daniel K. Inouye, HI
 Dale Bumpers, AR *ae*
 Harry Reid, NV *ae*
 Herb Kohl, WI *ad*

Dan / Rockefeller

*Cochran
 Gorton
 J. Jeffords signed*

See Approp's Meeting

Invited - RWR

9:20

Sgt 12

Gar. All

Dennis -

M. Kalski

Harkin

Reid - Kewala

Hollings

Bumbers → Gen. W. Hart

Inouye -

Murray

refer Pres. Cant

Hankels → Proj. Rep. b

Phone call to Rep. has CMC as \$

Author: Mikel Morton at WDCB01
Date: 8/18/95 5:15 PM
Priority: Normal
TO: Mike Cohen
TO: Kay Casstevens
CC: Mike Smith at WDCT01
CC: Frank Holleman
CC: Scott Fleming at WDCE03
CC: Thomas Skelly at WDCT02
CC: Bill Cordes at WDCT02
CC: Susan Frost at WDCT02
CC: Susan Wiener at WDCT02
CC: Thomas Corwin at WDCT02
CC: Patricia Mathews at WDCT02
CC: Jennifer Davis at WDCB02
CC: Eleanor Briscoe at WDCT02
CC: Terry Peterson
TO: Sally Christensen at WDCT02
CC: Connie Jameson
CC: Gale Belton at WDCB02
CC: Vicky Stroud at WDCT01
CC: Bennie Jessup
CC: Regan Burke at WDCB02
CC: John Funderburk at WDCB02
CC: Katherine Signs
CC: Shawnrick Polk at WDCB02
CC: Jennifer Peck at WDCB02
CC: Mikel Morton
Subject: Sen. Specter's Goals 2000 Hearing

----- Message Contents -----

Sally,
on the Secretary's schedule, I've blocked off:
Spector Hearing: 9-11:30 am on Tuesday, Sept. 12
Briefing: Wed. Sept. 6, 1-2:30 pm (in the Secretary's office)
Fri. Sept. 8, 2:30-4:00
I've already alerted Mike Smith & Mike Cohen's schedules to these
times. Please alert others who need to be in on these briefings.

----- Reply Separator -----

Subject: Request from Sen. Specter for Goals 2000 Hearing
Author: Sally Christensen at WDCT02
Date: 8/18/95 12:39 PM

Mike and Kay:

Bettilou Taylor called me late yesterday (from her vacation) to see if the Secretary would be available at 9:30 a.m. on Tuesday, September 12, to testify on Goals 2000. The purpose of the hearing is to highlight the importance of Goals 2000 before the Subcommittee marks up, in the afternoon on that same day, its 1996 appropriations bill. Senator Specter wants to restore as much as he possibly can to Goals, and feels this hearing will help. He also intends to invite some other big names to follow the Secretary (such as Tommy Thompson). (He plans to hold a second hearing on Domestic Violence immediately following the Goals hearing.)

Working through Mikel Morton, Mike Smith, and Frank

Holleman, I was able to confirm this time on the Secretary's schedule and get back to Bettilou with a positive response. There is a possibility the Secretary will be asked to do something that day with the President on a Back-to-School program, but it was agreed that this could be worked around the hearing.

I have asked Bill Cordes, working with Mike Cohen, to develop a first draft of a statement. Since the hearing will be a relatively short one, I would suggest a really strong, short statement, using some of our more recent arguments such as those developed by Jennifer Davis.

I will be on travel Monday 8/21 through Wednesday 8/23, but have asked Bill Cordes to contact Mike Cohen first thing Monday to discuss this with him before beginning a draft. (Mike, if you want to proceed in another way, or want to have something drafted yourself, that of course would be fine.)

Mikel is also setting up a couple of briefing sessions for the Secretary on September 6 and 8, and will be coordinating with Mike Cohen on these.

If any of you need anything further while I am away, please feel free to call Bill Cordes, Tom Skelly, or Tom Corwin.

Thanks! Sally

Author: Susan Frost at WDCT02
Date: 8/11/95 6:45 PM
Priority: Normal
Receipt Requested
TO: Mike Smith at WDCT01
TO: Terry Peterson at WDCB01
TO: Mike Cohen at WDCB01
TO: Kay Casstevens at WDCB01
TO: Frank Holleman at WDCB01
TO: Kay Kahler at WDCB01
TO: Kevin Sullivan at WDCB01
TO: Mario Moreno at WDCE01
TO: Jennifer Davis at WDCB02
TO: Leslie Thornton at WDCB01
Subject: Budget update

----- Message Contents -----

Hope everyone who has been on vacation had a great time. I'll be at the beach the week of August 14th --- number is 302-537-2223.

I'm assuming our first lunch meeting is Monday the 21st at noon.

Many of you have this schedule but just in case ---

Week of September 11th -- BACK TO SCHOOL Focus of Events

11th --- House Cmte mark-up of reconciliation (student loans)
Possible mark-up of IDEA and Ed Reform Block Grant

12th --- Senate Subcmte mark-up of Labor, HHS, Ed bill

13th --- Senate Cmte mark-up of reconciliation (student loans)

14th --- Senate Full Appropriations Cmte mark-up

WEEK of September 18th --- Continuation of Back to School Events

House and Senate may consider reconciliation on floor

Senate may consider Labor, HHS, Ed bill on floor

WEEK of September 25th --- finish appropriations bills/mark-up
continuing resolution for bills that are not done or vetoed

Sunday, October 1st -- First trainwreck due -- beginning of FY1996.

We met with the ed groups on Thursday August 10th and distributed updated budget documents so they could be included in their mailings to their constituents that are going out now. We briefly discussed the Kassebaum and the welfare bill -- Louis relayed our position. Looks like we are all on the same page on this one. Tom P. discussed the language we had just gotten on the Ed Reform Block Grant. We seem to agree with the groups that this is a bad proposal. The next meeting will be Thursday, September 7th. If we need to meet with any of them before that we can do so on an ad hoc basis.

The groups will try to focus their energy on local budget events the week of Sept 11th. They will share details of those plans as they are told what is going on by their own people ...the idea is to stimulate a lot of activity across the country rather than try to control it from Washington. Many events the week of the 18th are in town. (President will do a video address for CEF dinner on 18th... I believe the Secretary has accepted their invitation...you all will also be invited and hopefully can attend.) Several groups are in town that week --- NEA, AFT, AASA and others have good size delegations.

Leslie continues to work with White House on a series of events/plans for the September budget battle --- President may visit a campus, may do a conference call with education leaders and satellite the conversation across different the country, etc. etc. Leslie has also been working on a letter from the Secretary informing all school districts of the potential cuts. There was no White House meeting on Friday the 11th.

As you know this was Kim's last week --- she promised to keep in touch via internet!!

Jennifer Peck begins working with me on budget on Monday the 21st and we will have a new intern from OHIO Patricia Hamlin also on the 21st.

Patricia is working on her teaching certificate at night so we will
job share an intern with OLCA to cover the later hours.

Think that's about it for now... see you the 21st.. susan

Author: Jennifer Davis at WDCB02

Date: 7/24/95 10:42 AM

Priority: Normal

TO: Kay Casstevens at WDCB01

TO: Mike Cohen at WDCB01

TO: Tom Wolanin at WDCE03

TO: Susan Frost at WDCT02

BCC: Jennifer Davis

Subject: Senate Appropriations Strategy for Goals

----- Message Contents -----

I got a call this morning from Senator Bingaman's new education staff person (who I worked with at the Goals Panel). She wants to work with us on a Senate appropriations strategy for Goals 2000. In addition, the Goals 2000 office got a call from Senator Breaux's office last week and he wants to help too. I think it would be a good idea for us to get together to talk about a Senate strategy. Sould we schedule a meeting this week?

Jennifer

B. Goals Appropriations Strategy: (MC, SF, MS, JD, DS, TP)

1. Build on general appropriations strategies:
2. Focus on Business folks: individuals and groups -- need endorsements, op-eds, etc. particularly those business people in key states (MC, JD)
3. Inter-governmental people: Govs? NASSB, Chiefs. (MC, JD)
4. Development of general grass-roots support:
 - o Get second year funds out. (TP, MC, DS)
 - o Move very quickly on overall state plans. (TP, MC, DS)
 - particulars* o Develop e-mail net-work of members of state planning councils and to others (KW, DS)
 - o Mailings to state planning councils and others about accomplishments of various states (MC, VP, KK)
 - o Work with special groups such as TD's teachers of the year (MC, TD others)
5. Support state reform in general:
 - o Organize Labs to hold conferences around state reforms (SR, DS, MC)
 - o Get out TA funds (DS, others)
 - o Work with disabled groups, bilingual groups etc. around G2000 (MC, DS, JH, GG)
6. State strategies: States to target: Need strategies: (MC, MM, JD)
 - o Oregon: Pennsylvania: *WM* Georgia: *Chio* Texas: Kansas:
Georgia: others
 - o Work with local people and state people
 - o Articles in local papers
 - o Visits by Riley etc.
7. Contact with Congressional people: Target to key states (MC, KC)

Appropriations Strategy

A. Overall: Need a Monday morning overall planning meeting: Mondays at 11:00 - 12:00 AM? Convene in OUS conference room -- Susan to bring together. MS, FH, SF, KK, TP, KC, DS, MC, MM.

1. White House General Strategy: to be worked out in Friday meetings. SF and KK to always be in attendance. MS to coordinate budget policy with OMB. KC to coordinate with Leg Affairs: FH to coordinate with Cabinet affairs.

2. Ed general strategy: Takes WH strategy into account

- o Involvement of ed groups orchestrated by SF working with Ed Groups and Thursday regular meetings. MS, SF

- o Involvement of Business groups and people and other inter-governmental groups: (SF, MC, JD)

- o Message Development -- Press releases -- events (including coordination with things like Back to School) -- press briefings..., op-eds: KK, FH, TP, DS, SF, MC:

- o Riley and Kunin speeches: KK, TP, FH, KS, TP.

- o Riley calls on Congresspeople and overall Congressional strategy: KC, TP, FH, SF

- o Involving Senior Staff and other in Dept. including regions: SF, FH (Cs), MM.

- o Involvement of other initiatives: Parents, reading, teachers. (TP, others as needed)

- o Internet and other Department information sources: SF, KW, MM.

- o Development of materials about programs working: (DS, AG, RT, SF, TC)

3. Development of Data, tables etc.: SC, MS, SF.

4. People needs:

- o Susan's working group -- is it going ok? Do you need others?

- o Schedule C appointment to replace Kim -- to be on-board by August 10th.

- o Others?

B. Goals Appropriations Strategy: (MC, SF, MS, JD, DS, TP)

1. Build on general appropriations strategies:
2. Focus on Business folks: individuals and groups -- need endorsements, op-eds, etc. particularly those business people in key states (MC, JD)
3. Inter-governmental people: Govs? NASSB, Chiefs. (MC, JD)
4. Development of general grass-roots support:
 - o Get second year funds out. (TP, MC, DS)
 - o Move very quickly on overall state plans. (TP, MC, DS)
 - o Develop e-mail net-work of members of state planning councils and to others (KW, DS)
 - o Mailings to state planning councils and others about accomplishments of various states (MC, VP, KK)
 - o Work with special groups such as TD's teachers of the year (MC, TD others)
5. Support state reform in general:
 - o Organize Labs to hold conferences around state reforms (SR, DS, MC)
 - o Get out TA funds (DS, others)
 - o Work with disabled groups, bilingual groups etc. around G2000 (MC, DS, JH, GG)
6. State strategies: States to target: Need strategies: (MC, MM, JD)
 - o Oregon: Pennsylvania: Georgia: Texas: Kansas: Georgia: others
 - o Work with local people and state people
 - o Articles in local papers
 - o Visits by Riley etc.
7. Contact with Congressional people: Target to key states (MC, KC)

① Apprentices Can the

- Haldel

- Jellus

- Harkin

- Specter

- Ech

- Mikulsk

Mernoy

Lehy

Lantals

② Of the down

③ Run - Gel

B. Goals Appropriations Strategy: (MC, SF, MS, JD, DS, TP)

1. Build on general appropriations strategies:
2. Focus on Business folks: individuals and groups -- need endorsements, op-eds, etc. particularly those business people in key states (MC, JD)
3. Inter-governmental people: Govs? NASSB, Chiefs. (MC, JD)
4. Development of general grass-roots support:
 - o Get second year funds out. (TP, MC, DS)
 - o Move very quickly on overall state plans. (TP, MC, DS)
 - o Develop e-mail net-work of members of state planning councils and to others (KW, DS)
 - o Mailings to state planning councils and others about accomplishments of various states (MC, VP, KK)
 - o Work with special groups such as TD's teachers of the year (MC, TD others)
5. Support state reform in general:
 - o Organize Labs to hold conferences around state reforms (SR, DS, MC)
 - o Get out TA funds (DS, others)
 - o Work with disabled groups, bilingual groups etc. around G2000 (MC, DS, JH, GG)
6. State strategies: States to target: Need strategies: (MC, MM, JD)
 - o Oregon: Pennsylvania: Georgia: Texas: Kansas: Georgia: others
 - o Work with local people and state people
 - o Articles in local papers
 - o Visits by Riley etc.
7. Contact with Congressional people: Target to key states (MC, KC)

B. Goals Appropriations Strategy: (MC, SF, MS, JD, DS, TP)

1. Build on general appropriations strategies:
2. Focus on Business folks: individuals and groups -- need endorsements, op-eds, etc. particularly those business people in key states (MC, JD)
3. Inter-governmental people: Govs? NASSB, Chiefs. (MC, JD)
4. Development of general grass-roots support:
 - o Get second year funds out. (TP, MC, DS)
 - o Move very quickly on overall state plans. (TP, MC, DS)
 - o Develop e-mail net-work of members of state planning councils and to others (KW, DS)
 - o Mailings to state planning councils and others about accomplishments of various states (MC, VP, KK).
 - o Work with special groups such as TD's teachers of the year (MC, TD others)
5. Support state reform in general:
 - o Organize Labs to hold conferences around state reforms (SR, DS, MC)
 - o Get out TA funds (DS, others)
 - o Work with disabled groups, bilingual groups etc. around G2000 (MC, DS, JH, GG)
6. State strategies: States to target: Need strategies: (MC, MM, JD)
 - o Oregon: Pennsylvania: Georgia: Texas: Kansas: Georgia: others
 - o Work with local people and state people
 - o Articles in local papers
 - o Visits by Riley etc.
7. Contact with Congressional people: Target to key states (MC, KC)

DRAFT GOALS 2000 TESTIMONY FOR SEPT. 12 SPECTER HEARING

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee:

DRAFT
AUG 23 1995

Let me begin by saying how much I appreciate this opportunity to testify in support of the Goals 2000: Educate America Act. We believe that Goals 2000 fulfills an essential Federal role by providing financial support for State and local reform efforts based on challenging academic standards. Unfortunately, there is a great deal of misunderstanding about Goals 2000 and what it does and does not do.

Just to give you one example, Mr. Chairman, the *Indianapolis News* recently ran a piece that was sharply critical of the history standards announced last year by a Federally funded panel. You may recall that the Senate subsequently voted to denounce those standards by a 99-1 margin. Whatever the merits of those standards, one fact is not in dispute: it was the Bush Administration and former Secretary Lamar Alexander that in 1991 selected the panel and awarded the funds to support its work. Despite this fact, the story in the *Indianapolis News* asserted that the panel was "created by the Clinton administration's Goals 2000 Act."

I believe this kind of misinformation is one reason that Goals 2000 is now under attack in the House of Representatives, which has chosen to eliminate funding for the program in its fiscal year 1996 appropriations bill. So I am very happy to be here today to set the record straight. My testimony this morning will set forth very briefly what

Goals 2000 is, what it isn't, what States and communities are doing with Goals 2000 dollars, and what would be lost if Congress abandons the program.

WHAT IS GOALS 2000?

The Goals 2000: Educate America Act was the culmination of several years of effort in Congress — with substantial involvement from outside groups from across the political spectrum sharing an interest in education — to hammer out a bipartisan consensus on how best to provide national support for State and local education reform. It reflects the best of what we know about the key ingredients of successful educational improvement: challenging academic standards, comprehensive planning, parental and community involvement, and flexibility in the use of Federal funding.

Goals 2000 is a new partnership between the Federal government and States and communities working to improve their schools. Like any successful partnership, Goals 2000 involves specific commitments from the partners. The Federal government provides financial assistance and gives States and communities great flexibility in using Federal funds to support State and local education reforms. In exchange, States and communities develop their own challenging academic standards for all students, and incorporate those standards into comprehensive reform plans.

Each of the key elements of Goals 2000 was a direct response to the recommendations of the Nation's Governors at the 1989 Education Summit. At the Summit hosted by President Bush in Charlottesville, Virginia, the Governors called for the adoption of high academic standards and, because they recognized the helping all students reach high standards would require changing the entire education system, every Governor pledged to launch comprehensive approaches to reform. The Governors also asked for greater flexibility in the use of Federal funds in exchange for accountability for results. These results were to be measured by improved student achievement, not by compliance with Federal regulations. Goals 2000 meets this request as well: the Department has issued no regulations for Goals 2000.

Ninety percent of the dollars that this Subcommittee appropriates for Goals 2000 flow directly to local school districts. These funds are used for, among other things, establishing challenging academic standards in core subjects, implementing existing school improvement plans, promoting greater parental involvement, designing programs that meet the specific needs of local students, improving professional development for teachers, bringing technology into the classroom, and building local partnerships to improve education.

MYTHS AND MISCONCEPTIONS ABOUT GOALS 2000

Unfortunately — as I mentioned in my opening remarks — the current debate over Goals 2000 rests largely on misconceptions about what the program actually does. Most of these misconceptions arise from allegations that Goals 2000 is some kind of Trojan Horse aimed at undermining local control of education. The same misstatements about Goals 2000 have been repeated so often that I personally have concluded that they reflect a disinformation campaign organized by groups that are opposed to any Federal role in education.

Whatever the source, the false assertions are without exception easily refuted. Perhaps the most common statement, and one that I have often seen attributed to certain Members of the House who oppose Goals 2000, is that it will lead to a Federal takeover of local education. As a former Governor of South Carolina, I am very sensitive to concerns about Federal intrusion in local affairs, and I am a strong believer in the long American tradition of local control of education. I would not have supported Goals 2000 if I thought it remotely threatened to undermine that tradition. You don't have to take my word on that, however, just look at the statute itself. Sections 318 states that Federal officials may not direct or control the expenditure of State and local education funds, and Section 319 specifically reaffirms that control of education is reserved to States and local school systems. Clearly, those who warn of a Federal takeover are raising fears without a shred of justification.

Another related allegation is that Goals 2000 will force Outcome-Based Education on local school districts. I know that concern over the OBE approach has been an issue in your home State, Mr. Chairman. I believe you would agree, however, that Goals 2000 does not promote any particular education philosophy. Goals 2000 focuses on improving academic achievement, but leaves decisions regarding how to accomplish this entirely up to States and communities.

The standards called for in Goals 2000 are another source of confusion. One of the subtexts of the outcry over the model national history standards was the implication that Goals 2000 would mandate the adoption of those standards or others like them. This simply isn't true. Goals 2000 does require States and schools to develop or adopt challenging academic standards, but it does not specify any particular standards. Nor will Goals 2000 control what is taught in the classroom by constituting a kind of "national school board," as some have charged with regard to the National Education Standards and Improvement Council. Under Goals 2000, States and school districts determine their own academic standards. They may choose to adopt voluntary national standards developed by professional organizations, such as the widely praised math standards created by the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, or to design their own standards outlining what they want their children to learn. The decision, however, is entirely up to them.

One last example, this one a myth most recently perpetuated by the House Budget Committee. Its report accompanying the 1996 House Budget Resolution justified the elimination of Goals 2000 because it "increases funding for bureaucracy and imposes new regulations on States and localities." The Committee is just flat wrong on both counts. We are using a team of existing staff to administer the new program, and as I have already mentioned, there are no regulations for Goals 2000. I urge the Members of this Subcommittee to ask your State education officials how much trouble it was to complete the first-year Goals 2000 application: the form was just 4 pages long and asked only for information required by law to award funds.

HOW ARE STATES AND DISTRICTS USING GOALS 2000 DOLLARS?

This Subcommittee helped to jumpstart Goals 2000 two years ago by providing an advance appropriation that allowed the Department to begin implementation immediately after the President signed the Goals 2000: Educate America Act into law. As a result, all States desiring to participate — 47 at last count — have received their first-year grants and we are now making second-year awards.

The response to Goals 2000 has been enthusiastic, and States have found Goals 2000 to be a "user-friendly" program, both because of our regulation-free, streamlined application process and because of the flexibility to adapt the program to pre-existing reform efforts. In Michigan, for example, 13 Upper Peninsula school

districts are working with May Mills Community College and Lake Superior University to train teachers in the use of technology to improve math and science learning in rural communities. In Kentucky, Goals 2000 is helping Harrison County to strengthen parental involvement in education by training teachers to recruit parents as volunteer instructional aides and by reaching out to parents through cable television programs and homework hotlines.

In Portland, Oregon, a Goals 2000 subgrant is helping to turn Jefferson High School into a science and math magnet school, with support from the Oregon Health Sciences University and Portland State University. Massachusetts is using Goals 2000 funds to pay the start-up costs of 14 charter schools. And in Kansas, where the State Board of Education has developed academic standards and assessments in core subject areas, Goals 2000 funds will be used to help districts and schools incorporate the new standards and assessments in classroom teaching.

These examples demonstrate clearly the wide range of activities that Goals 2000 funding supports, as well as some of the ways that States and communities have been able to integrate Goals 2000 into existing reforms. Far from leading to a "takeover" of local education, the Federal role under Goals 2000 has been that of a supportive partner.

For fiscal year 1996, President Clinton has proposed to expand this partnership by providing \$750 million for Goals 2000. This level of funding could help as many as 17,000 schools raise standards, increase accountability, improve discipline, and increase parent involvement. The House, citing "the tight budgetary environment," did not provide any funding for Goals 2000. I believe the House action, unless reversed by the Senate, threatens to deal a tremendous setback to education reform in America, one from which we might not recover for a good many years.

MAINTAINING OUR MOMENTUM

Eleven years after *A Nation At Risk* warned that declining educational achievement threatened America's economic competitiveness in the world economy, and five years after the Nation's governors agreed on six National Education Goals for the year 2000, Goals 2000 is giving a much-needed shot in the arm to education reform.

Education reform is a high-stakes enterprise for America. In our rapidly changing, technology-based economy, education divides those of our citizens who can compete and succeed in the global economy from those whose standard of living is declining along with their wages. And unless we reverse this division by raising the educational achievement and skills of all Americans, we will surely fall from the top rank of nations.

Successful education reform requires a sustained, long-term commitment. With Goals 2000, we are out of the blocks and rounding the first turn, and we cannot afford to sacrifice the momentum achieved by nearly all the States and hundreds of communities. Senator Jeffords doubtless was referring to this momentum when he recently wrote: "We have no time to wait and argue about the politics of implementing higher standards in education. . . we must keep moving forward."

If you share my belief that the Federal government has a vital role to play in supporting State and local efforts to improve the quality of education in America for all students, then Goals 2000 is the vehicle for that support. If it didn't already exist, you would have to invent it. It is the only responsible and accountable way to spend taxpayer dollars on education reform. That's what House authorizers are discovering as they work on their Education Reform Block Grant proposal. Billed as a replacement for Goals 2000 and other school improvement programs, early drafts of the proposal have included standards, assessments, and comprehensive reform plans. In other words, it sounds a lot like Goals 2000.

The real Goals 2000 is already making a difference in States and communities across America. It is helping to improve academic achievement, increase parental involvement, and bring technology into the classroom. It is reducing bureaucratic red-tape and regulation and bringing new flexibility to the Federal role in education. And it is maintaining the tradition of local control of our schools. It makes no sense to abandon

the effort now, to start over and reinvent the wheel. I urge you to renew the Federal commitment to effective education reform by restoring funding for Goals 2000.

I will be happy to answer any questions you might have.

DRAFT GOALS 2000 TESTIMONY FOR SEPT. 12 SPECTER HEARING

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee:

DRAFT
AUG 23 1995

Let me begin by saying how much I appreciate this opportunity to testify in support of the Goals 2000: Educate America Act. We believe that Goals 2000 fulfills an essential Federal role by providing financial support for State and local reform efforts based on challenging academic standards. Unfortunately, there is a great deal of misunderstanding about Goals 2000 and what it does and does not do.

Just to give you one example, Mr. Chairman, the *Indianapolis News* recently ran a piece that was sharply critical of the history standards announced last year by a Federally funded panel. You may recall that the Senate subsequently voted to denounce those standards by a 99-1 margin. Whatever the merits of those standards, one fact is not in dispute: it was the Bush Administration and former Secretary Lamar Alexander that in 1991 selected the panel and awarded the funds to support its work. Despite this fact, the story in the *Indianapolis News* asserted that the panel was "created by the Clinton administration's Goals 2000 Act."

I believe this kind of misinformation is one reason that Goals 2000 is now under attack in the House of Representatives, which has chosen to eliminate funding for the program in its fiscal year 1996 appropriations bill. So I am very happy to be here today to set the record straight. My testimony this morning will set forth very briefly what

Goals 2000 is, what it isn't, what States and communities are doing with Goals 2000 dollars, and what would be lost if Congress abandons the program.

WHAT IS GOALS 2000?

The Goals 2000: Educate America Act was the culmination of several years of effort in Congress — with substantial involvement from outside groups from across the political spectrum sharing an interest in education — to hammer out a bipartisan consensus on how best to provide national support for State and local education reform. It reflects the best of what we know about the key ingredients of successful educational improvement: challenging academic standards, comprehensive planning, parental and community involvement, and flexibility in the use of Federal funding.

Goals 2000 is a new partnership between the Federal government and States and communities working to improve their schools. Like any successful partnership, Goals 2000 involves specific commitments from the partners. The Federal government provides financial assistance and gives States and communities great flexibility in using Federal funds to support State and local education reforms. In exchange, States and communities develop their own challenging academic standards for all students, and incorporate those standards into comprehensive reform plans.

Each of the key elements of Goals 2000 was a direct response to the recommendations of the Nation's Governors at the 1989 Education Summit. At the Summit hosted by President Bush in Charlottesville, Virginia, the Governors called for the adoption of high academic standards and, because they recognized the helping all students reach high standards would require changing the entire education system, every Governor pledged to launch comprehensive approaches to reform. The Governors also asked for greater flexibility in the use of Federal funds in exchange for accountability for results. These results were to be measured by improved student achievement, not by compliance with Federal regulations. Goals 2000 meets this request as well: the Department has issued no regulations for Goals 2000.

Ninety percent of the dollars that this Subcommittee appropriates for Goals 2000 flow directly to local school districts. These funds are used for, among other things, establishing challenging academic standards in core subjects, implementing existing school improvement plans, promoting greater parental involvement, designing programs that meet the specific needs of local students, improving professional development for teachers, bringing technology into the classroom, and building local partnerships to improve education.

MYTHS AND MISCONCEPTIONS ABOUT GOALS 2000

Unfortunately — as I mentioned in my opening remarks — the current debate over Goals 2000 rests largely on misconceptions about what the program actually does. Most of these misconceptions arise from allegations that Goals 2000 is some kind of Trojan Horse aimed at undermining local control of education. The same misstatements about Goals 2000 have been repeated so often that I personally have concluded that they reflect a disinformation campaign organized by groups that are opposed to any Federal role in education.

Whatever the source, the false assertions are without exception easily refuted. Perhaps the most common statement, and one that I have often seen attributed to certain Members of the House who oppose Goals 2000, is that it will lead to a Federal takeover of local education. As a former Governor of South Carolina, I am very sensitive to concerns about Federal intrusion in local affairs, and I am a strong believer in the long American tradition of local control of education. I would not have supported Goals 2000 if I thought it remotely threatened to undermine that tradition. You don't have to take my word on that, however, just look at the statute itself. Sections 318 states that Federal officials may not direct or control the expenditure of State and local education funds, and Section 319 specifically reaffirms that control of education is reserved to States and local school systems. Clearly, those who warn of a Federal takeover are raising fears without a shred of justification.

Another related allegation is that Goals 2000 will force Outcome-Based Education on local school districts. I know that concern over the OBE approach has been an issue in your home State, Mr. Chairman. I believe you would agree, however, that Goals 2000 does not promote any particular education philosophy. Goals 2000 focuses on improving academic achievement, but leaves decisions regarding how to accomplish this entirely up to States and communities.

The standards called for in Goals 2000 are another source of confusion. One of the subtexts of the outcry over the model national history standards was the implication that Goals 2000 would mandate the adoption of those standards or others like them. This simply isn't true. Goals 2000 does require States and schools to develop or adopt challenging academic standards, but it does not specify any particular standards. Nor will Goals 2000 control what is taught in the classroom by constituting a kind of "national school board," as some have charged with regard to the National Education Standards and Improvement Council. Under Goals 2000, States and school districts determine their own academic standards. They may choose to adopt voluntary national standards developed by professional organizations, such as the widely praised math standards created by the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, or to design their own standards outlining what they want their children to learn. The decision, however, is entirely up to them.

One last example, this one a myth most recently perpetuated by the House Budget Committee. Its report accompanying the 1996 House Budget Resolution justified the elimination of Goals 2000 because it "increases funding for bureaucracy and imposes new regulations on States and localities." The Committee is just flat wrong on both counts. We are using a team of existing staff to administer the new program, and as I have already mentioned, there are no regulations for Goals 2000. I urge the Members of this Subcommittee to ask your State education officials how much trouble it was to complete the first-year Goals 2000 application: the form was just 4 pages long and asked only for information required by law to award funds.

HOW ARE STATES AND DISTRICTS USING GOALS 2000 DOLLARS?

This Subcommittee helped to jumpstart Goals 2000 two years ago by providing an advance appropriation that allowed the Department to begin implementation immediately after the President signed the Goals 2000: Educate America Act into law. As a result, all States desiring to participate — 47 at last count — have received their first-year grants and we are now making second-year awards.

The response to Goals 2000 has been enthusiastic, and States have found Goals 2000 to be a "user-friendly" program, both because of our regulation-free, streamlined application process and because of the flexibility to adapt the program to pre-existing reform efforts. In Michigan, for example, 13 Upper Peninsula school

districts are working with May Mills Community College and Lake Superior University to train teachers in the use of technology to improve math and science learning in rural communities. In Kentucky, Goals 2000 is helping Harrison County to strengthen parental involvement in education by training teachers to recruit parents as volunteer instructional aides and by reaching out to parents through cable television programs and homework hotlines.

In Portland, Oregon, a Goals 2000 subgrant is helping to turn Jefferson High School into a science and math magnet school, with support from the Oregon Health Sciences University and Portland State University. Massachusetts is using Goals 2000 funds to pay the start-up costs of 14 charter schools. And in Kansas, where the State Board of Education has developed academic standards and assessments in core subject areas, Goals 2000 funds will be used to help districts and schools incorporate the new standards and assessments in classroom teaching.

These examples demonstrate clearly the wide range of activities that Goals 2000 funding supports, as well as some of the ways that States and communities have been able to integrate Goals 2000 into existing reforms. Far from leading to a "takeover" of local education, the Federal role under Goals 2000 has been that of a supportive partner.

For fiscal year 1996, President Clinton has proposed to expand this partnership by providing \$750 million for Goals 2000. This level of funding could help as many as 17,000 schools raise standards, increase accountability, improve discipline, and increase parent involvement. The House, citing "the tight budgetary environment," did not provide any funding for Goals 2000. I believe the House action, unless reversed by the Senate, threatens to deal a tremendous setback to education reform in America, one from which we might not recover for a good many years.

MAINTAINING OUR MOMENTUM

Eleven years after *A Nation At Risk* warned that declining educational achievement threatened America's economic competitiveness in the world economy, and five years after the Nation's governors agreed on six National Education Goals for the year 2000, Goals 2000 is giving a much-needed shot in the arm to education reform.

Education reform is a high-stakes enterprise for America. In our rapidly changing, technology-based economy, education divides those of our citizens who can compete and succeed in the global economy from those whose standard of living is declining along with their wages. And unless we reverse this division by raising the educational achievement and skills of all Americans, we will surely fall from the top rank of nations.

Successful education reform requires a sustained, long-term commitment. With Goals 2000, we are out of the blocks and rounding the first turn, and we cannot afford to sacrifice the momentum achieved by nearly all the States and hundreds of communities. Senator Jeffords doubtless was referring to this momentum when he recently wrote: "We have no time to wait and argue about the politics of implementing higher standards in education. . . we must keep moving forward."

If you share my belief that the Federal government has a vital role to play in supporting State and local efforts to improve the quality of education in America for all students, then Goals 2000 is the vehicle for that support. If it didn't already exist, you would have to invent it. It is the only responsible and accountable way to spend taxpayer dollars on education reform. That's what House authorizers are discovering as they work on their Education Reform Block Grant proposal. Billed as a replacement for Goals 2000 and other school improvement programs, early drafts of the proposal have included standards, assessments, and comprehensive reform plans. In other words, it sounds a lot like Goals 2000.

The real Goals 2000 is already making a difference in States and communities across America. It is helping to improve academic achievement, increase parental involvement, and bring technology into the classroom. It is reducing bureaucratic red-tape and regulation and bringing new flexibility to the Federal role in education. And it is maintaining the tradition of local control of our schools. It makes no sense to abandon

the effort now, to start over and reinvent the wheel. I urge you to renew the Federal commitment to effective education reform by restoring funding for Goals 2000.

I will be happy to answer any questions you might have.

DRAFT GOALS 2000 TESTIMONY FOR SEPT. 12 SPECTER HEARING

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee:

DRAFT
AUG 23 1995

Let me begin by saying how much I appreciate this opportunity to testify in support of the Goals 2000: Educate America Act. We believe that Goals 2000 fulfills an essential Federal role by providing financial support for State and local reform efforts based on challenging academic standards. Unfortunately, there is a great deal of misunderstanding about Goals 2000 and what it does and does not do.

Just to give you one example, Mr. Chairman, the *Indianapolis News* recently ran a piece that was sharply critical of the history standards announced last year by a Federally funded panel. You may recall that the Senate subsequently voted to denounce those standards by a 99-1 margin. Whatever the merits of those standards, one fact is not in dispute: it was the Bush Administration and former Secretary Lamar Alexander that in 1991 selected the panel and awarded the funds to support its work. Despite this fact, the story in the *Indianapolis News* asserted that the panel was "created by the Clinton administration's Goals 2000 Act."

I believe this kind of misinformation is one reason that Goals 2000 is now under attack in the House of Representatives, which has chosen to eliminate funding for the program in its fiscal year 1996 appropriations bill. So I am very happy to be here today to set the record straight. My testimony this morning will set forth very briefly what

Goals 2000 is, what it isn't, what States and communities are doing with Goals 2000 dollars, and what would be lost if Congress abandons the program.

WHAT IS GOALS 2000?

The Goals 2000: Educate America Act was the culmination of several years of effort in Congress — with substantial involvement from outside groups from across the political spectrum sharing an interest in education — to hammer out a bipartisan consensus on how best to provide national support for State and local education reform. It reflects the best of what we know about the key ingredients of successful educational improvement: challenging academic standards, comprehensive planning, parental and community involvement, and flexibility in the use of Federal funding.

Goals 2000 is a new partnership between the Federal government and States and communities working to improve their schools. Like any successful partnership, Goals 2000 involves specific commitments from the partners. The Federal government provides financial assistance and gives States and communities great flexibility in using Federal funds to support State and local education reforms. In exchange, States and communities develop their own challenging academic standards for all students, and incorporate those standards into comprehensive reform plans.

Each of the key elements of Goals 2000 was a direct response to the recommendations of the Nation's Governors at the 1989 Education Summit. At the Summit hosted by President Bush in Charlottesville, Virginia, the Governors called for the adoption of high academic standards and, because they recognized the helping all students reach high standards would require changing the entire education system, every Governor pledged to launch comprehensive approaches to reform. The Governors also asked for greater flexibility in the use of Federal funds in exchange for accountability for results. These results were to be measured by improved student achievement, not by compliance with Federal regulations. Goals 2000 meets this request as well: the Department has issued no regulations for Goals 2000.

Ninety percent of the dollars that this Subcommittee appropriates for Goals 2000 flow directly to local school districts. These funds are used for, among other things, establishing challenging academic standards in core subjects, implementing existing school improvement plans, promoting greater parental involvement, designing programs that meet the specific needs of local students, improving professional development for teachers, bringing technology into the classroom, and building local partnerships to improve education.

MYTHS AND MISCONCEPTIONS ABOUT GOALS 2000

Unfortunately — as I mentioned in my opening remarks — the current debate over Goals 2000 rests largely on misconceptions about what the program actually does. Most of these misconceptions arise from allegations that Goals 2000 is some kind of Trojan Horse aimed at undermining local control of education. The same misstatements about Goals 2000 have been repeated so often that I personally have concluded that they reflect a disinformation campaign organized by groups that are opposed to any Federal role in education.

Whatever the source, the false assertions are without exception easily refuted. Perhaps the most common statement, and one that I have often seen attributed to certain Members of the House who oppose Goals 2000, is that it will lead to a Federal takeover of local education. As a former Governor of South Carolina, I am very sensitive to concerns about Federal intrusion in local affairs, and I am a strong believer in the long American tradition of local control of education. I would not have supported Goals 2000 if I thought it remotely threatened to undermine that tradition. You don't have to take my word on that, however, just look at the statute itself. Sections 318 states that Federal officials may not direct or control the expenditure of State and local education funds, and Section 319 specifically reaffirms that control of education is reserved to States and local school systems. Clearly, those who warn of a Federal takeover are raising fears without a shred of justification.

Another related allegation is that Goals 2000 will force Outcome-Based Education on local school districts. I know that concern over the OBE approach has been an issue in your home State, Mr. Chairman. I believe you would agree, however, that Goals 2000 does not promote any particular education philosophy. Goals 2000 focuses on improving academic achievement, but leaves decisions regarding how to accomplish this entirely up to States and communities.

The standards called for in Goals 2000 are another source of confusion. One of the subtexts of the outcry over the model national history standards was the implication that Goals 2000 would mandate the adoption of those standards or others like them. This simply isn't true. Goals 2000 does require States and schools to develop or adopt challenging academic standards, but it does not specify any particular standards. Nor will Goals 2000 control what is taught in the classroom by constituting a kind of "national school board," as some have charged with regard to the National Education Standards and Improvement Council. Under Goals 2000, States and school districts determine their own academic standards. They may choose to adopt voluntary national standards developed by professional organizations, such as the widely praised math standards created by the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, or to design their own standards outlining what they want their children to learn. The decision, however, is entirely up to them.

One last example, this one a myth most recently perpetuated by the House Budget Committee. Its report accompanying the 1996 House Budget Resolution justified the elimination of Goals 2000 because it "increases funding for bureaucracy and imposes new regulations on States and localities." The Committee is just flat wrong on both counts. We are using a team of existing staff to administer the new program, and as I have already mentioned, there are no regulations for Goals 2000. I urge the Members of this Subcommittee to ask your State education officials how much trouble it was to complete the first-year Goals 2000 application: the form was just 4 pages long and asked only for information required by law to award funds.

HOW ARE STATES AND DISTRICTS USING GOALS 2000 DOLLARS?

This Subcommittee helped to jumpstart Goals 2000 two years ago by providing an advance appropriation that allowed the Department to begin implementation immediately after the President signed the Goals 2000: Educate America Act into law. As a result, all States desiring to participate — 47 at last count — have received their first-year grants and we are now making second-year awards.

The response to Goals 2000 has been enthusiastic, and States have found Goals 2000 to be a "user-friendly" program, both because of our regulation-free, streamlined application process and because of the flexibility to adapt the program to pre-existing reform efforts. In Michigan, for example, 13 Upper Peninsula school

districts are working with May Mills Community College and Lake Superior University to train teachers in the use of technology to improve math and science learning in rural communities. In Kentucky, Goals 2000 is helping Harrison County to strengthen parental involvement in education by training teachers to recruit parents as volunteer instructional aides and by reaching out to parents through cable television programs and homework hotlines.

In Portland, Oregon, a Goals 2000 subgrant is helping to turn Jefferson High School into a science and math magnet school, with support from the Oregon Health Sciences University and Portland State University. Massachusetts is using Goals 2000 funds to pay the start-up costs of 14 charter schools. And in Kansas, where the State Board of Education has developed academic standards and assessments in core subject areas, Goals 2000 funds will be used to help districts and schools incorporate the new standards and assessments in classroom teaching.

These examples demonstrate clearly the wide range of activities that Goals 2000 funding supports, as well as some of the ways that States and communities have been able to integrate Goals 2000 into existing reforms. Far from leading to a "takeover" of local education, the Federal role under Goals 2000 has been that of a supportive partner.

For fiscal year 1996, President Clinton has proposed to expand this partnership by providing \$750 million for Goals 2000. This level of funding could help as many as 17,000 schools raise standards, increase accountability, improve discipline, and increase parent involvement. The House, citing "the tight budgetary environment," did not provide any funding for Goals 2000. I believe the House action, unless reversed by the Senate, threatens to deal a tremendous setback to education reform in America, one from which we might not recover for a good many years.

MAINTAINING OUR MOMENTUM

Eleven years after *A Nation At Risk* warned that declining educational achievement threatened America's economic competitiveness in the world economy, and five years after the Nation's governors agreed on six National Education Goals for the year 2000, Goals 2000 is giving a much-needed shot in the arm to education reform.

Education reform is a high-stakes enterprise for America. In our rapidly changing, technology-based economy, education divides those of our citizens who can compete and succeed in the global economy from those whose standard of living is declining along with their wages. And unless we reverse this division by raising the educational achievement and skills of all Americans, we will surely fall from the top rank of nations.

Successful education reform requires a sustained, long-term commitment. With Goals 2000, we are out of the blocks and rounding the first turn, and we cannot afford to sacrifice the momentum achieved by nearly all the States and hundreds of communities. Senator Jeffords doubtless was referring to this momentum when he recently wrote: "We have no time to wait and argue about the politics of implementing higher standards in education. . . we must keep moving forward."

If you share my belief that the Federal government has a vital role to play in supporting State and local efforts to improve the quality of education in America for all students, then Goals 2000 is the vehicle for that support. If it didn't already exist, you would have to invent it. It is the only responsible and accountable way to spend taxpayer dollars on education reform. That's what House authorizers are discovering as they work on their Education Reform Block Grant proposal. Billed as a replacement for Goals 2000 and other school improvement programs, early drafts of the proposal have included standards, assessments, and comprehensive reform plans. In other words, it sounds a lot like Goals 2000.

The real Goals 2000 is already making a difference in States and communities across America. It is helping to improve academic achievement, increase parental involvement, and bring technology into the classroom. It is reducing bureaucratic red-tape and regulation and bringing new flexibility to the Federal role in education. And it is maintaining the tradition of local control of our schools. It makes no sense to abandon

the effort now, to start over and reinvent the wheel. I urge you to renew the Federal commitment to effective education reform by restoring funding for Goals 2000.

I will be happy to answer any questions you might have.

DRAFT GOALS 2000 TESTIMONY FOR SEPT. 12 SPECTER HEARING

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee:

DRAFT
AUG 23 1995

Let me begin by saying how much I appreciate this opportunity to testify in support of the Goals 2000: Educate America Act. We believe that Goals 2000 fulfills an essential Federal role by providing financial support for State and local reform efforts based on challenging academic standards. Unfortunately, there is a great deal of misunderstanding about Goals 2000 and what it does and does not do.

Just to give you one example, Mr. Chairman, the *Indianapolis News* recently ran a piece that was sharply critical of the history standards announced last year by a Federally funded panel. You may recall that the Senate subsequently voted to denounce those standards by a 99-1 margin. Whatever the merits of those standards, one fact is not in dispute: it was the Bush Administration and former Secretary Lamar Alexander that in 1991 selected the panel and awarded the funds to support its work. Despite this fact, the story in the *Indianapolis News* asserted that the panel was "created by the Clinton administration's Goals 2000 Act."

I believe this kind of misinformation is one reason that Goals 2000 is now under attack in the House of Representatives, which has chosen to eliminate funding for the program in its fiscal year 1996 appropriations bill. So I am very happy to be here today to set the record straight. My testimony this morning will set forth very briefly what

Goals 2000 is, what it isn't, what States and communities are doing with Goals 2000 dollars, and what would be lost if Congress abandons the program.

WHAT IS GOALS 2000?

The Goals 2000: Educate America Act was the culmination of several years of effort in Congress — with substantial involvement from outside groups from across the political spectrum sharing an interest in education — to hammer out a bipartisan consensus on how best to provide national support for State and local education reform. It reflects the best of what we know about the key ingredients of successful educational improvement: challenging academic standards, comprehensive planning, parental and community involvement, and flexibility in the use of Federal funding.

Goals 2000 is a new partnership between the Federal government and States and communities working to improve their schools. Like any successful partnership, Goals 2000 involves specific commitments from the partners. The Federal government provides financial assistance and gives States and communities great flexibility in using Federal funds to support State and local education reforms. In exchange, States and communities develop their own challenging academic standards for all students, and incorporate those standards into comprehensive reform plans.

Each of the key elements of Goals 2000 was a direct response to the recommendations of the Nation's Governors at the 1989 Education Summit. At the Summit hosted by President Bush in Charlottesville, Virginia, the Governors called for the adoption of high academic standards and, because they recognized the helping all students reach high standards would require changing the entire education system, every Governor pledged to launch comprehensive approaches to reform. The Governors also asked for greater flexibility in the use of Federal funds in exchange for accountability for results. These results were to be measured by improved student achievement, not by compliance with Federal regulations. Goals 2000 meets this request as well: the Department has issued no regulations for Goals 2000.

Ninety percent of the dollars that this Subcommittee appropriates for Goals 2000 flow directly to local school districts. These funds are used for, among other things, establishing challenging academic standards in core subjects, implementing existing school improvement plans, promoting greater parental involvement, designing programs that meet the specific needs of local students, improving professional development for teachers, bringing technology into the classroom, and building local partnerships to improve education.

MYTHS AND MISCONCEPTIONS ABOUT GOALS 2000

Unfortunately — as I mentioned in my opening remarks — the current debate over Goals 2000 rests largely on misconceptions about what the program actually does. Most of these misconceptions arise from allegations that Goals 2000 is some kind of Trojan Horse aimed at undermining local control of education. The same misstatements about Goals 2000 have been repeated so often that I personally have concluded that they reflect a disinformation campaign organized by groups that are opposed to any Federal role in education.

Whatever the source, the false assertions are without exception easily refuted. Perhaps the most common statement, and one that I have often seen attributed to certain Members of the House who oppose Goals 2000, is that it will lead to a Federal takeover of local education. As a former Governor of South Carolina, I am very sensitive to concerns about Federal intrusion in local affairs, and I am a strong believer in the long American tradition of local control of education. I would not have supported Goals 2000 if I thought it remotely threatened to undermine that tradition. You don't have to take my word on that, however, just look at the statute itself. Sections 318 states that Federal officials may not direct or control the expenditure of State and local education funds, and Section 319 specifically reaffirms that control of education is reserved to States and local school systems. Clearly, those who warn of a Federal takeover are raising fears without a shred of justification.

Another related allegation is that Goals 2000 will force Outcome-Based Education on local school districts. I know that concern over the OBE approach has been an issue in your home State, Mr. Chairman. I believe you would agree, however, that Goals 2000 does not promote any particular education philosophy. Goals 2000 focuses on improving academic achievement, but leaves decisions regarding how to accomplish this entirely up to States and communities.

The standards called for in Goals 2000 are another source of confusion. One of the subtexts of the outcry over the model national history standards was the implication that Goals 2000 would mandate the adoption of those standards or others like them. This simply isn't true. Goals 2000 does require States and schools to develop or adopt challenging academic standards, but it does not specify any particular standards. Nor will Goals 2000 control what is taught in the classroom by constituting a kind of "national school board," as some have charged with regard to the National Education Standards and Improvement Council. Under Goals 2000, States and school districts determine their own academic standards. They may choose to adopt voluntary national standards developed by professional organizations, such as the widely praised math standards created by the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, or to design their own standards outlining what they want their children to learn. The decision, however, is entirely up to them.

One last example, this one a myth most recently perpetuated by the House Budget Committee. Its report accompanying the 1996 House Budget Resolution justified the elimination of Goals 2000 because it "increases funding for bureaucracy and imposes new regulations on States and localities." The Committee is just flat wrong on both counts. We are using a team of existing staff to administer the new program, and as I have already mentioned, there are no regulations for Goals 2000. I urge the Members of this Subcommittee to ask your State education officials how much trouble it was to complete the first-year Goals 2000 application: the form was just 4 pages long and asked only for information required by law to award funds.

HOW ARE STATES AND DISTRICTS USING GOALS 2000 DOLLARS?

This Subcommittee helped to jumpstart Goals 2000 two years ago by providing an advance appropriation that allowed the Department to begin implementation immediately after the President signed the Goals 2000: Educate America Act into law. As a result, all States desiring to participate — 47 at last count — have received their first-year grants and we are now making second-year awards.

The response to Goals 2000 has been enthusiastic, and States have found Goals 2000 to be a "user-friendly" program, both because of our regulation-free, streamlined application process and because of the flexibility to adapt the program to pre-existing reform efforts. In Michigan, for example, 13 Upper Peninsula school

districts are working with May Mills Community College and Lake Superior University to train teachers in the use of technology to improve math and science learning in rural communities. In Kentucky, Goals 2000 is helping Harrison County to strengthen parental involvement in education by training teachers to recruit parents as volunteer instructional aides and by reaching out to parents through cable television programs and homework hotlines.

In Portland, Oregon, a Goals 2000 subgrant is helping to turn Jefferson High School into a science and math magnet school, with support from the Oregon Health Sciences University and Portland State University. Massachusetts is using Goals 2000 funds to pay the start-up costs of 14 charter schools. And in Kansas, where the State Board of Education has developed academic standards and assessments in core subject areas, Goals 2000 funds will be used to help districts and schools incorporate the new standards and assessments in classroom teaching.

These examples demonstrate clearly the wide range of activities that Goals 2000 funding supports, as well as some of the ways that States and communities have been able to integrate Goals 2000 into existing reforms. Far from leading to a "takeover" of local education, the Federal role under Goals 2000 has been that of a supportive partner.

For fiscal year 1996, President Clinton has proposed to expand this partnership by providing \$750 million for Goals 2000. This level of funding could help as many as 17,000 schools raise standards, increase accountability, improve discipline, and increase parent involvement. The House, citing "the tight budgetary environment," did not provide any funding for Goals 2000. I believe the House action, unless reversed by the Senate, threatens to deal a tremendous setback to education reform in America, one from which we might not recover for a good many years.

MAINTAINING OUR MOMENTUM

Eleven years after *A Nation At Risk* warned that declining educational achievement threatened America's economic competitiveness in the world economy, and five years after the Nation's governors agreed on six National Education Goals for the year 2000, Goals 2000 is giving a much-needed shot in the arm to education reform.

Education reform is a high-stakes enterprise for America. In our rapidly changing, technology-based economy, education divides those of our citizens who can compete and succeed in the global economy from those whose standard of living is declining along with their wages. And unless we reverse this division by raising the educational achievement and skills of all Americans, we will surely fall from the top rank of nations.

Successful education reform requires a sustained, long-term commitment. With Goals 2000, we are out of the blocks and rounding the first turn, and we cannot afford to sacrifice the momentum achieved by nearly all the States and hundreds of communities. Senator Jeffords doubtless was referring to this momentum when he recently wrote: "We have no time to wait and argue about the politics of implementing higher standards in education. . . we must keep moving forward."

If you share my belief that the Federal government has a vital role to play in supporting State and local efforts to improve the quality of education in America for all students, then Goals 2000 is the vehicle for that support. If it didn't already exist, you would have to invent it. It is the only responsible and accountable way to spend taxpayer dollars on education reform. That's what House authorizers are discovering as they work on their Education Reform Block Grant proposal. Billed as a replacement for Goals 2000 and other school improvement programs, early drafts of the proposal have included standards, assessments, and comprehensive reform plans. In other words, it sounds a lot like Goals 2000.

The real Goals 2000 is already making a difference in States and communities across America. It is helping to improve academic achievement, increase parental involvement, and bring technology into the classroom. It is reducing bureaucratic red-tape and regulation and bringing new flexibility to the Federal role in education. And it is maintaining the tradition of local control of our schools. It makes no sense to abandon

the effort now, to start over and reinvent the wheel. I urge you to renew the Federal commitment to effective education reform by restoring funding for Goals 2000.

I will be happy to answer any questions you might have.

DRAFT GOALS 2000 TESTIMONY FOR SEPT. 12 SPECTER HEARING

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee:

DRAFT
AUG 23 1995

Let me begin by saying how much I appreciate this opportunity to testify in support of the Goals 2000: Educate America Act. We believe that Goals 2000 fulfills an essential Federal role by providing financial support for State and local reform efforts based on challenging academic standards. Unfortunately, there is a great deal of misunderstanding about Goals 2000 and what it does and does not do.

Just to give you one example, Mr. Chairman, the *Indianapolis News* recently ran a piece that was sharply critical of the history standards announced last year by a Federally funded panel. You may recall that the Senate subsequently voted to denounce those standards by a 99-1 margin. Whatever the merits of those standards, one fact is not in dispute: it was the Bush Administration and former Secretary Lamar Alexander that in 1991 selected the panel and awarded the funds to support its work. Despite this fact, the story in the *Indianapolis News* asserted that the panel was "created by the Clinton administration's Goals 2000 Act."

I believe this kind of misinformation is one reason that Goals 2000 is now under attack in the House of Representatives, which has chosen to eliminate funding for the program in its fiscal year 1996 appropriations bill. So I am very happy to be here today to set the record straight. My testimony this morning will set forth very briefly what

Goals 2000 is, what it isn't, what States and communities are doing with Goals 2000 dollars, and what would be lost if Congress abandons the program.

WHAT IS GOALS 2000?

The Goals 2000: Educate America Act was the culmination of several years of effort in Congress — with substantial involvement from outside groups from across the political spectrum sharing an interest in education — to hammer out a bipartisan consensus on how best to provide national support for State and local education reform. It reflects the best of what we know about the key ingredients of successful educational improvement: challenging academic standards, comprehensive planning, parental and community involvement, and flexibility in the use of Federal funding.

Goals 2000 is a new partnership between the Federal government and States and communities working to improve their schools. Like any successful partnership, Goals 2000 involves specific commitments from the partners. The Federal government provides financial assistance and gives States and communities great flexibility in using Federal funds to support State and local education reforms. In exchange, States and communities develop their own challenging academic standards for all students, and incorporate those standards into comprehensive reform plans.

Each of the key elements of Goals 2000 was a direct response to the recommendations of the Nation's Governors at the 1989 Education Summit. At the Summit hosted by President Bush in Charlottesville, Virginia, the Governors called for the adoption of high academic standards and, because they recognized the helping all students reach high standards would require changing the entire education system, every Governor pledged to launch comprehensive approaches to reform. The Governors also asked for greater flexibility in the use of Federal funds in exchange for accountability for results. These results were to be measured by improved student achievement, not by compliance with Federal regulations. Goals 2000 meets this request as well: the Department has issued no regulations for Goals 2000.

Ninety percent of the dollars that this Subcommittee appropriates for Goals 2000 flow directly to local school districts. These funds are used for, among other things, establishing challenging academic standards in core subjects, implementing existing school improvement plans, promoting greater parental involvement, designing programs that meet the specific needs of local students, improving professional development for teachers, bringing technology into the classroom, and building local partnerships to improve education.

MYTHS AND MISCONCEPTIONS ABOUT GOALS 2000

Unfortunately — as I mentioned in my opening remarks — the current debate over Goals 2000 rests largely on misconceptions about what the program actually does. Most of these misconceptions arise from allegations that Goals 2000 is some kind of Trojan Horse aimed at undermining local control of education. The same misstatements about Goals 2000 have been repeated so often that I personally have concluded that they reflect a disinformation campaign organized by groups that are opposed to any Federal role in education.

Whatever the source, the false assertions are without exception easily refuted. Perhaps the most common statement, and one that I have often seen attributed to certain Members of the House who oppose Goals 2000, is that it will lead to a Federal takeover of local education. As a former Governor of South Carolina, I am very sensitive to concerns about Federal intrusion in local affairs, and I am a strong believer in the long American tradition of local control of education. I would not have supported Goals 2000 if I thought it remotely threatened to undermine that tradition. You don't have to take my word on that, however, just look at the statute itself. Sections 318 states that Federal officials may not direct or control the expenditure of State and local education funds, and Section 319 specifically reaffirms that control of education is reserved to States and local school systems. Clearly, those who warn of a Federal takeover are raising fears without a shred of justification.

Another related allegation is that Goals 2000 will force Outcome-Based Education on local school districts. I know that concern over the OBE approach has been an issue in your home State, Mr. Chairman. I believe you would agree, however, that Goals 2000 does not promote any particular education philosophy. Goals 2000 focuses on improving academic achievement, but leaves decisions regarding how to accomplish this entirely up to States and communities.

The standards called for in Goals 2000 are another source of confusion. One of the subtexts of the outcry over the model national history standards was the implication that Goals 2000 would mandate the adoption of those standards or others like them. This simply isn't true. Goals 2000 does require States and schools to develop or adopt challenging academic standards, but it does not specify any particular standards. Nor will Goals 2000 control what is taught in the classroom by constituting a kind of "national school board," as some have charged with regard to the National Education Standards and Improvement Council. Under Goals 2000, States and school districts determine their own academic standards. They may choose to adopt voluntary national standards developed by professional organizations, such as the widely praised math standards created by the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, or to design their own standards outlining what they want their children to learn. The decision, however, is entirely up to them.

One last example, this one a myth most recently perpetuated by the House Budget Committee. Its report accompanying the 1996 House Budget Resolution justified the elimination of Goals 2000 because it "increases funding for bureaucracy and imposes new regulations on States and localities." The Committee is just flat wrong on both counts. We are using a team of existing staff to administer the new program, and as I have already mentioned, there are no regulations for Goals 2000. I urge the Members of this Subcommittee to ask your State education officials how much trouble it was to complete the first-year Goals 2000 application: the form was just 4 pages long and asked only for information required by law to award funds.

HOW ARE STATES AND DISTRICTS USING GOALS 2000 DOLLARS?

This Subcommittee helped to jumpstart Goals 2000 two years ago by providing an advance appropriation that allowed the Department to begin implementation immediately after the President signed the Goals 2000: Educate America Act into law. As a result, all States desiring to participate — 47 at last count — have received their first-year grants and we are now making second-year awards.

The response to Goals 2000 has been enthusiastic, and States have found Goals 2000 to be a "user-friendly" program, both because of our regulation-free, streamlined application process and because of the flexibility to adapt the program to pre-existing reform efforts. In Michigan, for example, 13 Upper Peninsula school

districts are working with May Mills Community College and Lake Superior University to train teachers in the use of technology to improve math and science learning in rural communities. In Kentucky, Goals 2000 is helping Harrison County to strengthen parental involvement in education by training teachers to recruit parents as volunteer instructional aides and by reaching out to parents through cable television programs and homework hotlines.

In Portland, Oregon, a Goals 2000 subgrant is helping to turn Jefferson High School into a science and math magnet school, with support from the Oregon Health Sciences University and Portland State University. Massachusetts is using Goals 2000 funds to pay the start-up costs of 14 charter schools. And in Kansas, where the State Board of Education has developed academic standards and assessments in core subject areas, Goals 2000 funds will be used to help districts and schools incorporate the new standards and assessments in classroom teaching.

These examples demonstrate clearly the wide range of activities that Goals 2000 funding supports, as well as some of the ways that States and communities have been able to integrate Goals 2000 into existing reforms. Far from leading to a "takeover" of local education, the Federal role under Goals 2000 has been that of a supportive partner.

For fiscal year 1996, President Clinton has proposed to expand this partnership by providing \$750 million for Goals 2000. This level of funding could help as many as 17,000 schools raise standards, increase accountability, improve discipline, and increase parent involvement. The House, citing "the tight budgetary environment," did not provide any funding for Goals 2000. I believe the House action, unless reversed by the Senate, threatens to deal a tremendous setback to education reform in America, one from which we might not recover for a good many years.

MAINTAINING OUR MOMENTUM

Eleven years after *A Nation At Risk* warned that declining educational achievement threatened America's economic competitiveness in the world economy, and five years after the Nation's governors agreed on six National Education Goals for the year 2000, Goals 2000 is giving a much-needed shot in the arm to education reform.

Education reform is a high-stakes enterprise for America. In our rapidly changing, technology-based economy, education divides those of our citizens who can compete and succeed in the global economy from those whose standard of living is declining along with their wages. And unless we reverse this division by raising the educational achievement and skills of all Americans, we will surely fall from the top rank of nations.

Successful education reform requires a sustained, long-term commitment. With Goals 2000, we are out of the blocks and rounding the first turn, and we cannot afford to sacrifice the momentum achieved by nearly all the States and hundreds of communities. Senator Jeffords doubtless was referring to this momentum when he recently wrote: "We have no time to wait and argue about the politics of implementing higher standards in education. . . we must keep moving forward."

If you share my belief that the Federal government has a vital role to play in supporting State and local efforts to improve the quality of education in America for all students, then Goals 2000 is the vehicle for that support. If it didn't already exist, you would have to invent it. It is the only responsible and accountable way to spend taxpayer dollars on education reform. That's what House authorizers are discovering as they work on their Education Reform Block Grant proposal. Billed as a replacement for Goals 2000 and other school improvement programs, early drafts of the proposal have included standards, assessments, and comprehensive reform plans. In other words, it sounds a lot like Goals 2000.

The real Goals 2000 is already making a difference in States and communities across America. It is helping to improve academic achievement, increase parental involvement, and bring technology into the classroom. It is reducing bureaucratic red-tape and regulation and bringing new flexibility to the Federal role in education. And it is maintaining the tradition of local control of our schools. It makes no sense to abandon

Page 10 - Draft Goals 2000 Testimony

the effort now, to start over and reinvent the wheel. I urge you to renew the Federal commitment to effective education reform by restoring funding for Goals 2000.

I will be happy to answer any questions you might have.