

File —

Goodbye Goals 2000
Letter

File -
Woodley letter

June 7, 1994

The Honorable James J. Rhoades
Chairman
Senate Education Committee
Room 168
Main Capitol Building
Harrisburg, PA 17120

Dear Mr. Chairman:

Thank you for inviting me to attend your hearing on GOALS 2000: The Educate America Act. Unfortunately, due to a previous commitment, I am unable to be with you today. Nevertheless, I wanted to share some of my thoughts on this important legislation.

After almost six years of negotiations spanning nearly the entire Bush Administration and the first year and one-half of the Clinton Administration, I was very pleased that this legislation finally became the law of the land a few months ago.

GOALS 2000 is the first Federal program to focus on improving the quality of education in this country; until now, the Federal government paid little attention to student learning and achievement. This law encourages States and localities to set high academic standards for America's children, and it makes it clear that we have high expectations for our future generations.

GOALS 2000 enshrines into law the national education goals and a National Education Goals Panel to monitor our country's progress toward attaining these goals. It contains an important safe schools provision that begins to address the rampant violence that is spreading from school to school across the nation. This legislation acknowledges that State and local education officials know best how to meet the needs of students and it provides regulatory flexibility to States, local educational agencies and schools.

While I strongly supported final passage of this bill, let me make it clear that this was not always the case. As one of the

strongest supporters of State and local control of education in the Congress, I fought throughout the legislative process against all unnecessary Federal intrusion and bureaucracy. In particular, I fought against the opportunity to learn provisions in this bill.

At the outset, I must emphasize that any State's participation in Goals 2000 is voluntary. A State must only meet the requirements of the program if it participates. Otherwise, it will not have to do so.

Let me take a moment to explain some of the changes we made in the final bill. First, while a State must develop opportunity to learn standards or strategies, they only have to include those factors it deems appropriate to achieve a State's content and performance standards. In other words, OTL standards or strategies are whatever a State wants them to be as long as they are focused on improved student learning.

The single most important section of the bill dealing with opportunity to learn is this: no State, local education agency, or school will be required to implement OTL standards or strategies. So, while a State must develop OTL standards or strategies, they do not have to be implemented. Briefly, let me outline a few of the other State and local control provisions in GOALS 2000:

- o no State must have their standards certified by any Panel or Commission;
- o the adoption of standards, assessments, and opportunity to learn strategies or standards is not linked to participation in any other program;
- o nothing in GOALS 2000 can be construed to mandate equalized spending or to mandate national school building standards;
- o nothing in GOALS 2000 can be construed to mandate a State or locality to incur costs not paid for under this act;
- o and, there is a general prohibition on Federal mandates with respect to the direction or control of a State, local education agency, or school's curriculum, program of instruction, or allocation of resources.
- o requires each State improvement plan to include strategies for ensuring that comprehensive, systemic reform is promoted from the bottom up in communities, local educational agencies and schools and includes a list of optional strategies for State consideration.

The Honorable James J. Rhoades
June 7, 1994
Page 3

- o reaffirms State and local responsibility for control of education.
- o requires the local plan to promote the flexibility of local schools in developing plans which address the particular needs of their school and community.

I would have preferred no opportunity to learn provisions, but that is not the way the legislative process works. So, while the final GOALS 2000 bill was not perfect, I believe it still has the potential to have an enormous impact on education in this nation. In my view, there are two big obstacles that must be overcome for this program to ultimately be judged a success.

First, the various groups involved in setting academic standards must do their job correctly and produce sensible, understandable standards, so everyone involved in the educational process will know what is expected of them. Overly complicated standards filled with academic jargon will meet with resistance by parents, teachers, and children, and will ultimately find their place buried on the shelf with dozens of other well-intended education reform efforts.

Let me also emphasize that these must be academic standards. Parents have the primary responsibility for instilling in their children the values and behaviors that will guide and shape the lives of their children. Standards that are promulgated at the Federal and State levels must carefully avoid straying into attempts to dictate values and behaviors. The extent to which schools may delve into these areas, if at all, is a decision that must be left to parents and the local schools that respond to them.

Second, the Department of Education must ensure that there is an absolute minimum of Federal influence on GOALS 2000 efforts in the States and communities. At this point, I am pleased to say that it appears for the most part the Department is doing just as they promised. They have decided not to promulgate complicated regulations to implement GOALS 2000, and they have even been able to keep the GOALS 2000 application forms to only a few short pages -- no small accomplishment for a Federal bureaucracy.

However, there are some early warning signs on the horizon that merit our careful scrutiny. In Ohio, the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Civil Rights is investigating that State's development and implementation of their Ninth-Grade Proficiency Tests on the grounds that perhaps not all students were provided an opportunity to learn. While this case is still in the relatively preliminary stages, it could have a profound impact on other States efforts to implement GOALS 2000.

The Honorable James J. Rhoades
June 7, 1994
Page 4

This investigation appears to unnecessarily involve the Federal government in the day-to-day operations of school systems and raises serious questions about the feasibility of standards and assessment efforts in all states. It raises the question of whether or not the Department will allow any high stakes standards and assessment provisions to ever be implemented. Clearly, the Ohio case is one to watch.

Finally, we have provided States, local educational agencies and local schools the opportunity to request waivers from federal regulations which they believe prevent them from undertaking education reform. This waiver authority is limited to seven elementary and secondary education programs at the present time.

In conclusion, I want to reiterate my support for GOALS 2000 and urge its careful implementation in Pennsylvania. The demands of an increasingly competitive international marketplace make it imperative that we dramatically change our educational system, not because it is failing but because we must provide all of our citizens with much higher levels of skills and knowledge if this democracy and its economy are to survive. In my view, passage of GOALS 2000 has the potential to be seen as a watershed event in the annals of education reform. However, the only way this will happen is with the active participation of everyone -- regardless of political persuasion -- with a stake in education reform. I know my friends in the Pennsylvania legislature are up to this important task.

If there is anything my staff or I can do to help with the Pennsylvania GOALS 2000 reform efforts, I hope you will not hesitate to call on me.

Sincerely,



BILL GOODLING

Ranking Republican Member

BG:ls



COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

2181 RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING

WASHINGTON, DC 20515-6100

WILLIAM B. BRYANT, MISSISSIPPI
 GEORGE MILLER, CALIFORNIA
 RUSTY M. MURPHY, PENNSYLVANIA
 DALE E. RUDE, MICHIGAN
 PAT WILLIAMS, MONTANA
 MATTHEW D. MARTINEZ, CALIFORNIA
 MAJOR D. OWENS, NEW YORK
 THOMAS D. SAWYER, OHIO
 DONALD M. PAYNE, NEW JERSEY
 JOLENE UNSCOLD, WASHINGTON
 PATSY MINE, HAWAII
 ROBERT E. ANDREWS, NEW JERSEY
 JACK REED, RHODE ISLAND
 TIM ROEMER, VIRGINIA
 ELYOT L. ENGEL, NEW YORK
 PATTER FERGUSON, CALIFORNIA
 ROBERT C. "BOBBY" SCOTT, VIRGINIA
 GENE GREEN, TEXAS
 LYNN C. WOOLSEY, CALIFORNIA
 CARLOS A. ROMERO-BARCELÓ, PUERTO RICO
 RON KLINE, PENNSYLVANIA
 CARAN ENGLISH, ARIZONA
 TED STRICKLAND, OHIO
 RON DE LUCA, VIRGIN ISLANDS
 ENRIQUE FALGOMAYAGA, AMERICAN SAMOA
 SCOTTY BUESLER, KENTUCKY
 ROBERT A. UNDERWOOD, GUAM

JOHN A. SCHNEIDER, OHIO
 RANDY DURE, MINNESOTA
 PETER H. DEUTSCH, MICHIGAN
 HOWARD BUCK, MICHIGAN
 DAN MILLER, FLORIDA
 MICHAEL N. CASTLE, DELAWARE

MAJORITY - 100-115-4507
 MINORITY - 100-115-4508
 MINORITY - 100-115-4509
 MINORITY - 100-115-4510

June 7, 1994

The Honorable James J. Rhoades
 Chairman
 Senate Education Committee
 Room 168
 Main Capitol Building
 Harrisburg, PA 17120

Dear Mr. Chairman:

Thank you for inviting me to attend your hearing on GOALS 2000: The Educate America Act. Unfortunately, due to a previous commitment, I am unable to be with you today. Nevertheless, I wanted to share some of my thoughts on this important legislation.

After almost six years of negotiations spanning nearly the entire Bush Administration and the first year and one-half of the Clinton Administration, I was very pleased that this legislation finally became the law of the land a few months ago.

GOALS 2000 is the first Federal program to focus on improving the quality of education in this country; until now, the Federal government paid little attention to student learning and achievement. This law encourages States and localities to set high academic standards for America's children, and it makes it clear that we have high expectations for our future generations.

GOALS 2000 enshrines into law the national education goals and a National Education Goals Panel to monitor our country's progress toward attaining these goals. It contains an important safe schools provision that begins to address the rampant violence that is spreading from school to school across the nation. This legislation acknowledges that State and local education officials know best how to meet the needs of students and it provides regulatory flexibility to States, local educational agencies and schools.

While I strongly supported final passage of this bill, let me make it clear that this was not always the case. As one of the

strongest supporters of State and local control of education in the Congress, I fought throughout the legislative process against all unnecessary Federal intrusion and bureaucracy. In particular, I fought against the opportunity to learn provisions in this bill.

At the outset, I must emphasize that any State's participation in Goals 2000 is voluntary. A State must only meet the requirements of the program if it participates. Otherwise, it will not have to do so.

Let me take a moment to explain some of the changes we made in the final bill. First, while a State must develop opportunity to learn standards or strategies, they only have to include those factors it deems appropriate to achieve a State's content and performance standards. In other words, OTL standards or strategies are whatever a State wants them to be as long as they are focused on improved student learning.

The single most important section of the bill dealing with opportunity to learn is this: no State, local education agency, or school will be required to implement OTL standards or strategies. So, while a State must develop OTL standards or strategies, they do not have to be implemented. Briefly, let me outline a few of the other State and local control provisions in GOALS 2000:

- o no State must have their standards certified by any Panel or Commission;
- o the adoption of standards, assessments, and opportunity to learn strategies or standards is not linked to participation in any other program;
- o nothing in GOALS 2000 can be construed to mandate equalized spending or to mandate national school building standards;
- o nothing in GOALS 2000 can be construed to mandate a State or locality to incur costs not paid for under this act;
- o and, there is a general prohibition on Federal mandates with respect to the direction or control of a State, local education agency, or school's curriculum, program of instruction, or allocation of resources.
- o requires each State improvement plan to include strategies for ensuring that comprehensive, systemic reform is promoted from the bottom up in communities, local educational agencies and schools and includes a list of optional strategies for State consideration.

- o reaffirms State and local responsibility for control of education.
- o requires the local plan to promote the flexibility of local schools in developing plans which address the particular needs of their school and community.

I would have preferred no opportunity to learn provisions, but that is not the way the legislative process works. So, while the final GOALS 2000 bill was not perfect, I believe it still has the potential to have an enormous impact on education in this nation. In my view, there are two big obstacles that must be overcome for this program to ultimately be judged a success.

First, the various groups involved in setting academic standards must do their job correctly and produce sensible, understandable standards, so everyone involved in the educational process will know what is expected of them. Overly complicated standards filled with academic jargon will meet with resistance by parents, teachers, and children, and will ultimately find their place buried on the shelf with dozens of other well-intended education reform efforts.

Let me also emphasize that these must be academic standards. Parents have the primary responsibility for instilling in their children the values and behaviors that will guide and shape the lives of their children. Standards that are promulgated at the Federal and State levels must carefully avoid straying into attempts to dictate values and behaviors. The extent to which schools may delve into these areas, if at all, is a decision that must be left to parents and the local schools that respond to them.

Second, the Department of Education must ensure that there is an absolute minimum of Federal influence on GOALS 2000 efforts in the States and communities. At this point, I am pleased to say that it appears for the most part the Department is doing just as they promised. They have decided not to promulgate complicated regulations to implement GOALS 2000, and they have even been able to keep the GOALS 2000 application forms to only a few short pages -- no small accomplishment for a Federal bureaucracy.

However, there are some early warning signs on the horizon that merit our careful scrutiny. In Ohio, the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Civil Rights is investigating that State's development and implementation of their Ninth-Grade Proficiency Tests on the grounds that perhaps not all students were provided an opportunity to learn. While this case is still in the relatively preliminary stages, it could have a profound impact on other States efforts to implement GOALS 2000.

The Honorable James J. Rhoades
June 7, 1994
Page 4

This investigation appears to unnecessarily involve the Federal government in the day-to-day operations of school systems and raises serious questions about the feasibility of standards and assessment efforts in all states. It raises the question of whether or not the Department will allow any high stakes standards and assessment provisions to ever be implemented. Clearly, the Ohio case is one to watch.

Finally, we have provided States, local educational agencies and local schools the opportunity to request waivers from federal regulations which they believe prevent them from undertaking education reform. This waiver authority is limited to seven elementary and secondary education programs at the present time.

In conclusion, I want to reiterate my support for GOALS 2000 and urge its careful implementation in Pennsylvania. The demands of an increasingly competitive international marketplace make it imperative that we dramatically change our educational system, not because it is failing but because we must provide all of our citizens with much higher levels of skills and knowledge if this democracy and its economy are to survive. In my view, passage of GOALS 2000 has the potential to be seen as a watershed event in the annals of education reform. However, the only way this will happen is with the active participation of everyone -- regardless of political persuasion -- with a stake in education reform. I know my friends in the Pennsylvania legislature are up to this important task.

If there is anything my staff or I can do to help with the Pennsylvania GOALS 2000 reform efforts, I hope you will not hesitate to call on me.

Sincerely,



BILL GOODLING

Ranking Republican Member

BG:ls



COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
2181 RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC 20515-6100

WILLIAM B. BRIDGES, MISSOURI
JEDRZE MILLER, CALIFORNIA
KUSTIN J. MURPHY, PENNSYLVANIA
DALE E. RHOADES, MICHIGAN
PAT WILLIAMS, MONTANA
MATTHEW J. MARTINEZ, CALIFORNIA
MAJOR R. OWENS, NEW YORK
THOMAS J. SARTER, OHIO
DONALD M. PAYNE, NEW JERSEY
JULIEN UNSCOLD, WASHINGTON
PATSY T. WINE, HAWAII
ROBERT E. ANDREWS, NEW JERSEY
JACE REED, RHODE ISLAND
TIM ROEMER, IOWA
EVOT L. ENGEL, NEW YORK
PATRICK PIERCE, CALIFORNIA
ROBERT C. TROBBY, SCOTLAND
GENE GREEN, TEXAS
LYNN C. WOOLSEY, CALIFORNIA
CARLOS A. ROMERO-BARCELÓ, PUERTO RICO
RON FINE, PENNSYLVANIA
LARAN ENGLISH, ARIZONA
ED STRICKLAND, OHIO
RON DE LUCA, VIRGIN ISLANDS
ENRIQUE FALCONI, VENEZUELA
SCOTT B. MESLER, KENTUCKY
ROBERT A. UNDERWOOD, GUAM

JOHN A. SCHNEIDER, OHIO
RANDY DURE, ALABAMA
PATRICK M. MCCARTHY, NEW YORK
HOWARD BUCK, MICHIGAN
DAN MILLER, FLORIDA
MICHAEL V. CASTLE, DELAWARE

MAJORITY — 1021-115-1507
— 1021-116-1170
MINORITY — 1021-115-1175
— 1021-116-1171

June 7, 1994

The Honorable James J. Rhoades
Chairman
Senate Education Committee
Room 168
Main Capitol Building
Harrisburg, PA 17120

Dear Mr. Chairman:

Thank you for inviting me to attend your hearing on GOALS 2000: The Educate America Act. Unfortunately, due to a previous commitment, I am unable to be with you today. Nevertheless, I wanted to share some of my thoughts on this important legislation.

After almost six years of negotiations spanning nearly the entire Bush Administration and the first year and one-half of the Clinton Administration, I was very pleased that this legislation finally became the law of the land a few months ago.

GOALS 2000 is the first Federal program to focus on improving the quality of education in this country; until now, the Federal government paid little attention to student learning and achievement. This law encourages States and localities to set high academic standards for America's children, and it makes it clear that we have high expectations for our future generations.

GOALS 2000 enshrines into law the national education goals and a National Education Goals Panel to monitor our country's progress toward attaining these goals. It contains an important safe schools provision that begins to address the rampant violence that is spreading from school to school across the nation. This legislation acknowledges that State and local education officials know best how to meet the needs of students and it provides regulatory flexibility to States, local educational agencies and schools.

While I strongly supported final passage of this bill, let me make it clear that this was not always the case. As one of the

strongest supporters of State and local control of education in the Congress, I fought throughout the legislative process against all unnecessary Federal intrusion and bureaucracy. In particular, I fought against the opportunity to learn provisions in this bill.

At the outset, I must emphasize that any State's participation in Goals 2000 is voluntary. A State must only meet the requirements of the program if it participates. Otherwise, it will not have to do so.

Let me take a moment to explain some of the changes we made in the final bill. First, while a State must develop opportunity to learn standards or strategies, they only have to include those factors it deems appropriate to achieve a State's content and performance standards. In other words, OTL standards or strategies are whatever a State wants them to be as long as they are focused on improved student learning.

The single most important section of the bill dealing with opportunity to learn is this: no State, local education agency, or school will be required to implement OTL standards or strategies. So, while a State must develop OTL standards or strategies, they do not have to be implemented. Briefly, let me outline a few of the other State and local control provisions in GOALS 2000:

- o no State must have their standards certified by any Panel or Commission;
- o the adoption of standards, assessments, and opportunity to learn strategies or standards is not linked to participation in any other program;
- o nothing in GOALS 2000 can be construed to mandate equalized spending or to mandate national school building standards;
- o nothing in GOALS 2000 can be construed to mandate a State or locality to incur costs not paid for under this act;
- o and, there is a general prohibition on Federal mandates with respect to the direction or control of a State, local education agency, or school's curriculum, program of instruction, or allocation of resources.
- o requires each State improvement plan to include strategies for ensuring that comprehensive, systemic reform is promoted from the bottom up in communities, local educational agencies and schools and includes a list of optional strategies for State consideration.

- o reaffirms State and local responsibility for control of education.
- o requires the local plan to promote the flexibility of local schools in developing plans which address the particular needs of their school and community.

I would have preferred no opportunity to learn provisions, but that is not the way the legislative process works. So, while the final GOALS 2000 bill was not perfect, I believe it still has the potential to have an enormous impact on education in this nation. In my view, there are two big obstacles that must be overcome for this program to ultimately be judged a success.

First, the various groups involved in setting academic standards must do their job correctly and produce sensible, understandable standards, so everyone involved in the educational process will know what is expected of them. Overly complicated standards filled with academic jargon will meet with resistance by parents, teachers, and children, and will ultimately find their place buried on the shelf with dozens of other well-intended education reform efforts.

Let me also emphasize that these must be academic standards. Parents have the primary responsibility for instilling in their children the values and behaviors that will guide and shape the lives of their children. Standards that are promulgated at the Federal and State levels must carefully avoid straying into attempts to dictate values and behaviors. The extent to which schools may delve into these areas, if at all, is a decision that must be left to parents and the local schools that respond to them.

Second, the Department of Education must ensure that there is an absolute minimum of Federal influence on GOALS 2000 efforts in the States and communities. At this point, I am pleased to say that it appears for the most part the Department is doing just as they promised. They have decided not to promulgate complicated regulations to implement GOALS 2000, and they have even been able to keep the GOALS 2000 application forms to only a few short pages -- no small accomplishment for a Federal bureaucracy.

However, there are some early warning signs on the horizon that merit our careful scrutiny. In Ohio, the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Civil Rights is investigating that State's development and implementation of their Ninth-Grade Proficiency Tests on the grounds that perhaps not all students were provided an opportunity to learn. While this case is still in the relatively preliminary stages, it could have a profound impact on other States efforts to implement GOALS 2000.

The Honorable James J. Rhoades

June 7, 1994

Page 4

This investigation appears to unnecessarily involve the Federal government in the day-to-day operations of school systems and raises serious questions about the feasibility of standards and assessment efforts in all states. It raises the question of whether or not the Department will allow any high stakes standards and assessment provisions to ever be implemented. Clearly, the Ohio case is one to watch.

Finally, we have provided States, local educational agencies and local schools the opportunity to request waivers from federal regulations which they believe prevent them from undertaking education reform. This waiver authority is limited to seven elementary and secondary education programs at the present time.

In conclusion, I want to reiterate my support for GOALS 2000 and urge its careful implementation in Pennsylvania. The demands of an increasingly competitive international marketplace make it imperative that we dramatically change our educational system, not because it is failing but because we must provide all of our citizens with much higher levels of skills and knowledge if this democracy and its economy are to survive. In my view, passage of GOALS 2000 has the potential to be seen as a watershed event in the annals of education reform. However, the only way this will happen is with the active participation of everyone -- regardless of political persuasion -- with a stake in education reform. I know my friends in the Pennsylvania legislature are up to this important task.

If there is anything my staff or I can do to help with the Pennsylvania GOALS 2000 reform efforts, I hope you will not hesitate to call on me.

Sincerely,



BILL GOODLING

Ranking Republican Member

BG:ls



COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

2181 RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING

WASHINGTON, DC 20515-6100

WILLIAM BRIDGES, MISSOURI
 GEORGE MILLER, CALIFORNIA
 RUSTY M. MURPHY, PENNSYLVANIA
 DALE E. KILDEE, MICHIGAN
 PAT WILLIAMS, MONTANA
 MATTHEW J. MARTINEZ, CALIFORNIA
 MAJOR R. OWENS, NEW YORK
 THOMAS J. SAWYER, OHIO
 DONALD M. PAYNE, NEW JERSEY
 JOSEPH J. SISK, WASHINGTON
 PATSY M. MINE, HAWAII
 ROBERT E. ANDREWS, NEW JERSEY
 JACK REED, RHODE ISLAND
 TIM ROEMER, VIRGINIA
 ERIK L. ENGEL, NEW YORK
 FAYAT PETERSON, CALIFORNIA
 ROBERT C. BOBBY, SCOTLAND
 JENNE GREEN, TEXAS
 LYNN C. WOOLSEY, CALIFORNIA
 CARLOS A. ROMERO-SANCHEZ, PUERTO RICO
 RON KLINE, PENNSYLVANIA
 JAMES ENGLISH, ARIZONA
 TED STRICKLAND, OHIO
 RON DE LUCA, VIRGINIA
 ENRIQUE FALCONI, MEXICO
 SCOTT B. BRESLER, KENTUCKY
 ROBERT A. UNDERWOOD, GUAM

WILLIAM BRIDGES, MISSOURI
 GEORGE MILLER, CALIFORNIA
 RUSTY M. MURPHY, PENNSYLVANIA
 DALE E. KILDEE, MICHIGAN
 PAT WILLIAMS, MONTANA
 MATTHEW J. MARTINEZ, CALIFORNIA
 MAJOR R. OWENS, NEW YORK
 THOMAS J. SAWYER, OHIO
 DONALD M. PAYNE, NEW JERSEY
 JOSEPH J. SISK, WASHINGTON
 PATSY M. MINE, HAWAII
 ROBERT E. ANDREWS, NEW JERSEY
 JACK REED, RHODE ISLAND
 TIM ROEMER, VIRGINIA
 ERIK L. ENGEL, NEW YORK
 FAYAT PETERSON, CALIFORNIA
 ROBERT C. BOBBY, SCOTLAND
 JENNE GREEN, TEXAS
 LYNN C. WOOLSEY, CALIFORNIA
 CARLOS A. ROMERO-SANCHEZ, PUERTO RICO
 RON KLINE, PENNSYLVANIA
 JAMES ENGLISH, ARIZONA
 TED STRICKLAND, OHIO
 RON DE LUCA, VIRGINIA
 ENRIQUE FALCONI, MEXICO
 SCOTT B. BRESLER, KENTUCKY
 ROBERT A. UNDERWOOD, GUAM

MAJORITY - 100-115-4927
 MINORITY - 100-115-1100
 100-115-1100

June 7, 1994

The Honorable James J. Rhoades
 Chairman
 Senate Education Committee
 Room 168
 Main Capitol Building
 Harrisburg, PA 17120

Dear Mr. Chairman:

Thank you for inviting me to attend your hearing on GOALS 2000: The Educate America Act. Unfortunately, due to a previous commitment, I am unable to be with you today. Nevertheless, I wanted to share some of my thoughts on this important legislation.

After almost six years of negotiations spanning nearly the entire Bush Administration and the first year and one-half of the Clinton Administration, I was very pleased that this legislation finally became the law of the land a few months ago.

GOALS 2000 is the first Federal program to focus on improving the quality of education in this country; until now, the Federal government paid little attention to student learning and achievement. This law encourages States and localities to set high academic standards for America's children, and it makes it clear that we have high expectations for our future generations.

GOALS 2000 enshrines into law the national education goals and a National Education Goals Panel to monitor our country's progress toward attaining these goals. It contains an important safe schools provision that begins to address the rampant violence that is spreading from school to school across the nation. This legislation acknowledges that State and local education officials know best how to meet the needs of students and it provides regulatory flexibility to States, local educational agencies and schools.

While I strongly supported final passage of this bill, let me make it clear that this was not always the case. As one of the

strongest supporters of State and local control of education in the Congress, I fought throughout the legislative process against all unnecessary Federal intrusion and bureaucracy. In particular, I fought against the opportunity to learn provisions in this bill.

At the outset, I must emphasize that any State's participation in Goals 2000 is voluntary. A State must only meet the requirements of the program if it participates. Otherwise, it will not have to do so.

Let me take a moment to explain some of the changes we made in the final bill. First, while a State must develop opportunity to learn standards or strategies, they only have to include those factors it deems appropriate to achieve a State's content and performance standards. In other words, OTL standards or strategies are whatever a State wants them to be as long as they are focused on improved student learning.

The single most important section of the bill dealing with opportunity to learn is this: no State, local education agency, or school will be required to implement OTL standards or strategies. So, while a State must develop OTL standards or strategies, they do not have to be implemented. Briefly, let me outline a few of the other State and local control provisions in GOALS 2000:

- o no State must have their standards certified by any Panel or Commission;
- o the adoption of standards, assessments, and opportunity to learn strategies or standards is not linked to participation in any other program;
- o nothing in GOALS 2000 can be construed to mandate equalized spending or to mandate national school building standards;
- o nothing in GOALS 2000 can be construed to mandate a State or locality to incur costs not paid for under this act;
- o and, there is a general prohibition on Federal mandates with respect to the direction or control of a State, local education agency, or school's curriculum, program of instruction, or allocation of resources.
- o requires each State improvement plan to include strategies for ensuring that comprehensive, systemic reform is promoted from the bottom up in communities, local educational agencies and schools and includes a list of optional strategies for State consideration.

- o reaffirms State and local responsibility for control of education.
- o requires the local plan to promote the flexibility of local schools in developing plans which address the particular needs of their school and community.

I would have preferred no opportunity to learn provisions, but that is not the way the legislative process works. So, while the final GOALS 2000 bill was not perfect, I believe it still has the potential to have an enormous impact on education in this nation. In my view, there are two big obstacles that must be overcome for this program to ultimately be judged a success.

First, the various groups involved in setting academic standards must do their job correctly and produce sensible, understandable standards, so everyone involved in the educational process will know what is expected of them. Overly complicated standards filled with academic jargon will meet with resistance by parents, teachers, and children, and will ultimately find their place buried on the shelf with dozens of other well-intended education reform efforts.

Let me also emphasize that these must be academic standards. Parents have the primary responsibility for instilling in their children the values and behaviors that will guide and shape the lives of their children. Standards that are promulgated at the Federal and State levels must carefully avoid straying into attempts to dictate values and behaviors. The extent to which schools may delve into these areas, if at all, is a decision that must be left to parents and the local schools that respond to them.

Second, the Department of Education must ensure that there is an absolute minimum of Federal influence on GOALS 2000 efforts in the States and communities. At this point, I am pleased to say that it appears for the most part the Department is doing just as they promised. They have decided not to promulgate complicated regulations to implement GOALS 2000, and they have even been able to keep the GOALS 2000 application forms to only a few short pages -- no small accomplishment for a Federal bureaucracy.

However, there are some early warning signs on the horizon that merit our careful scrutiny. In Ohio, the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Civil Rights is investigating that State's development and implementation of their Ninth-Grade Proficiency Tests on the grounds that perhaps not all students were provided an opportunity to learn. While this case is still in the relatively preliminary stages, it could have a profound impact on other States efforts to implement GOALS 2000.

The Honorable James J. Rhoades
June 7, 1994
Page 4

This investigation appears to unnecessarily involve the Federal government in the day-to-day operations of school systems and raises serious questions about the feasibility of standards and assessment efforts in all states. It raises the question of whether or not the Department will allow any high stakes standards and assessment provisions to ever be implemented. Clearly, the Ohio case is one to watch.

Finally, we have provided States, local educational agencies and local schools the opportunity to request waivers from federal regulations which they believe prevent them from undertaking education reform. This waiver authority is limited to seven elementary and secondary education programs at the present time.

In conclusion, I want to reiterate my support for GOALS 2000 and urge its careful implementation in Pennsylvania. The demands of an increasingly competitive international marketplace make it imperative that we dramatically change our educational system, not because it is failing but because we must provide all of our citizens with much higher levels of skills and knowledge if this democracy and its economy are to survive. In my view, passage of GOALS 2000 has the potential to be seen as a watershed event in the annals of education reform. However, the only way this will happen is with the active participation of everyone -- regardless of political persuasion -- with a stake in education reform. I know my friends in the Pennsylvania legislature are up to this important task.

If there is anything my staff or I can do to help with the Pennsylvania GOALS 2000 reform efforts, I hope you will not hesitate to call on me.

Sincerely,



BILL GOODLING

Ranking Republican Member

BG:ls