



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

STRONG PROTECTION AGAINST FEDERAL INTRUSION IN GOALS 2000

Goals 2000 is designed to provide Federal support, in the form of financial assistance and models or exemplars of outstanding practices, to education reforms designed and initiated at the local and state levels. Education is a State and local responsibility, and, over the past decade in particular, the leadership for raising academic standards and improving education overall has come from the State and local levels. Goals 2000 will enable participating States and local communities to strengthen these reforms, broaden grass roots involvement in them, and more rapidly involve all schools, parents and educators in education improvement.

Goals 2000 is different from other Federal education programs. While Federal legislation is often designed and intended to require or encourage States, localities or individuals to do things they would not otherwise do, Goals 2000 is designed to assist States and localities to undertake education reforms they are already committed to.

Consequently, the Goals 2000 Act provides maximum flexibility to States, local education agencies, and individual schools in designing their own approaches to improving education. The main requirements of the law are that: (1) these approaches be aimed at helping all students reach challenging academic standards set by each State; (2) these approaches have a reasonable chance of success; (3) that there is a significant commitment within the state to implementing them; and, (4) that they provide for a good deal of local flexibility.

Because the Goals 2000 program is designed to encourage and support reforms initiated at the local and State levels, it does not in any way seek to impose a "federal" approach to specific State or local approaches. In addition, it contains the following provisions that limit federal involvement and protect State and local control:

- o Prohibition on Federal mandates, direction and control. Nothing in the Goals 2000 Act authorizes any Federal official to mandate, direct or control State, local school district or individual school curriculum, program of instruction, or allocation of resources, or to require any State, local district or school to incur any costs not covered by Goals 2000. (Section 318)
- o State and Local Government Control of Education. Reaffirms that State and local governments have primary responsibility for control of education, and that the Federal government shall not directly or indirectly impose standards or promulgate rules or regulations that would reduce or undermine State and local control. (Section 319)

- o Unconditioned State Participation. No State shall be required to obtain certification of its standards from the National Education Standards and Improvement Council (NESIC), nor participate in Goals 2000 in any way, as a condition of participating in any Federal education program, such as Chapter 1, Drug Free Schools, vocational education, or Goals 2000. (Section 213(h)(1))
- o Voluntary National Standards shall be certified by NESIC only if they are sufficiently general to be used by any State without restricting State and local control of curriculum. (Section 213(e))
- o National Standards do not create legally enforceable rights. Standards and assessments certified by NESIC do not create legally enforceable rights against States, school districts or individual schools. (Section 213(h)(2))
- o States participating in Goals 2000 do not submit their standards for review to NESIC (see above) or to the Secretary of Education for review and approval. In order to receive funds under Goals 2000, States must present plans for a process to develop state content standards. They are not required to submit the actual standards to the Education Department for approval. (Section 306 (c)(1))
- o Opportunity to learn standards or strategies. While States must develop opportunity to learn standards or strategies, they only have to include the factors the State itself deems appropriate to achieve its own content and performance standards. In other words, opportunity to learn strategies or standards are determined by a State and focused on improved student learning. (Section 306 (d))

In addition to these specific provisions of the Goals 2000 Act, the U.S. Department of Education has taken additional steps to reduce the possibility of inappropriate federal intrusion, and to preserve all of the State and local discretion incorporated into the law:

- o The Department of Education has not issued any new regulations to implement Title III of Goals 2000. The Education Department intends to implement the program of grants for State and local education improvement without issuing additional, complicated regulations that micromanage a flexible program.
- o The Education Department has designed a streamlined application procedure for states, that cuts paperwork considerably. The initial application for States to request Goals 2000 funds is only 4 pages long, asks only for information required by law to award funds, and eliminates numerous forms.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

STRONG PROTECTION AGAINST FEDERAL INTRUSION IN GOALS 2000

Goals 2000 is designed to provide Federal support, in the form of financial assistance and models or exemplars of outstanding practices, to education reforms designed and initiated at the local and state levels. Education is a State and local responsibility, and, over the past decade in particular, the leadership for raising academic standards and improving education overall has come from the State and local levels. Goals 2000 will enable participating States and local communities to strengthen these reforms, broaden grass roots involvement in them, and more rapidly involve all schools, parents and educators in education improvement.

Goals 2000 is different from other Federal education programs. While Federal legislation is often designed and intended to require or encourage States, localities or individuals to do things they would not otherwise do, Goals 2000 is designed to assist States and localities to undertake education reforms they are already committed to.

Consequently, the Goals 2000 Act provides maximum flexibility to States, local education agencies, and individual schools in designing their own approaches to improving education. The main requirements of the law are that: (1) these approaches be aimed at helping all students reach challenging academic standards set by each State; (2) these approaches have a reasonable chance of success; (3) that there is a significant commitment within the state to implementing them; and, (4) that they provide for a good deal of local flexibility.

Because the Goals 2000 program is designed to encourage and support reforms initiated at the local and State levels, it does not in any way seek to impose a "federal" approach to specific State or local approaches. In addition, it contains the following provisions that limit federal involvement and protect State and local control:

- o Prohibition on Federal mandates, direction and control. Nothing in the Goals 2000 Act authorizes any Federal official to mandate, direct or control State, local school district or individual school curriculum, program of instruction, or allocation of resources, or to require any State, local district or school to incur any costs not covered by Goals 2000. (Section 318)
- o State and Local Government Control of Education. Reaffirms that State and local governments have primary responsibility for control of education, and that the Federal government shall not directly or indirectly impose standards or promulgate rules or regulations that would reduce or undermine State and local control. (Section 319)

- o Unconditioned State Participation. No State shall be required to obtain certification of its standards from the National Education Standards and Improvement Council (NESIC), nor participate in Goals 2000 in any way, as a condition of participating in any Federal education program, such as Chapter 1, Drug Free Schools, vocational education, or Goals 2000. (Section 213(h)(1))
- o Voluntary National Standards shall be certified by NESIC only if they are sufficiently general to be used by any State without restricting State and local control of curriculum. (Section 213(e))
- o National Standards do not create legally enforceable rights. Standards and assessments certified by NESIC do not create legally enforceable rights against States, school districts or individual schools. (Section 213(h)(2))
- o States participating in Goals 2000 do not submit their standards for review to NESIC (see above) or to the Secretary of Education for review and approval. In order to receive funds under Goals 2000, States must present plans for a process to develop state content standards. They are not required to submit the actual standards to the Education Department for approval. (Section 306 (c)(1))
- o Opportunity to learn standards or strategies. While States must develop opportunity to learn standards or strategies, they only have to include the factors the State itself deems appropriate to achieve its own content and performance standards. In other words, opportunity to learn strategies or standards are determined by a State and focused on improved student learning. (Section 306 (d))

In addition to these specific provisions of the Goals 2000 Act, the U.S. Department of Education has taken additional steps to reduce the possibility of inappropriate federal intrusion, and to preserve all of the State and local discretion incorporated into the law:

- o The Department of Education has not issued any new regulations to implement Title III of Goals 2000. The Education Department intends to implement the program of grants for State and local education improvement without issuing additional, complicated regulations that micromanage a flexible program.
- o The Education Department has designed a streamlined application procedure for states, that cuts paperwork considerably. The initial application for States to request Goals 2000 funds is only 4 pages long, asks only for information required by law to award funds, and eliminates numerous forms.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

STRONG PROTECTION AGAINST FEDERAL INTRUSION IN GOALS 2000

Goals 2000 is designed to provide Federal support, in the form of financial assistance and models or exemplars of outstanding practices, to education reforms designed and initiated at the local and state levels. Education is a State and local responsibility, and, over the past decade in particular, the leadership for raising academic standards and improving education overall has come from the State and local levels. Goals 2000 will enable participating States and local communities to strengthen these reforms, broaden grass roots involvement in them, and more rapidly involve all schools, parents and educators in education improvement.

Goals 2000 is different from other Federal education programs. While Federal legislation is often designed and intended to require or encourage States, localities or individuals to do things they would not otherwise do, Goals 2000 is designed to assist States and localities to undertake education reforms they are already committed to.

Consequently, the Goals 2000 Act provides maximum flexibility to States, local education agencies, and individual schools in designing their own approaches to improving education. The main requirements of the law are that: (1) these approaches be aimed at helping all students reach challenging academic standards set by each State; (2) these approaches have a reasonable chance of success; (3) that there is a significant commitment within the state to implementing them; and, (4) that they provide for a good deal of local flexibility.

Because the Goals 2000 program is designed to encourage and support reforms initiated at the local and State levels, it does not in any way seek to impose a "federal" approach to specific State or local approaches. In addition, it contains the following provisions that limit federal involvement and protect State and local control:

- o Prohibition on Federal mandates, direction and control. Nothing in the Goals 2000 Act authorizes any Federal official to mandate, direct or control State, local school district or individual school curriculum, program of instruction, or allocation of resources, or to require any State, local district or school to incur any costs not covered by Goals 2000. (Section 318)
- o State and Local Government Control of Education. Reaffirms that State and local governments have primary responsibility for control of education, and that the Federal government shall not directly or indirectly impose standards or promulgate rules or regulations that would reduce or undermine State and local control. (Section 319)

- o Unconditioned State Participation. No State shall be required to obtain certification of its standards from the National Education Standards and Improvement Council (NESIC), nor participate in Goals 2000 in any way, as a condition of participating in any Federal education program, such as Chapter 1, Drug Free Schools, vocational education, or Goals 2000. (Section 213(h)(1))
- o Voluntary National Standards shall be certified by NESIC only if they are sufficiently general to be used by any State without restricting State and local control of curriculum. (Section 213(e))
- o National Standards do not create legally enforceable rights. Standards and assessments certified by NESIC do not create legally enforceable rights against States, school districts or individual schools. (Section 213(h)(2))
- o States participating in Goals 2000 do not submit their standards for review to NESIC (see above) or to the Secretary of Education for review and approval. In order to receive funds under Goals 2000, States must present plans for a process to develop state content standards. They are not required to submit the actual standards to the Education Department for approval. (Section 306 (c)(1))
- o Opportunity to learn standards or strategies. While States must develop opportunity to learn standards or strategies, they only have to include the factors the State itself deems appropriate to achieve its own content and performance standards. In other words, opportunity to learn strategies or standards are determined by a State and focused on improved student learning. (Section 306 (d))

In addition to these specific provisions of the Goals 2000 Act, the U.S. Department of Education has taken additional steps to reduce the possibility of inappropriate federal intrusion, and to preserve all of the State and local discretion incorporated into the law:

- o The Department of Education has not issued any new regulations to implement Title III of Goals 2000. The Education Department intends to implement the program of grants for State and local education improvement without issuing additional, complicated regulations that micromanage a flexible program.
- o The Education Department has designed a streamlined application procedure for states, that cuts paperwork considerably. The initial application for States to request Goals 2000 funds is only 4 pages long, asks only for information required by law to award funds, and eliminates numerous forms.

LEGISLATIVE SUMMARY

Goals 2000: Educate America Act Legislative Summary

Overview

The Goals 2000 Act, signed into law March 31, 1994, provides resources to states and communities as they work to improve student academic achievement. States and communities are using Goals 2000 funds to provide quality professional development for teachers, expand the use of computers in classrooms, raise academic standards, and increase parental and community involvement in education.

Components of the "Goals 2000: Educate America Act"

Title I: The National Education Goals

- This title formalizes in law the original six National Education Goals. These goals concern: readiness for school; increased school graduation rates; student academic achievement and citizenship; mathematics and science performance; adult literacy; and safe, disciplined, and drug-free schools. The Act adds two new goals that encourage parental participation and improved professional development for teachers.
- These goals are symbolic expressions of what the President, the nation's Governors, and now the U.S. Congress, hope we will accomplish as a nation by the year 2000. Some states and communities have adopted the original goals, others have adapted them to their own circumstances. Neither the Goals 2000 Act nor any other federal legislation requires states to adopt or implement the National Education Goals as a condition of receiving federal funding.
- The National Education Goals are not mandates, and there are no enforcement or compliance monitoring mechanisms written into law.

Title II: National Education Reform Leadership, Standards, and Assessments

- The bipartisan National Education Goals panel, was originally created by President Bush and the nation's governors in 1990 to monitor the nation's progress toward the National Education Goals. The Goals Panel is comprised of eight Governors, four state legislators, four members of Congress, the Secretary of Education and the President's Domestic Policy Advisor.

- The National Education Standards and Improvement Council is made up of a bipartisan, broad base of citizens, employees, and educators, to examine and certify voluntary national and state standards submitted on a voluntary basis by states and organizations working on particular academic subjects.

(NOTE: Despite the carefully delineated authority provided to NESIC under the Goals 2000 Act, concerns have been raised about any certification of standards. Upon recommendation of the National Education Goals Panel on January 28, 1995, the Secretary of Education has asked the President not to appoint NESIC. Legislation has passed in the House and is pending in the Senate to eliminate NESIC.)

- This title also authorizes grants to support the development of voluntary student assessment systems aligned to state standards, and for the development of model opportunity-to-learn standards. Funds have not been available for the development of model opportunity-to-learn standards. Nine assessment grants have been awarded to a total of twenty-five states to develop or field test new student assessment systems aligned to high standards.

Title III: State and Local Education Improvement

For first-year funding, states submitted a brief application that described how a broad-based citizen panel will develop a plan to improve schools. States have the option to use plans that already have been developed. The application also described how subgrants were to be made for local education improvement and better teacher preservice and continuing professional development.

Broad-Based Citizen Involvement in State Improvement Efforts

- The Governor and the Chief State School Officer each appoint half the members of a broad-based school improvement panel. This panel is comprised of teachers, principals, administrators, parents, representatives of business, labor, and higher education, and members of the public, as well as the chair of the state board of education and the chairs of the appropriate authorizing committees of the state legislature.
- States that already have a broad-based panel in place that has made substantial progress in developing a education improvement plan may request that the Secretary of Education recognize the existing panel.

Comprehensive Improvement Plan Geared to High Standards of Achievement

- The State Planning Panel is responsible for developing a comprehensive reform plan. The plan must be approved by the state education agency and be consistent with state

law.

- States with improvement plans already in place will not have to develop new plans for Goals 2000. The U.S. Secretary of Education may approve plans, or portions of plans, already adopted by the state. To date, six states have submitted preexisting plans: Kentucky, Massachusetts, Ohio, Utah, Michigan, and Oregon. All these plans have been approved.
- In order to receive Goals 2000 funds after the first year, states submit their school improvement plan or an application that indicates they have made substantial progress in its plan development.
- A peer review panel is brought together to review the state improvement plans. This panel, comprised of non-federal educators, employers, parents, and state and local officials, offers guidance to states and recommends to the Secretary of Education whether the education improvement plan should be approved.
- The purpose of reviewing and approving state education reform plans is to ensure that federal funds are invested only in state education reforms with a reasonable chance of success.
- As of November 14, 1995, fourteen states have submitted and had their education improvement plans approved. No state has had their plan rejected, nor has any state been required to modify its plan.

In general, the plans address:

- Strategies for the development or adoption of student academic standards, assessments, and plans for improving the preparation and advanced professional training of teachers.
- Strategies to involve parents and the community in helping all students meet challenging state standards and to promote grass-roots, bottom-up involvement in education.
- Strategies for ensuring that all local educational agencies and schools in the state are involved in developing and implementing needed improvements.
- Strategies for improved management and governance, and for promoting accountability for results, flexibility, site-based management, and other principles of high-performance management.
- Strategies for providing all students an opportunity to learn at higher academic levels. While these strategies have to be outlined in the plan, the implementation of the strategies is voluntary.

- Strategies for assisting local educational agencies and schools to meet the needs of school-age students who have dropped out of school.
- Strategies for bringing technology into the classroom to increase learning.

Funds are also available to states to support the development of a state technology plan, to be integrated with the overall reform plan.

Broad-Based Involvement in Local Education Improvement Efforts

- Each local school district, applying to the state for Goals 2000 funds will be asked to develop a broad consensus regarding a local improvement plan.
- Local districts encourage and assist schools in developing and implementing improvements that best meet the particular needs of the schools. The local plan would include strategies for ensuring that students meet higher academic standards.
- All of these strategies focus on improving student achievement. Decisions regarding the content of curriculum, assessments, and social services remain local decisions. Section 318 of the Act specifically prohibits federal mandates, direction and control of education.

Waivers and Flexibility

- States with approved Goals 2000 plans may request from the Secretary of Education waivers of statutory and regulatory requirements in most other federal education programs, if these requirements interfere with implementation of the state's approach to education improvement. Local school districts and individual schools working on education improvement may similarly request waivers through their state regardless of whether they receive goals 2000 funds.
- Certain requirements, such as the allocation of funds to school districts, and certain laws, such as civil rights and special education laws, may not be waived.
- Up to six states will participate in the "Ed-Flex Demonstration Program," in which the Secretary of Education delegates his waiver authority to the state education agency. This permits state officials to waive federal requirements for local school districts and schools if they impede education reform efforts.
- To date, Oregon, Massachusetts, Kansas, and Ohio have been selected as Ed Flex states.
- Prior to the enactment of Goals 2000, no U.S. Secretary of Education had the authority

to waive any statutory or regulatory requirements for any reason.

Timetable and Funding

In 1994, \$105 million was appropriated for Goals 2000. Congress appropriated \$372 million for 1995. The Senate Appropriations Committee has proposed \$310 million for 1996 while the House of Representatives eliminated funding for Goals 2000. The President has stated that he will veto any bill that substantially reduces funding for education.

Goals 2000 funds are available to states on a formula basis. Attached is a chart with the state funding levels for 1994 and 1995.

During the first year of participation, at least 60 percent of each state's funds were awarded to local school districts. Seventy-five percent of those funds went directly to schools.

During years 2-5, at least 90 percent of each state's funds will be awarded to school districts. At least 85 percent of those funds are awarded to schools.

Title IV. Parental Assistance

- This title creates parental information and resource centers to increase parents' knowledge about child-rearing and to strengthen partnerships between parents and educators in meeting the educational needs of children.
- Local non-profit agencies serving parents are eligible to receive funds to establish parent resource centers. These grants are awarded independent of state participation in Title III of Goals 2000. Agencies in states not participating in Goals 2000 can and have received grants under this title. Their activities are not necessarily related to the state's Goals 2000 activities.
- Twenty-eight parent resource centers were funded by the U.S. Department of Education in 1995.

Title V. National Skill Standards Board

- This title creates a National Skill Standards Board to support the development and adoption of voluntary occupational skill standards and certification. The Board is responsible for identifying major occupations in the U.S. to facilitate voluntary partnerships to develop skill standards for each occupation. The Board will endorse those skill standards submitted by the partnerships that meet certain criteria.

Other Provisions Contained in PL 103-227, but not related to Goals 2000

Title VI. International Education Program

- This title authorizes international exchange activities designed to promote democracy and free market economies. Through grants or contracts awarded by the Secretary, curricula and teacher professional development programs in civics and economics developed in the United States are made available to eligible countries in Central and Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union. Two grants were awarded in 1995, one focusing on civics education, the other on economics education.

Title VII. Safe Schools

- Title VII creates the Safe Schools Act of 1994, which provides funds to help local school districts achieve Goal Six of the National Education Goals. Nineteen grants were awarded in 1995 to help schools develop programs to address drugs and violence.

Title VIII. Minority-focused Civics Education

- This title authorizes the award of grants for seminars in American government and civics for elementary and secondary school teachers and other educators who work with minority and Native American students. The program consists of summer institutes followed by inservice training programs during the academic year. No funds have been made available for this title.

Title IX. Educational Research and Improvement

- This title, the "Educational Research, Development, Dissemination, and Improvement Act," reauthorizes the Department's research and dissemination unit. It establishes five research institutes, an office for reform assistance, the National Library of Education, a research policies and priorities board, and administrative structures to support them. This title does not directly relate to Goals 2000.

Title X. Miscellaneous

- Sections in this title include authorization for a study on how well students with disabilities are represented in school improvement efforts funded under Goals 2000. The title also contains other provisions unrelated to Goals 2000.

11/29/95

11/20/95

Goals 2000 - Title III

State	FY 1994 Final Allotment	FY 1995 Final Allotment
TOTAL, 52 STATES:	\$91,480,000	\$358,251,300
ALABAMA	1,604,625	\$5,941,766
ALASKA	460,574	1,547,345
ARIZONA	1,364,600	5,450,582
ARKANSAS	993,175	3,650,495
CALIFORNIA	10,514,198	42,111,705
COLORADO	1,086,789	4,288,514
CONNECTICUT	962,265	3,460,756
DELAWARE	406,278	1,291,544
FLORIDA	4,022,211	15,861,034
GEORGIA	2,358,215	8,959,402
HAWAII	417,745	1,381,641
IDAHO	458,232	1,568,397
ILLINOIS	4,138,448	15,992,571
INDIANA	1,737,392	6,557,145
IOWA	888,162	3,219,618
KANSAS	865,991	3,193,916
KENTUCKY	1,479,642	5,775,274
LOUISIANA	2,064,025	7,968,128
MAINE	506,617	1,647,540
MARYLAND	1,450,703	5,379,938
MASSACHUSETTS	1,884,961	6,990,859
MICHIGAN	3,622,852	14,371,488
MINNESOTA	1,389,913	5,377,078
MISSISSIPPI	1,361,751	5,094,972
MISSOURI	1,694,086	6,525,935
MONTANA	449,712	1,560,150
NEBRASKA	568,280	1,986,104
NEVADA	410,679	1,419,052
NEW HAMPSHIRE	0	1,290,294
NEW JERSEY	2,445,502	8,792,536
NEW MEXICO	742,764	2,782,261
NEW YORK	7,166,140	27,112,295
NORTH CAROLINA	2,060,116	7,745,087
NORTH DAKOTA	406,852	1,340,576
OHIO	3,711,499	14,833,684
OKLAHOMA	1,155,879	4,396,613
OREGON	1,048,333	4,012,392
PENNSYLVANIA	4,070,640	15,529,194
RHODE ISLAND	442,901	1,480,004
SOUTH CAROLINA	1,276,721	4,710,359
SOUTH DAKOTA	427,589	1,412,549
TENNESSEE	1,680,252	6,387,802
TEXAS	7,286,644	29,228,278
UTAH	710,199	2,587,039
VERMONT	407,301	1,272,847
VIRGINIA	0	6,658,924
WASHINGTON	1,583,754	6,328,974
WEST VIRGINIA	779,620	2,799,259
WISCONSIN	1,685,573	6,582,097
WYOMING	370,640	1,262,907
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	477,300	1,523,409
PUERTO RICO	2,381,661	9,608,968

Goals 2000: Educate America Act

Legislative Summary

Overview

The Goals 2000 Act, signed into law March 31, 1994, provides resources to states and communities as they work to improve student academic achievement. States and communities are using Goals 2000 funds to provide quality professional development for teachers, expand the use of computers in classrooms, raise academic standards, and increase parental and community involvement in education.

Components of the "Goals 2000: Educate America Act"

Title I: The National Education Goals

- This title formalizes in law the original six National Education Goals. These goals concern: readiness for school; increased school graduation rates; student academic achievement and citizenship; mathematics and science performance; adult literacy; and safe, disciplined, and drug-free schools. The Act adds two new goals that encourage parental participation and improved professional development for teachers.
- These goals are symbolic expressions of what the President, the nation's Governors, and now the U.S. Congress, hope we will accomplish as a nation by the year 2000. Some states and communities have adopted the original goals, others have adapted them to their own circumstances. Neither the Goals 2000 Act nor any other federal legislation requires states to adopt or implement the National Education Goals as a condition of receiving federal funding.
- The National Education Goals are not mandates, and there are no enforcement or compliance monitoring mechanisms written into law.

Title II: National Education Reform Leadership, Standards, and Assessments

- The bipartisan National Education Goals panel, was originally created by President Bush and the nation's governors in 1990 to monitor the nation's progress toward the National Education Goals. The Goals Panel is comprised of eight Governors, four state legislators, four members of Congress, the Secretary of Education and the President's Domestic Policy Advisor.

- The National Education Standards and Improvement Council is made up of a bipartisan, broad base of citizens, employees, and educators, to examine and certify voluntary national and state standards submitted on a voluntary basis by states and organizations working on particular academic subjects.

(NOTE: Despite the carefully delineated authority provided to NESIC under the Goals 2000 Act, concerns have been raised about any certification of standards. Upon recommendation of the National Education Goals Panel on January 28, 1995, the Secretary of Education has asked the President not to appoint NESIC. Legislation has passed in the House and is pending in the Senate to eliminate NESIC.)

- This title also authorizes grants to support the development of voluntary student assessment systems aligned to state standards, and for the development of model opportunity-to-learn standards. Funds have not been available for the development of model opportunity-to-learn standards. Nine assessment grants have been awarded to a total of twenty-five states to develop or field test new student assessment systems aligned to high standards.

Title III: State and Local Education Improvement

For first-year funding, states submitted a brief application that described how a broad-based citizen panel will develop a plan to improve schools. States have the option to use plans that already have been developed. The application also described how subgrants were to be made for local education improvement and better teacher preservice and continuing professional development.

Broad-Based Citizen Involvement in State Improvement Efforts

- The Governor and the Chief State School Officer each appoint half the members of a broad-based school improvement panel. This panel is comprised of teachers, principals, administrators, parents, representatives of business, labor, and higher education, and members of the public, as well as the chair of the state board of education and the chairs of the appropriate authorizing committees of the state legislature.
- States that already have a broad-based panel in place that has made substantial progress in developing a education improvement plan may request that the Secretary of Education recognize the existing panel.

Comprehensive Improvement Plan Geared to High Standards of Achievement

- The State Planning Panel is responsible for developing a comprehensive reform plan. The plan must be approved by the state education agency and be consistent with state

law.

- States with improvement plans already in place will not have to develop new plans for Goals 2000. The U.S. Secretary of Education may approve plans, or portions of plans, already adopted by the state. To date, six states have submitted preexisting plans: Kentucky, Massachusetts, Ohio, Utah, Michigan, and Oregon. All these plans have been approved.
- In order to receive Goals 2000 funds after the first year, states submit their school improvement plan or an application that indicates they have made substantial progress in its plan development.
- A peer review panel is brought together to review the state improvement plans. This panel, comprised of non-federal educators, employers, parents, and state and local officials, offers guidance to states and recommends to the Secretary of Education whether the education improvement plan should be approved.
- The purpose of reviewing and approving state education reform plans is to ensure that federal funds are invested only in state education reforms with a reasonable chance of success.
- As of November 14, 1995, fourteen states have submitted and had their education improvement plans approved. No state has had their plan rejected, nor has any state been required to modify its plan.

In general, the plans address:

- Strategies for the development or adoption of student academic standards, assessments, and plans for improving the preparation and advanced professional training of teachers.
- Strategies to involve parents and the community in helping all students meet challenging state standards and to promote grass-roots, bottom-up involvement in education.
- Strategies for ensuring that all local educational agencies and schools in the state are involved in developing and implementing needed improvements.
- Strategies for improved management and governance, and for promoting accountability for results, flexibility, site-based management, and other principles of high-performance management.
- Strategies for providing all students an opportunity to learn at higher academic levels. While these strategies have to be outlined in the plan, the implementation of the strategies is voluntary.

- Strategies for assisting local educational agencies and schools to meet the needs of school-age students who have dropped out of school.
- Strategies for bringing technology into the classroom to increase learning.

Funds are also available to states to support the development of a state technology plan, to be integrated with the overall reform plan.

Broad-Based Involvement in Local Education Improvement Efforts

- Each local school district, applying to the state for Goals 2000 funds will be asked to develop a broad consensus regarding a local improvement plan.
- Local districts encourage and assist schools in developing and implementing improvements that best meet the particular needs of the schools. The local plan would include strategies for ensuring that students meet higher academic standards.
- All of these strategies focus on improving student achievement. Decisions regarding the content of curriculum, assessments, and social services remain local decisions. Section 318 of the Act specifically prohibits federal mandates, direction and control of education.

Waivers and Flexibility

- States with approved Goals 2000 plans may request from the Secretary of Education waivers of statutory and regulatory requirements in most other federal education programs, if these requirements interfere with implementation of the state's approach to education improvement. Local school districts and individual schools working on education improvement may similarly request waivers through their state regardless of whether they receive goals 2000 funds.
- Certain requirements, such as the allocation of funds to school districts, and certain laws, such as civil rights and special education laws, may not be waived.
- Up to six states will participate in the "Ed-Flex Demonstration Program," in which the Secretary of Education delegates his waiver authority to the state education agency. This permits state officials to waive federal requirements for local school districts and schools if they impede education reform efforts.
- To date, Oregon, Massachusetts, Kansas, and Ohio have been selected as Ed Flex states.
- Prior to the enactment of Goals 2000, no U.S. Secretary of Education had the authority

to waive any statutory or regulatory requirements for any reason.

Timetable and Funding

In 1994, \$105 million was appropriated for Goals 2000. Congress appropriated \$372 million for 1995. The Senate Appropriations Committee has proposed \$310 million for 1996 while the House of Representatives eliminated funding for Goals 2000. The President has stated that he will veto any bill that substantially reduces funding for education.

Goals 2000 funds are available to states on a formula basis. Attached is a chart with the state funding levels for 1994 and 1995.

During the first year of participation, at least 60 percent of each state's funds were awarded to local school districts. Seventy-five percent of those funds went directly to schools.

During years 2-5, at least 90 percent of each state's funds will be awarded to school districts. At least 85 percent of those funds are awarded to schools.

Title IV. Parental Assistance

- This title creates parental information and resource centers to increase parents' knowledge about child-rearing and to strengthen partnerships between parents and educators in meeting the educational needs of children.
- Local non-profit agencies serving parents are eligible to receive funds to establish parent resource centers. These grants are awarded independent of state participation in Title III of Goals 2000. Agencies in states not participating in Goals 2000 can and have received grants under this title. Their activities are not necessarily related to the state's Goals 2000 activities.
- Twenty-eight parent resource centers were funded by the U.S. Department of Education in 1995.

Title V. National Skill Standards Board

- This title creates a National Skill Standards Board to support the development and adoption of voluntary occupational skill standards and certification. The Board is responsible for identifying major occupations in the U.S. to facilitate voluntary partnerships to develop skill standards for each occupation. The Board will endorse those skill standards submitted by the partnerships that meet certain criteria.

Other Provisions Contained in PL 103-227, but not related to Goals 2000

Title VI. International Education Program

- This title authorizes international exchange activities designed to promote democracy and free market economies. Through grants or contracts awarded by the Secretary, curricula and teacher professional development programs in civics and economics developed in the United States are made available to eligible countries in Central and Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union. Two grants were awarded in 1995, one focusing on civics education, the other on economics education.

Title VII. Safe Schools

- Title VII creates the Safe Schools Act of 1994, which provides funds to help local school districts achieve Goal Six of the National Education Goals. Nineteen grants were awarded in 1995 to help schools develop programs to address drugs and violence.

Title VIII. Minority-focused Civics Education

- This title authorizes the award of grants for seminars in American government and civics for elementary and secondary school teachers and other educators who work with minority and Native American students. The program consists of summer institutes followed by inservice training programs during the academic year. No funds have been made available for this title.

Title IX. Educational Research and Improvement

- This title, the "Educational Research, Development, Dissemination, and Improvement Act," reauthorizes the Department's research and dissemination unit. It establishes five research institutes, an office for reform assistance, the National Library of Education, a research policies and priorities board, and administrative structures to support them. This title does not directly relate to Goals 2000.

Title X. Miscellaneous

- Sections in this title include authorization for a study on how well students with disabilities are represented in school improvement efforts funded under Goals 2000. The title also contains other provisions unrelated to Goals 2000.

11/29/95

11/20/95

Goals 2000 - Title III

State	FY 1994 Final Allotment	FY 1995 Final Allotment
TOTAL, 52 STATES:	\$91,480,000	\$358,251,300
ALABAMA	1,604,625	\$5,941,766
ALASKA	460,574	1,547,345
ARIZONA	1,364,600	5,450,582
ARKANSAS	993,175	3,650,495
CALIFORNIA	10,514,198	42,111,705
COLORADO	1,086,789	4,288,514
CONNECTICUT	962,265	3,460,756
DELAWARE	406,278	1,291,544
FLORIDA	4,022,211	15,861,034
GEORGIA	2,358,215	8,959,402
HAWAII	417,745	1,381,641
IDAHO	458,232	1,568,397
ILLINOIS	4,138,448	15,992,571
INDIANA	1,737,392	6,557,145
IOWA	888,162	3,219,618
KANSAS	865,991	3,193,916
KENTUCKY	1,479,642	5,775,274
LOUISIANA	2,064,025	7,968,128
MAINE	506,617	1,647,540
MARYLAND	1,450,703	5,379,938
MASSACHUSETTS	1,884,961	6,990,859
MICHIGAN	3,622,852	14,371,488
MINNESOTA	1,389,913	5,377,078
MISSISSIPPI	1,361,751	5,094,972
MISSOURI	1,694,086	6,525,935
MONTANA	449,712	1,560,150
NEBRASKA	568,280	1,986,104
NEVADA	410,679	1,419,052
NEW HAMPSHIRE	0	1,290,294
NEW JERSEY	2,445,502	8,792,536
NEW MEXICO	742,764	2,782,261
NEW YORK	7,166,140	27,112,295
NORTH CAROLINA	2,060,116	7,745,087
NORTH DAKOTA	406,852	1,340,576
OHIO	3,711,499	14,833,684
OKLAHOMA	1,155,879	4,396,613
OREGON	1,048,333	4,012,392
PENNSYLVANIA	4,070,640	15,529,194
RHODE ISLAND	442,901	1,480,004
SOUTH CAROLINA	1,276,721	4,710,359
SOUTH DAKOTA	427,589	1,412,549
TENNESSEE	1,680,252	6,387,802
TEXAS	7,286,644	29,228,278
UTAH	710,199	2,587,039
VERMONT	407,301	1,272,847
VIRGINIA	0	6,658,924
WASHINGTON	1,583,754	6,328,974
WEST VIRGINIA	779,620	2,799,259
WISCONSIN	1,685,573	6,582,097
WYOMING	370,640	1,262,907
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	477,300	1,523,409
PUERTO RICO	2,381,661	9,608,968

Goals 2000: Educate America Act Legislative Summary

Overview

The Goals 2000 Act, signed into law March 31, 1994, provides resources to states and communities as they work to improve student academic achievement. States and communities are using Goals 2000 funds to provide quality professional development for teachers, expand the use of computers in classrooms, raise academic standards, and increase parental and community involvement in education.

Components of the "Goals 2000: Educate America Act"

Title I: The National Education Goals

- This title formalizes in law the original six National Education Goals. These goals concern: readiness for school; increased school graduation rates; student academic achievement and citizenship; mathematics and science performance; adult literacy; and safe, disciplined, and drug-free schools. The Act adds two new goals that encourage parental participation and improved professional development for teachers.
- These goals are symbolic expressions of what the President, the nation's Governors, and now the U.S. Congress, hope we will accomplish as a nation by the year 2000. Some states and communities have adopted the original goals, others have adapted them to their own circumstances. Neither the Goals 2000 Act nor any other federal legislation requires states to adopt or implement the National Education Goals as a condition of receiving federal funding.
- The National Education Goals are not mandates, and there are no enforcement or compliance monitoring mechanisms written into law.

Title II: National Education Reform Leadership, Standards, and Assessments

- The bipartisan National Education Goals panel, was originally created by President Bush and the nation's governors in 1990 to monitor the nation's progress toward the National Education Goals. The Goals Panel is comprised of eight Governors, four state legislators, four members of Congress, the Secretary of Education and the President's Domestic Policy Advisor.

- The National Education Standards and Improvement Council is made up of a bipartisan, broad base of citizens, employees, and educators, to examine and certify voluntary national and state standards submitted on a voluntary basis by states and organizations working on particular academic subjects.

(NOTE: Despite the carefully delineated authority provided to NESIC under the Goals 2000 Act, concerns have been raised about any certification of standards. Upon recommendation of the National Education Goals Panel on January 28, 1995, the Secretary of Education has asked the President not to appoint NESIC. Legislation has passed in the House and is pending in the Senate to eliminate NESIC.)

- This title also authorizes grants to support the development of voluntary student assessment systems aligned to state standards, and for the development of model opportunity-to-learn standards. Funds have not been available for the development of model opportunity-to-learn standards. Nine assessment grants have been awarded to a total of twenty-five states to develop or field test new student assessment systems aligned to high standards.

Title III: State and Local Education Improvement

For first-year funding, states submitted a brief application that described how a broad-based citizen panel will develop a plan to improve schools. States have the option to use plans that already have been developed. The application also described how subgrants were to be made for local education improvement and better teacher preservice and continuing professional development.

Broad-Based Citizen Involvement in State Improvement Efforts

- The Governor and the Chief State School Officer each appoint half the members of a broad-based school improvement panel. This panel is comprised of teachers, principals, administrators, parents, representatives of business, labor, and higher education, and members of the public, as well as the chair of the state board of education and the chairs of the appropriate authorizing committees of the state legislature.
- States that already have a broad-based panel in place that has made substantial progress in developing a education improvement plan may request that the Secretary of Education recognize the existing panel.

Comprehensive Improvement Plan Geared to High Standards of Achievement

- The State Planning Panel is responsible for developing a comprehensive reform plan. The plan must be approved by the state education agency and be consistent with state

law.

- States with improvement plans already in place will not have to develop new plans for Goals 2000. The U.S. Secretary of Education may approve plans, or portions of plans, already adopted by the state. To date, six states have submitted preexisting plans: Kentucky, Massachusetts, Ohio, Utah, Michigan, and Oregon. All these plans have been approved.
- In order to receive Goals 2000 funds after the first year, states submit their school improvement plan or an application that indicates they have made substantial progress in its plan development.
- A peer review panel is brought together to review the state improvement plans. This panel, comprised of non-federal educators, employers, parents, and state and local officials, offers guidance to states and recommends to the Secretary of Education whether the education improvement plan should be approved.
- The purpose of reviewing and approving state education reform plans is to ensure that federal funds are invested only in state education reforms with a reasonable chance of success.
- As of November 14, 1995, fourteen states have submitted and had their education improvement plans approved. No state has had their plan rejected, nor has any state been required to modify its plan.

In general, the plans address:

- Strategies for the development or adoption of student academic standards, assessments, and plans for improving the preparation and advanced professional training of teachers.
- Strategies to involve parents and the community in helping all students meet challenging state standards and to promote grass-roots, bottom-up involvement in education.
- Strategies for ensuring that all local educational agencies and schools in the state are involved in developing and implementing needed improvements.
- Strategies for improved management and governance, and for promoting accountability for results, flexibility, site-based management, and other principles of high-performance management.
- Strategies for providing all students an opportunity to learn at higher academic levels. While these strategies have to be outlined in the plan, the implementation of the strategies is voluntary.

- Strategies for assisting local educational agencies and schools to meet the needs of school-age students who have dropped out of school.
- Strategies for bringing technology into the classroom to increase learning.

Funds are also available to states to support the development of a state technology plan, to be integrated with the overall reform plan.

Broad-Based Involvement in Local Education Improvement Efforts

- Each local school district, applying to the state for Goals 2000 funds will be asked to develop a broad consensus regarding a local improvement plan.
- Local districts encourage and assist schools in developing and implementing improvements that best meet the particular needs of the schools. The local plan would include strategies for ensuring that students meet higher academic standards.
- All of these strategies focus on improving student achievement. Decisions regarding the content of curriculum, assessments, and social services remain local decisions. Section 318 of the Act specifically prohibits federal mandates, direction and control of education.

Waivers and Flexibility

- States with approved Goals 2000 plans may request from the Secretary of Education waivers of statutory and regulatory requirements in most other federal education programs, if these requirements interfere with implementation of the state's approach to education improvement. Local school districts and individual schools working on education improvement may similarly request waivers through their state regardless of whether they receive goals 2000 funds.
- Certain requirements, such as the allocation of funds to school districts, and certain laws, such as civil rights and special education laws, may not be waived.
- Up to six states will participate in the "Ed-Flex Demonstration Program," in which the Secretary of Education delegates his waiver authority to the state education agency. This permits state officials to waive federal requirements for local school districts and schools if they impede education reform efforts.
- To date, Oregon, Massachusetts, Kansas, and Ohio have been selected as Ed Flex states.
- Prior to the enactment of Goals 2000, no U.S. Secretary of Education had the authority

to waive any statutory or regulatory requirements for any reason.

Timetable and Funding

In 1994, \$105 million was appropriated for Goals 2000. Congress appropriated \$372 million for 1995. The Senate Appropriations Committee has proposed \$310 million for 1996 while the House of Representatives eliminated funding for Goals 2000. The President has stated that he will veto any bill that substantially reduces funding for education.

Goals 2000 funds are available to states on a formula basis. Attached is a chart with the state funding levels for 1994 and 1995.

During the first year of participation, at least 60 percent of each state's funds were awarded to local school districts. Seventy-five percent of those funds went directly to schools.

During years 2-5, at least 90 percent of each state's funds will be awarded to school districts. At least 85 percent of those funds are awarded to schools.

Title IV. Parental Assistance

- This title creates parental information and resource centers to increase parents' knowledge about child-rearing and to strengthen partnerships between parents and educators in meeting the educational needs of children.
- Local non-profit agencies serving parents are eligible to receive funds to establish parent resource centers. These grants are awarded independent of state participation in Title III of Goals 2000. Agencies in states not participating in Goals 2000 can and have received grants under this title. Their activities are not necessarily related to the state's Goals 2000 activities.
- Twenty-eight parent resource centers were funded by the U.S. Department of Education in 1995.

Title V. National Skill Standards Board

- This title creates a National Skill Standards Board to support the development and adoption of voluntary occupational skill standards and certification. The Board is responsible for identifying major occupations in the U.S. to facilitate voluntary partnerships to develop skill standards for each occupation. The Board will endorse those skill standards submitted by the partnerships that meet certain criteria.

Other Provisions Contained in PL 103-227, but not related to Goals 2000

Title VI. International Education Program

- This title authorizes international exchange activities designed to promote democracy and free market economies. Through grants or contracts awarded by the Secretary, curricula and teacher professional development programs in civics and economics developed in the United States are made available to eligible countries in Central and Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union. Two grants were awarded in 1995, one focusing on civics education, the other on economics education.

Title VII. Safe Schools

- Title VII creates the Safe Schools Act of 1994, which provides funds to help local school districts achieve Goal Six of the National Education Goals. Nineteen grants were awarded in 1995 to help schools develop programs to address drugs and violence.

Title VIII. Minority-focused Civics Education

- This title authorizes the award of grants for seminars in American government and civics for elementary and secondary school teachers and other educators who work with minority and Native American students. The program consists of summer institutes followed by inservice training programs during the academic year. No funds have been made available for this title.

Title IX. Educational Research and Improvement

- This title, the "Educational Research, Development, Dissemination, and Improvement Act," reauthorizes the Department's research and dissemination unit. It establishes five research institutes, an office for reform assistance, the National Library of Education, a research policies and priorities board, and administrative structures to support them. This title does not directly relate to Goals 2000.

Title X. Miscellaneous

- Sections in this title include authorization for a study on how well students with disabilities are represented in school improvement efforts funded under Goals 2000. The title also contains other provisions unrelated to Goals 2000.

11/29/95

11/20/95

Goals 2000 - Title III

State	FY 1994 Final Allotment	FY 1995 Final Allotment
TOTAL, 52 STATES:	\$91,480,000	\$358,251,300
ALABAMA	1,604,625	\$5,941,766
ALASKA	460,574	1,547,345
ARIZONA	1,364,600	5,450,582
ARKANSAS	993,175	3,650,495
CALIFORNIA	10,514,198	42,111,705
COLORADO	1,086,789	4,288,514
CONNECTICUT	962,265	3,460,756
DELAWARE	406,278	1,291,544
FLORIDA	4,022,211	15,861,034
GEORGIA	2,358,215	8,959,402
HAWAII	417,745	1,381,641
IDAHO	458,232	1,568,397
ILLINOIS	4,138,448	15,992,571
INDIANA	1,737,392	6,557,145
IOWA	888,162	3,219,618
KANSAS	865,991	3,193,916
KENTUCKY	1,479,642	5,775,274
LOUISIANA	2,064,025	7,968,128
MAINE	506,617	1,647,540
MARYLAND	1,450,703	5,379,938
MASSACHUSETTS	1,884,961	6,990,859
MICHIGAN	3,622,852	14,371,488
MINNESOTA	1,389,913	5,377,078
MISSISSIPPI	1,361,751	5,094,972
MISSOURI	1,694,086	6,525,935
MONTANA	449,712	1,560,150
NEBRASKA	568,280	1,986,104
NEVADA	410,679	1,419,052
NEW HAMPSHIRE	0	1,290,294
NEW JERSEY	2,445,502	8,792,536
NEW MEXICO	742,764	2,782,261
NEW YORK	7,166,140	27,112,295
NORTH CAROLINA	2,060,116	7,745,087
NORTH DAKOTA	406,852	1,340,576
OHIO	3,711,499	14,833,684
OKLAHOMA	1,155,879	4,396,613
OREGON	1,048,333	4,012,392
PENNSYLVANIA	4,070,640	15,529,194
RHODE ISLAND	442,901	1,480,004
SOUTH CAROLINA	1,276,721	4,710,359
SOUTH DAKOTA	427,589	1,412,549
TENNESSEE	1,680,252	6,387,802
TEXAS	7,286,644	29,228,278
UTAH	710,199	2,587,039
VERMONT	407,301	1,272,847
VIRGINIA	0	6,658,924
WASHINGTON	1,583,754	6,328,974
WEST VIRGINIA	779,620	2,799,259
WISCONSIN	1,685,573	6,582,097
WYOMING	370,640	1,262,907
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	477,300	1,523,409
PUERTO RICO	2,381,661	9,608,968

MYTH & REALITY

GOALS 2000 QUOTES

EXAMPLES

To fully appreciate the depth of reform called for in Goals 2000, it helps to examine a couple of states that launched similar efforts prior to the enactment of the Act. In both Maryland and Kentucky -- after six years of sustained effort and commitment to high standards -- students are showing achievement gains.

In 1990, the **Kentucky** State Legislature passed the comprehensive Kentucky Education Reform Act. A central part of the Act is high standards for all students: each strategy is tied to achieving high standards so that all activities complement and reinforce one another. For example, a curriculum framework provides schools the tools to develop a curriculum based on the state's high standards, as well as assessments to measure student progress.

New state assessments tied to high standards have been designed and in place since 1992. Every year, students, educators, and policymakers are held accountable for student learning through a school performance reporting system that includes rewards for outstanding schools and interventions for low performing ones -- ranging from technical assistance to state takeover. At the same time, schools have been given greater autonomy and authority to manage themselves through school-based decision making councils that include teachers, parents and community members.

A new financing system brought greater equity across districts. Teachers now get more training to teach to high standards, and schools have greater access to educational technology in their classrooms. Also, more students enter school ready to learn due to expanded preschool programs, family resource centers, and extended school services for those who need additional support to achieve high standards. Kentucky has targeted its Goals 2000 funds toward accelerating local reforms, with a particular emphasis on strengthening parent involvement in schools.

Comprehensive reform is beginning to pay off in Kentucky. Students are showing gains in academic achievement. The state's 4th, 8th, and 12th graders made substantial improvement on the 1993-94 state assessment and continued improvement on the 1994-95 assessment, with the most dramatic gains experienced by 4th graders. In all grades, the percentage of students performing at the proficient/distinguished level in mathematics, reading, science, and social studies increased over time. In grade 4 the average of the scores across all subjects tested rose from 24 in 1993 to 38 points in 1995, on a scale from 0 to 140. In reading, the percentage of 4th graders scoring at the proficient/distinguished level increased from 8% in 1993 to 30% in 1995.⁵

Similarly, **Maryland** launched a comprehensive reform effort -- Schools for Success -- after the National Education Summit in 1989. The cornerstone of Maryland's reform effort is its accountability system that establishes high standards for student achievement and related statewide assessments of student progress toward meeting the high standards. Over 3,000 teachers have been involved in designing and scoring test items for grades 3, 5, and 8 as part of the Maryland School Performance Assessment Program (MSPAP). Every year the state reports school progress along such indicators as student achievement in relation to the state's standards and school attendance and dropout rates. Low performing schools receive such interventions as training, consultations and grants, and, if performance does not improve, can

ultimately face reconstitution which may involve changing a school's administration, staff, organization, and/or instructional program.

The state has also developed curricular frameworks in subject areas that are designed to assist administrators and teachers in planning, developing, and implementing local curricula and assessments that support the achievement of state standards. Schools are now governed by School Improvement Teams -- comprised of the principal, school staff, parents, and business and community members -- that develop and implement school improvement plans with objectives, strategies, and activities to achieve the state standards.

Maryland chose to use Goals 2000 to comprehensively review and refine its Schools for Success initiative. A 54-member statewide planning panel -- co-chaired by a local educator and a business partner -- met for over a year to review current school reform activities, and develop strategies to fill in gaps. In particular, Goals 2000 funds were used to make awards to districts for local improvement initiatives, increase public involvement in education, accelerate development of a high school performance assessment, and develop strategies to improve educational technology throughout schools.

Maryland reforms are also showing positive results. In comparison with 1994 state assessment results, in 1995 52% more schools met or approached the standards for satisfactory performance at the third grade level. The number of schools similarly improving has increased by 13% at the fifth grade level and by 32% at the 8th grade. Students have also made gains: 40% of all students statewide met the state standards -- a 25% gain over 1993.⁶

Both Maryland and Kentucky are examples of the depth of activity and long-term commitment to standards that is required to raise student achievement. Both states set high targets for performance, measure progress, and continually refine their strategies. They still have a long way to go -- but their gains are mounting.

Vermont's Green Mountain Challenge⁷

Goals 2000 builds on Vermont's comprehensive reform effort -- the Green Mountain Challenge -- that was launched in 1991. Vermont's challenge is simply stated: high skills for every student, no exceptions, no excuses. Recognizing that such a vision would require dramatic changes, the state has actively engaged citizens throughout Vermont in school improvement.

The Green Mountain Challenge calls for the development of world-class academic standards, comprehensive assessments, and an education system that provides every student an opportunity to meet the standards. In 1993 Vermont adopted the *Common Core of Learning* that describes 20 "vital results" (learning goals), after more than 4,000 Vermonters actively provided input. Work is underway to develop a framework for curriculum and assessment that includes concrete standards of performance as well as suggested types of learning experiences. Local districts will determine how best to reach the state standards. Vermont also has an annual school report night when parents and community members are invited into schools for a presentation and discussion of student performance.

Goals 2000 has afforded Vermont an opportunity to review, assess, and improve its reform activity to date. The state used Goals 2000 to target three areas of weakness in its education system: dropout prevention, accountability, and local reform activity. The state designed a comprehensive prevention program to reduce its dropout rate. It also developed a Framework of Standards and Learning Opportunities, indicators to measure educational progress at the school, district, and state levels. Now a report is available that compares all schools in Vermont on 24 indicators. Local Goals 2000 grants have focused on developing and implementing school plans that support the achievement of high standards by all students and address weak school indicators.

PROMOTING FLEXIBILITY



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20202-_____

Promoting Flexibility to Support State and Community Education Reform Efforts: An Overview

A. Waivers from federal statutory and regulatory requirements.

States, school districts and schools may now request waivers from the vast majority of statutory and regulatory requirements in the reauthorized Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and certain other federal education programs. The Department is prepared to work with your State to remove federal requirements impeding your ability to help all children reach challenging academic standards. States or school districts considering requesting waivers may contact Bill Kincaid on the Department's waiver assistance line, on (202) 401-7801 or 1-800-USA-LEARN, or they may contact the relevant program office.

B. Ed-Flex Demonstration Program: authority for states to grant federal waivers.

The Goals 2000: Educate America Act establishes an educational flexibility demonstration program (Ed-Flex program) under which the Secretary may delegate up to six State educational agencies (SEAs) the authority to waive certain Federal statutory or regulatory requirements affecting the State, its districts and schools. To be eligible to apply for Ed-Flex status, an SEA must have an approved State improvement plan under Goals 2000. In addition, the SEA must waive its own related statutory or regulatory education requirements, while holding LEAs and schools affected by the waivers accountable for the performance of their students.

The Secretary is prepared to review Ed-Flex applications as soon as they are received, and to grant Ed-Flex waiver authority to a State whose application demonstrates substantial promise of assisting that State, its communities, and schools in carrying out comprehensive education reform. Those States desiring to participate in the program are encouraged to submit their applications as soon as possible. **Attachment A** is an invitation for States to participate in Ed-Flex. For additional information, contact Tom Fagan on (202) 401-0039.

C. Charter Schools Demonstration Program.

The development of public charter schools is an important new strategy to promote local innovation and results-based accountability in education. Because one of the greatest challenges facing charter school developers is getting started, the new Improving America's Schools Act (IASA) provides start-up grants to public charter schools, in States with charter school laws, for up to three years. Moreover, the Charter Schools program in the IASA gives the Secretary broad authority to waive, for public charter schools, most federal education laws and regulations.



The Administration asked for \$15 million to fund this grant program in FY 1995, and Congress appropriated \$6 million. In addition to these funds, States can use funds under Goals 2000, the IASA, and other federal programs to support the development and operations of charter schools. **Attachment B** provides a description of how States, and charter schools, may apply for these funds.

D. Other provisions promoting flexibility in the Improving America's Schools Act.

The Improving America's Schools Act of 1994 (IASA), which reauthorized the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), promotes new flexibility for comprehensive school reform efforts in States, communities, and schools. New opportunities for flexibility under the IASA include the following:

Schoolwide programs.

Title I significantly expands the number of schools eligible to become "schoolwide" programs. By the 1996 school year, schools with at least 50% low-income children will be eligible for schoolwide status, increasing the total number of potential schoolwide programs from 8,000 to 20,000 schools nationwide.

Moreover, for the first time, these schools will be able to combine most of their federal funds, not solely their Title I funds, to support schoolwide reform. In addition, they will be free from most federal requirements. In return, these schools will develop comprehensive plans to improve teaching and learning in their entire school and meet the needs of all children served.

Elimination of many federal requirements for Chapter 1 testing and reporting.

The IASA eliminates burdensome Title I testing and reporting requirements. No longer will the federal government require schools to give annual norm-referenced tests to all participating students in grades 2-12. Nor will the federal government require States to comply with burdensome annual reporting requirements. Instead, States will use their own assessments to evaluate the progress of schools and districts served by Title I programs. Moreover, assessment results will be used to inform parents, teachers, principals and others of progress, rather than be reported to the federal government.

Submitting a single (consolidated) plan to receive most federal funds.

The Improving America's Schools Act allows the Secretary of Education to accept a single State plan for most federal funds supporting elementary and secondary education. The development of a single plan eliminates the need to develop separate, often overlapping, plans for many federal programs. A consolidated plan can reduce program fragmentation and improve the use of federal funds to support State and local reform

efforts. Under the IASA, States may also enable school districts to develop a single plan for many federal programs.

A copy of the Federal Register notice, published on January 13, 1994, which outlines how States and school districts may take full advantage of this opportunity, is being mailed to you under separate cover. If you are interested in discussing this further, please contact Bill Wooten on (202) 260-1922.

Consolidation of State and local administrative funds.

An SEA may consolidate funds available for State administration under Title I, other major IASA programs, and Goals 2000. In addition, an SEA may authorize LEAs to consolidate administrative funds.

CLINTON ADMINISTRATION
EDUCATION ACCOMPLISHMENTS

CLINTON ADMINISTRATION'S EDUCATION ACCOMPLISHMENTS

March 15, 1996

1. Encouraging High Standards and Accountability in the Basics and Core Academics

The Clinton Administration has overhauled the federal role in elementary and secondary education to focus on supporting state efforts to establish challenging academic standards with assessments and accountability geared to those standards:

- **Goals 2000:** Forty-eight states received funding under the Goals 2000: Educate America Act to develop and implement their own challenging academic standards. The majority of the funds available through Goals 2000 are assisting local districts and schools with the implementation of challenging standards. Almost 10,000 schools are currently benefitting from Goals 2000.
- With Goals 2000 funds, nine assessment grants were awarded in 1995 to a total of twenty-five states to develop or field test new student assessment systems aligned to the state's standards.
- **Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA):** Title I of ESEA provides 50,000 schools with extra resources to strengthen achievement in the basics. It was completely overhauled in 1994 to focus on high standards and state assessments to measure progress toward the standards.
- **School-to-Work Opportunities Act:** The Administration's School-to-Work Act also encourages the use of challenging state academic standards in school as well as skill standards.
- **National Skill Standards Board:** Created under the Goals 2000 Act, this board helps to stimulate the development of voluntary occupational skill standards and certification in such fields as bio-science, advanced manufacturing, and health care. These skill standards will help students know what skills are needed in these fields and provide a voluntary industry certification that lets employers know that the skills have been obtained.

2. Increasing Flexibility and Providing New Waiver Authority

Under the Clinton Administration, the U.S. Department of Education has eliminated 79% or 3/4 of the regulations affecting elementary and secondary education programs. Prior to 1993, the U.S. Secretary of Education did not have the authority to waive rules and regulations of federal

education laws. Upon passage of the Goals 2000 Act, the School-to-Work Opportunities Act and the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Secretary was granted broad waiver authority.

- No new regulations were issued to carry out the Goals 2000: Educate America Act and the School-to-Work Opportunities Act.
- Close to 100 waivers have been approved in little more than a year under the authority granted in the Goals 2000 Act, the School-to-Work Opportunities Act, and the Improving America's Schools Act.
- Six states have been designated "Ed-Flex" states, where the Secretary of Education delegates his waiver authority over certain federal programs to the states.
- All of the Administration's elementary and secondary programs now encourage streamlining and building on state reform efforts through consolidated applications and planning.

3. Expanding Charter Schools and Public School Choice

The Clinton Administration has supported a variety of public school choice options including charter schools and the expansion of magnet schools:

- In 1993, the President proposed, as part of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, a program to provide start-up funds for public charter schools around the nation. This program is now providing start-up funds to charter schools in 11 states.
- The Department has encouraged states and school districts to consider using Goals 2000, Title I and other federal funds to support charter schools. Already, at least three states -- Michigan, Minnesota, and Massachusetts -- are using Goals 2000 funds for charter schools.
- The President also continues to support magnet schools, another important form of public school choice. The magnet schools program is tying magnet schools to overall school reform efforts and to challenging state standards in 25 states.
- The Department of Education is funding the nation's most comprehensive study of charter schools. This 4-year study will provide important information for educators, governors and other policy-makers, and communities interested in the success of, and challenges facing, charter schools.

4. Supporting the Use of Technology in Education

The Administration's Technology Initiative supports technology planning, infrastructure development, classroom connections to the information highway with affordable access, computers and software for teaching and learning, and professional development for teachers. Bringing every school and classroom into the 21st century is a national effort that includes every sector of government, community leaders and the private sector. The elements include:

- Partnerships of local school systems, universities, and private businesses to create new applications of technology for learning across the curriculum. Nineteen Technology Challenge Grants were awarded in 1995 to consortia of districts in 23 states. Other educational and community partnerships in educational telecommunications are supported through the Telecommunications and Information Infrastructure Assistance Program. The Star Schools Program, another example of partnerships between education and telecommunications entities, helps over one million students and their teachers in all 50 states improve instruction in math, science, foreign language, and literacy skills.
- Five million dollars was provided to 48 states for state technology infrastructure development under the Goals 2000 Act. In addition, many states are using portions of their Goals 2000 funds to integrate technology into professional development, assessment, and student learning.
- Most of the federal government's largest education and training programs, including Goals 2000, Head Start, Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the School-to-Work Opportunities Act, the Perkins Vocational Education Act, and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act allow funds to be used for educational technology, including training for teachers to incorporate technology into their classrooms and purchasing hardware and software.
- Helping states, school districts, schools, teachers, parents, professional organizations and the private sector know and share what works in educational technology is a major function of the six regional technology centers, the ERIC clearinghouses, the Regional Education Labs, and other entities.
- On March 9, 1996 the President, Vice President and other administration officials joined 20,000 volunteers and more than a hundred industry sponsors, to lay 6 million feet of cable in California Schools for NetDay '96. This was the first of such efforts in California and plans are to hold NetDay in other states.
- The Administration will provide leadership and work with Governors, educational leaders, parents, industry providers, and regulators to carry out the provisions in the 1996 Telecommunications Act. This Act promotes affordable access and connections to the internet and other technology resources to schools, libraries, hospitals and clinics.

- The Technology Literacy Challenge is a challenge to the Nation to provide all teachers with the training and support they need to help students learn through technology, develop effective and engaging software and on-line learning resources, provide access to modern computers for all teachers and students, and connect every school and classroom in America to the information highway. The President has proposed a \$2 billion, 5-year fund that will catalyze and leverage state, local, and private sector efforts to meet these goals.

5. Making Investments in Education a Top Priority

The Clinton Administration has made investing in education an top priority of its Administration.

- From 1993 to 1995, the Clinton Administration increased investments in education programs from \$23.7 billion to \$24.5 billion, an increase of \$800 million.
- The President has presented a seven year balanced budget proposal that invests in education priorities. Over the next seven years, the President's budget proposes \$311 billion for education and training, \$61 billion more than the 1996 congressional budget resolution.

6. Supporting the American Family in Children's Learning

The most important teachers in any child's life are her parents. The Clinton Administration recognizes this and has helped to encourage and support parent and family involvement in learning through a variety of initiatives:

- The Family Involvement Partnership for Learning, which was launched in September 1994, brings together over 250 national education, family, and civic organizations and employers to encourage more family involvement in education. The partnership includes thirty-five national religious denominations representing over 75% of church-going Americans.

There are two major projects of this partnership:

READ*WRITE*NOW!, launched in the spring of 1995, reached over 425,000 children last summer. Over 125,000 reading partners provided mentoring and literacy support.

AMERICA GOES BACK TO SCHOOL, organized each September since 1994 to encourage Americans to get involved in education. This effort has included celebrities, community leaders, parents and thousands of volunteers who went back to school to highlight the importance of education.

- National and local employers all over the country, including Disney, Marriott, HBO, Hewlett-Packard, John Hancock Financial Services, are signing the "Employer's Promise"

to adopt family-friendly business practices that encourage employees to help their own children learn and to volunteer time in schools.

- Nonprofit organizations in 28 states were awarded \$9.9 million in 1995 to establish parent information and resource centers. These centers are collaborating with schools, institutions of higher education, social service agencies, and other nonprofit organizations to help children learn.
- The reauthorized Elementary and Secondary Education Act emphasizes parental involvement in education through school-parent compacts to increase student achievement. The Goals 2000 Act also encourages parental involvement in all aspects of education reform and improvement efforts from setting standards to developing school improvement plans.

7. Preparing Young People for a Strong Transition from School to Work

Seventy-five percent of students do not attend college directly after completing high school. The Clinton Administration recognized how important it is that these young people have opportunities to develop the skills they need to get good paying jobs and be productive, responsible citizens. The Administration and Congress passed the School-to-Work Opportunities Act in 1994 to help support local partnerships--among businesses, schools, community organizations and state and local governments--and to create opportunities for young people to receive the skills and training they need.

- In 1994 all 50 states received School-to-Work planning grants to begin to produce comprehensive plans for helping students develop the skills they need to successfully transition from school to work.
- To date, 27 states have received multi-million dollar implementation grants totaling over \$215 million.
- Local School-to-Work grants have also been awarded to 37 communities.

8. Expanding Access to College

Since 1992, the President has substantially increased the level of Federal financial assistance actually available to students. In 1992, \$22.5 billion (grants, loans and work-study) was available to help students pay for the costs of higher education. The 1997 budget proposes \$41.5 billion in aid available, an increase of \$19 billion, or 84 percent since 1992.

- The Direct Student Loan, proposed by President Clinton, simplifies the process for receiving a student loan and provides more flexible repayment options. The Direct Loan program has been successfully implemented at 1,330 institutions and borrowers and schools have indicated overwhelming support.

- The President has proposed a substantial increase in the maximum Pell grant award to \$2,700--an increase of \$360 of 15 percent above the current 1995 level.

9. Making Schools Safe and Disciplined

The Clinton Administration has supported a number of initiatives and programs to reduce violence and drugs in the schools. For example:

- Since 1994, more than \$18 million has been awarded under the Safe Schools Act to local education agencies for violence prevention programs--including conflict resolution, peer mediation, and teach training--and for metal detectors and security personnel.
- This program was expanded in 1994. The Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act will provide nearly \$500 million to communities and states for a wide variety of violence and drug prevention programs.
- In his State of the Union address, the President encouraged communities to explore the option of implementing uniform policies as one approach to reducing violence and focus students back on learning the basics.

10. Helping Children Start School Ready to Learn

One of the top priorities of the Clinton Administration has been to help ensure that young children in America start school prepared to learn. The 1994 Head Start reauthorization included efforts to improve Head Start programs, including professional development for teachers, expansion in enrollment, and extended days for children with working parents. The administration has proposed consistent growth in Head Start funding, and Congress has provided for continual increases in appropriations since 1992. Over 730,000 children are served by Head Start every year.

11. National and Community Service

The national service program is creating opportunities for young people all over the country to earn or pay back college tuition through community service. Through this initiative, more than 25,000 Americans are at work in schools and neighborhoods across the country helping to reduce youth gang/violence, providing after school mentoring and tutoring, helping children learn computer skills, and offering other educational services.

CLAREMONT REPORT

Setting the Record Straight: Responding to the Claremont Institute Report on Goals 2000 and Education in California

The Goals 2000 Act provides resources to states and local communities to improve academic achievement. States and school districts set standards for basic and advanced skills in academic subject areas. They undertake education reforms to improve teaching and learning, provide training to teachers, expand the use of computers in the classroom, increase parental and community involvement, and make other locally designed education improvements. The federal government supports these efforts by providing funding, and by providing expanded flexibility in how these funds, as well as all federal education funds, can be used to support locally designed reforms.

This document responds to the erroneous assertions made by Izumi and Williams about Goals 2000 and its potential to assist California's educational improvement efforts in *Goals 2000 and California Education: Devolution in Retreat?*, a report from the Claremont Institute. That paper attempts to cast Goals 2000 (along with related federal programs) as a mechanism for substantially increasing federal control over education, at the expense of local and state control. Indeed, as a review of the legislation and the U.S. Department of Education's track record will show, the paper displays a shocking ignorance of both new and longstanding federal education programs, and a complete misunderstanding of key provisions of the law.

More specifically, the paper makes the following assertions:

Assertion: *"The original six goals were expanded to eight by Clinton and his new Secretary of Education" (p. 3). Title I of Goals 2000, which contains the National Education Goals, "indicates a greater willingness by the federal government to impose its will than it would have the public believe. . . . [T]he Act uses the command word 'will' at least forty-five times . . . such as: All children will have access to high-quality and developmentally appropriate preschool programs" (p. 5).*

Response: The authors are confused. They can't tell the difference between Congressional endorsement of a vision for the future of American education and federal mandates. The rest of the analysis in the paper reflects equally glaring misunderstandings of the Act and of what its provisions actually mean.

- Through Goals 2000, Congress endorsed—on a bipartisan basis—the goals initially developed by the nation's governors and President Bush. While Congress added two goals (parental involvement and teacher professional development) to the original six, the wording of the goals and objectives is virtually the same as when the goals were initially developed by the governors and President Bush. The goals use the word "will"

precisely because they are goals—descriptions of what the governors and President hoped would occur in the future.

- The authors may have beancounted the verbs, but they missed the main point. The goals are not requirements, and there are no federal funds tied to adopting or meeting them. The goals have always enjoyed broad, bipartisan support, both before and after they were incorporated into the Goals 2000 Act. The wording the authors dissect and criticize has already been widely accepted by governors and legislators of both parties, parents, employers, state and local education officials, and civic groups of all stripes.

In addition, states and communities all across the country have adopted, or adapted them to fit their particular circumstances.

Assertion: *“The minute any state decides to accept any part of the Goals 2000 largesse, the supposedly ‘voluntary’ goals become mandatory” (p. 9). In order to receive funds under Title III of Goals 2000, states have to meet federal requirements, including developing a state education improvement plan and submitting it to the Secretary for approval. “[T]he federal Secretary has significant discretionary power to accept or reject a state’s application based on the state’s adherence to Washington’s policies . . . [T]here will be powerful and irresistible pressure on states to conform to federal education policies” (p. 12).*

Response: These criticisms reflect another fundamental misunderstanding of the Act. They are strongly contradicted by the experience of states participating in Goals 2000.

- These criticisms are based on misinformed interpretations of specific provisions of the Act, taken completely out of context, and conveniently overlook the track record established over the past 15 months. Forty-eight states and hundreds of local school districts have received Goals 2000 funds. No state or school district has been told what policies, practices, or education improvement strategies to adopt as a result of participating in Goals 2000. Not one local school district has even submitted an education improvement plan to the federal government, nor will they. Fourteen states have submitted completed Goals 2000 plans. All have been approved, and not one state has been asked to change even a single word in its education reform plan.
- Neither Title III of the Goals 2000 Act nor any other federal legislation requires states to adopt or implement the National Education Goals as a condition of receiving federal funding. The provisions describing what state Goals 2000 plans must address do not require any particular

strategies for achieving the goals, and the reviews of state plans have not looked at this at all. The paper's warnings of federal intrusion and increased federal control are myths, designed to play on the fears of parents and, in this case, to pressure Governor Wilson into turning down funds that can help California schools.

- The federal government was a partner in establishing the goals. The agreement between the governors and President Bush at the 1989 Charlottesville Education Summit, as well as the goals themselves, explicitly acknowledge that the federal government must support state and local efforts to achieve these goals. It would make no sense to establish widely endorsed national goals and then make the federal government irrelevant to achieving them. Yet to have no relationship between federal education programs and the goals would do just that. Designing federal education programs to assist states in their own efforts to achieve the National Education Goals should be applauded, not criticized. Failure to do this would mean that the federal government was failing to do its limited and carefully defined share in helping to achieve the goals.
- The requirement that states develop education improvement plans is based on (1) the lessons state leaders themselves learned about how to improve education; and (2) the fact that every governor in the country committed to develop education improvement plans when they participated in the Charlottesville education summit.
- The requirement for Secretarial approval of state plans is for the purpose of responsible federal use of taxpayer funds, not for federal intrusion into state and local education matters. The review of state plans is conducted by educators, employers and parents, not federal officials. The purpose is simply to determine if the plans are promising enough to invest in. The Secretary does not approve academic standards, tests, or any specific part of a state plan. The law doesn't allow for an intrusive approach, the Secretary doesn't want an intrusive approach and the U.S. Department of Education has not used an intrusive approach—the track record since the enactment of Goals 2000 leaves no room for doubt.
- The Goals 2000 legislation incorporates the best features of an accountable block grant—providing unprecedented flexibility in how funds are spent in exchange for states and districts setting higher standards for results.
- Goals 2000 Act requirements are minimal and focus on achieving better results for students. In addition, the legislation authorizes states, local

districts, and schools to apply for waivers of requirements in elementary and secondary programs, when regulations hinder reform efforts. Moreover, the Education Department has issued no new regulations for the Goals 2000 Act.

Assertion: *The paper claims (supposedly quoting Gov. Roy Romer) that “parents and voters oppose” Goals 2000 (p. 7).*

Response: In fact, parent organizations, business groups, and educational organizations representing states and local communities have endorsed and continue to support Goals 2000. It supports their efforts to set challenging standards that will strengthen education in their states—teaching, curriculum, and testing aligned with the higher standards. The Goals 2000 Act provides support for effective change. It creates a partnership with states and local school systems to help our students achieve the high standards they will need if they are to meet the challenges of the 21st century.

Assertion: *Goals 2000 “lists the strategies that they [states] must follow in order to meet the goals,” including ‘one-stop shopping’ and other ways of providing social services, health care, and other nonacademic activities in schools (p. 11).*

Response: The Goals 2000 Act provides a broad and very flexible framework for state education improvement plans. It does not, however, in any way determine the specific content of the plans. Nor does it require any specific practices, such as provision of social services or the use of particular types of textbooks or instructional materials. The authors are simply wrong about this. These are local or state decisions.

Goals 2000 does not require any particular strategies; this is up to state and local discretion. Children who are hungry, need eye glasses or are encountering other problems do not learn well; ignoring these problems only leads to more problems in educating children. Fragmenting and duplicating bureaucracies is not a very effective way to solve such problems; many states and localities have found that coordination of services is a key to solving complex problems and using tax dollars more effectively. This legislation simply encourages states to build on what they have already decided works for them.

Assertion: *Goals 2000 creates “new bureaucracies” to advance federal control over education; “resisting federal ‘advice’ will not be as easy as it may seem” (p. 6). They include:*
—*the National Education Goals Panel [“charged with an advocacy mission” (p. 6) to ensure that local leaders are “educated and propagandized until they come around. The federal goals will drive local reforms, not the other way around” (p. 7)],*
—*the National Education Standards and Improvement Council (NESIC) [“the NESIC’s possible demise does not eliminate the national standards themselves, or the fact that*

states receiving federal funds will have to meet those standards" (p. 7)],
—the Regional Laboratories ["another group of bureaucracies created by the Act, which have so far received little attention"; they "have the potential to impose their will on local schools" (p. 8)], and
—the federal research institutes ["the mission outlined for them . . . contains provisions that would turn them into advocacy organizations" and prevent efforts to develop single-sex schools for African American males from receiving "a fair hearing and analysis" (p. 8)].

Response: Once again, the authors demonstrate a fundamental misunderstanding of various provisions of the Act and the extent to which they interrelate. They also demonstrate ignorance of ongoing national activities in support of educational improvement by states and localities—some dating back three decades or more.

- None of these entities has authority over state and local matters; they are a set of resources that can be used at the discretion of states, local communities or individual schools.
- The National Education Goals Panel was established in 1990 by President Bush as a result of the President's education summit with the nation's governors. This independent, bipartisan panel has 18 members, nine Democrats and nine Republicans. Of the eight governors who are members, five of them (David Beasley of South Carolina, John Rowland of Connecticut, John Engler of Michigan, Kirk Fordice of Mississippi, and Christine Whitman of New Jersey) are Republicans. The Panel's primary purpose is to measure the nation's and states' progress toward the National Education Goals and to highlight successful community and state efforts to improve student performance.
- Concerning national standards, the authors have done what they accuse others of doing: confusing a national effort to improve education with a federal mandate. The U.S. Department of Education is encouraging states to set their own standards for what students should know and be able to do in core academic areas. While there are national efforts under way by various organizations to establish model standards, in many cases supported by funds provided by the Bush Administration, these are nationally-developed models, not federal standards. The Department will not promulgate or endorse them, and states and localities are not under any obligation to adopt them, regardless of whether or not they participate in Goals 2000.
- The regional labs and research institutes are part of the Office of Educational Research and Improvement—which has been in existence for

over 30 years, and which is independent of Goals 2000 or any other federal education program. Their role in schools is determined by local and state needs, not federal dictates. They provide assistance only upon request.

Assertion: *The National Skills Standards Board creates "federal entanglement in local education and the private sector job market" (p. 14). Furthermore, "the education standards created by the National Education Goals Panel will be incorporated into the national skills standards. . . . [T]he Clinton administration wants the business community to pressure local schools to use the education standards contained in the Act" (p. 14).*

Response: Once again, the authors are confused. The National Education Goals Panel is not creating standards and imposing them on states, and the business community is not being deputized to enforce federal changes to local school curricula. Federal funds are not contingent upon the use of skill standards in any way. Educational improvement is an issue of national importance and interest, and there is need for national leadership—from governors, legislators, educators, employers, and the public—on various aspects of education reform. The Goals Panel and the National Skills Standards Board provide the structure for this leadership, using modest amounts of federal funds to provide tools for supporting local and state education reform, with limited involvement of federal officials.

Response: The National Skill Standards Board (NSSB) and the business community's support for education standards are not about pressuring local schools to use a specific set of standards. NSSB is a group of private citizens -- business, education, and labor leaders -- that will facilitate a process whereby employers can articulate the skills they need from workers. Local schools can use that information to choose the curriculum and programs they think will prepare their students to meet the demands of employers. There is no federal entanglement. Local schools want the best futures for their children, and skill standards will provide them more information they can use to better prepare their students for their futures.

Assertion: *If the government is handing out skill certificates to select students, then these students will have an advantage [over students who attend private schools, home schools, and schools not participating in Goals 2000] in getting a job or perhaps getting into college.*

Response: Skill certificates give industry an opportunity to let students, parents, and teachers know what skills are required for employment. Skill certificates give students an opportunity to let potential employers know what skills they have. The government does not hand out skill certificates. A skill certificate is a credential issued by the local school-to-work program. What kinds of credentials to issue are decided on by the state through its planning process. Skill certificates only matter if employers look for them in hiring and employers will only look for

them if they certify the skills employers are looking for anyway. Therefore, students benefit from the opportunity to acquire the skills that industries are demanding. Individuals will also have the opportunity to acquire skill certificates through postsecondary education, union and apprenticeship programs, professional associations, and from employers -- not just from public schools.

Assertion: School-to-work exists in large part simply to further the reach of Goals 2000.

Response: The School-to-Work Act exists to provide states and communities resources to help their youth develop the skills they need for citizenship, career opportunities, and higher education. It is part of the Act's purpose to support academic achievement and, to that end, it simply says that state school-to-work activities should not operate at cross purposes with state academic requirements: if there are state academic standards, school-based school-to-work activities should be consistent with them. None of these provisions specify what those standards must be.

Assertion: *"Even though compliance with Goals 2000 is 'voluntary' for states, the law holds disadvantaged children hostage to its dictates" (p. 2) because states that receive funds under the Improving America's Schools Act (IASA) must align their curriculum, assessments, and teacher professional development with Goals 2000 standards.*

Response: Neither disadvantaged students nor states are "held hostage" by either Goals 2000 or the Improving America's Schools Act, which provides assistance to disadvantaged students under the Title 1 program. Quite to the contrary, the provisions in both Goals 2000 and Title 1 clearly place the states and local school districts in charge of determining academic standards and educational policy. They also both serve to encourage states and local communities to set more rigorous academic standards for all students, including economically disadvantaged students.

- Goals 2000 requires that participating states establish their own academic standards in basic and advanced skills for students, and develop tests to measure student progress toward achieving these standards. The Title 1 program also requires that states set their own academic standards in basic and advanced skills for participating students, and test to determine progress toward achieving those standards. When the two programs operate together, the result will be that disadvantaged students served by the Title 1 program will be expected to reach for the same academic standards as are other students in the state. Rather than being "held hostage", disadvantaged students are freed from a tyranny of low expectations, and will be challenged to work harder and learn more.

- There are no "goals 2000" standards, only state or local standards, determined by state or local authorities. The same is true of curriculum, assessments, and ways of preparing and upgrading the skills of teachers. These are all determined at the state and local level, without federal direction or control.
- According to a recent report by the American Federation of Teachers, 49 states are setting their own academic standards for its students. The U.S. Department of Education independently counts all 50 states engaged in this process. For states participating in Goals 2000 and Title 1, they too will use the standards they are setting themselves. In either case, the academic standards that student will be held to are determined by the state, not by the federal government. And standards used for Goals 2000 and Title 1 are those same standards.
- No state is required to participate in Goals 2000 in order to continue to receive Title 1 funds or funds under IASA or any other federal education programs. This is stated explicitly in Section 213 of the Goals 2000 Act.
- This situation represents an increase in state and local control and a decrease in federal requirements. The federal government exercises no control over the resources that states and communities spend on education or over school and classroom practices. Therefore, if federal programs are to be effective, they must work in tandem with state and local reform efforts. The new legislation recognizes this and responds to concern that in the past compliance with rules and regulations surrounding federal education programs has often constrained the flexibility necessary to achieve improvement. For example, reliance on nationally-normed testing in the Title I program was often redundant with state testing and consequently cut into instructional time for students who needed extra help the most. The new Title I allows states to use their own state assessments that measure performance in attaining the skills and standards they deem to be important.

Assertion: *"The objectives of Goals 2000 are already mirrored in California's subject frameworks and its statewide assessment" (p. 2). California's math and English frameworks "have resulted in the de-emphasis of basic math skills and phonics" (p. 21). The "connection between these state Math and English frameworks and the Goals 2000 debate over measuring standards . . . lies with the California Learning Assessment*

System (CLAS). . . . The link is that the CLAS test was designed to measure the effectiveness of education reforms envisioned under Goals 2000 programs” (p. 22). This type of “performance-based” test “bases its scoring on non-academic benchmarks” not “right and wrong answers” (p. 22).

Response: Standards and testing procedures are determined by the state and by local school districts and schools, not by the federal government. This has been true in the past and will continue to be true under Goals 2000.

- Any flaws in previous curriculum frameworks and assessments in California were the complete responsibility of the state, not of the federal government, and correcting any problems is also California's responsibility, without regard to whether or not California participates in Goals 2000. California is in the midst of revising its curriculum frameworks, and Governor Wilson has just signed legislation calling for the development of a new testing program. The state can use Goals 2000 funds to support its own activities in these areas, if it chooses to. Because education is so important, some aspects of reform are bound to generate controversy, but how these issues are addressed in California will be determined by the citizens of California, not by federal requirements—whether or not the state participates in Goals 2000.
- Goals 2000 promotes assessments that are aligned with each state's **content** standards in academic subjects. These use valid and reliable academic performance measures to provide coherent information about student attainments relative to the state content standards.

Assertion: *Goals 2000 promotes outcomes-based education: (1) The Regional Laboratories have “a primary duty” to promote school restructuring, which is “a buzz word in many education circles . . . for promoting the controversial principles of outcomes-based education” (pp. 8-9); (2) One purpose of the Act is to provide “a national framework for education reform” and “the term ‘frameworks’ . . . is the buzzword for California’s troubled experiment with outcome-based education” (p. 20).*

Response: These are transparent and illogical attempts to generate objections to Goals 2000 by purporting to find a link to the outcomes-based education controversy. To set the record straight: (1) The provision that allows the labs to respond to a school’s request for help with its restructuring efforts is not intended to promote outcomes-based education; (2) A national “framework” for education reform means a structure of support and is not a secret code for OBE.

Goals 2000 doesn’t promote any particular education philosophy or approach; that is a local decision. GOALS 2000 focuses on upgrading **academic** achievement and

preparing students for the world of work. Each state, school district, and school determines what content it wants students to learn, and whether that content should focus strictly on core academic and basic skills or should also include other areas. The federal government will not be involved in those kinds of local decisions.

Assertion: *One California school district plans to use its Goals 2000 funds to hire school counselors to address “the supposed emotional and social needs of district children” and focus on “‘soft’ areas of school management and school environment” rather than academics (p. 23). Therefore, Goals 2000 “will mean a significant expansion” in these areas, “with no assurance as to improved student performance or a higher quality classroom instruction” (p. 23).*

Response: Whatever the strengths or weaknesses of the program in this one district, it effectively illustrates the ability of local schools and communities to use Goals 2000 resources in ways not required by the statute or imposed by the federal government. By providing flexibility for states and localities to decide how best to use their Goals 2000 funds, the Act supports local control and decision making, rather than federal mandates. When control is decentralized, funds will be used to support a variety of initiatives. The point of establishing state standards and carrying out a state and local planning process, as Goals 2000 calls for, is to allow individuals and groups who are concerned about education reform to help decide how best to improve instruction and student performance.

It is ironic that the authors call for local control of education, and at the same time they criticize a local district’s use of the authority and resources at its disposal. Supporters of local control in theory should also support it in practice.

Assertion: *Rigorous academic standards will only be established by involving the public in a broad-based deliberation on the subject, thereby building a genuine and informed consensus. Goals 2000 obfuscates and delays that public debate by purveying the myth that new federal goals, standards, and strategies are meeting these needs.*

Response: We agree completely that academic standards must be established through a broad-based process, and rest on an informed consensus. That is precisely what Goals 2000 supports—broad-based, grass roots involvement in the development of academic standards and the necessary education reforms so that students can reach those standards. It is the authors of this report who have been purveying myths and obfuscating the public debate. While their attacks are aimed at the federal law, if successful they will deny resources and opportunities to students, teachers and parents in California.

Setting the Record Straight: Responding to the Claremont Institute Report on Goals 2000 and Education in California

The Goals 2000 Act provides resources to states and local communities to improve academic achievement. States and school districts set standards for basic and advanced skills in academic subject areas. They undertake education reforms to improve teaching and learning, provide training to teachers, expand the use of computers in the classroom, increase parental and community involvement, and make other locally designed education improvements. The federal government supports these efforts by providing funding, and by providing expanded flexibility in how these funds, as well as all federal education funds, can be used to support locally designed reforms.

This document responds to the erroneous assertions made by Izumi and Williams about Goals 2000 and its potential to assist California's educational improvement efforts in *Goals 2000 and California Education: Devolution in Retreat?*, a report from the Claremont Institute. That paper attempts to cast Goals 2000 (along with related federal programs) as a mechanism for substantially increasing federal control over education, at the expense of local and state control. Indeed, as a review of the legislation and the U.S. Department of Education's track record will show, the paper displays a shocking ignorance of both new and longstanding federal education programs, and a complete misunderstanding of key provisions of the law.

More specifically, the paper makes the following assertions:

Assertion: *"The original six goals were expanded to eight by Clinton and his new Secretary of Education" (p. 3). Title I of Goals 2000, which contains the National Education Goals, "indicates a greater willingness by the federal government to impose its will than it would have the public believe. . . . [T]he Act uses the command word 'will' at least forty-five times . . . such as: All children will have access to high-quality and developmentally appropriate preschool programs" (p. 5).*

Response: The authors are confused. They can't tell the difference between Congressional endorsement of a vision for the future of American education and federal mandates. The rest of the analysis in the paper reflects equally glaring misunderstandings of the Act and of what its provisions actually mean.

- Through Goals 2000, Congress endorsed—on a bipartisan basis—the goals initially developed by the nation's governors and President Bush. While Congress added two goals (parental involvement and teacher professional development) to the original six, the wording of the goals and objectives is virtually the same as when the goals were initially developed by the governors and President Bush. The goals use the word "will"

precisely because they are goals—descriptions of what the governors and President hoped would occur in the future.

- The authors may have beancounted the verbs, but they missed the main point. The goals are not requirements, and there are no federal funds tied to adopting or meeting them. The goals have always enjoyed broad, bipartisan support, both before and after they were incorporated into the Goals 2000 Act. The wording the authors dissect and criticize has already been widely accepted by governors and legislators of both parties, parents, employers, state and local education officials, and civic groups of all stripes.

In addition, states and communities all across the country have adopted, or adapted them to fit their particular circumstances.

Assertion: *"The minute any state decides to accept any part of the Goals 2000 largesse, the supposedly 'voluntary' goals become mandatory" (p. 9). In order to receive funds under Title III of Goals 2000, states have to meet federal requirements, including developing a state education improvement plan and submitting it to the Secretary for approval. "[T]he federal Secretary has significant discretionary power to accept or reject a state's application based on the state's adherence to Washington's policies . . . [T]here will be powerful and irresistible pressure on states to conform to federal education policies" (p. 12).*

Response: These criticisms reflect another fundamental misunderstanding of the Act. They are strongly contradicted by the experience of states participating in Goals 2000.

- These criticisms are based on misinformed interpretations of specific provisions of the Act, taken completely out of context, and conveniently overlook the track record established over the past 15 months. Forty-eight states and hundreds of local school districts have received Goals 2000 funds. No state or school district has been told what policies, practices, or education improvement strategies to adopt as a result of participating in Goals 2000. Not one local school district has even submitted an education improvement plan to the federal government, nor will they. Fourteen states have submitted completed Goals 2000 plans. All have been approved, and not one state has been asked to change even a single word in its education reform plan.
- Neither Title III of the Goals 2000 Act nor any other federal legislation requires states to adopt or implement the National Education Goals as a condition of receiving federal funding. The provisions describing what state Goals 2000 plans must address do not require any particular

strategies for achieving the goals, and the reviews of state plans have not looked at this at all. The paper's warnings of federal intrusion and increased federal control are myths, designed to play on the fears of parents and, in this case, to pressure Governor Wilson into turning down funds that can help California schools.

- The federal government was a partner in establishing the goals. The agreement between the governors and President Bush at the 1989 Charlottesville Education Summit, as well as the goals themselves, explicitly acknowledge that the federal government must support state and local efforts to achieve these goals. It would make no sense to establish widely endorsed national goals and then make the federal government irrelevant to achieving them. Yet to have no relationship between federal education programs and the goals would do just that. Designing federal education programs to assist states in their own efforts to achieve the National Education Goals should be applauded, not criticized. Failure to do this would mean that the federal government was failing to do its limited and carefully defined share in helping to achieve the goals.
- The requirement that states develop education improvement plans is based on (1) the lessons state leaders themselves learned about how to improve education; and (2) the fact that every governor in the country committed to develop education improvement plans when they participated in the Charlottesville education summit.
- The requirement for Secretarial approval of state plans is for the purpose of responsible federal use of taxpayer funds, not for federal intrusion into state and local education matters. The review of state plans is conducted by educators, employers and parents, not federal officials. The purpose is simply to determine if the plans are promising enough to invest in. The Secretary does not approve academic standards, tests, or any specific part of a state plan. The law doesn't allow for an intrusive approach, the Secretary doesn't want an intrusive approach and the U.S. Department of Education has not used an intrusive approach—the track record since the enactment of Goals 2000 leaves no room for doubt.
- The Goals 2000 legislation incorporates the best features of an accountable block grant—providing unprecedented flexibility in how funds are spent in exchange for states and districts setting higher standards for results.
- Goals 2000 Act requirements are minimal and focus on achieving better results for students. In addition, the legislation authorizes states, local

districts, and schools to apply for waivers of requirements in elementary and secondary programs, when regulations hinder reform efforts. Moreover, the Education Department has issued no new regulations for the Goals 2000 Act.

Assertion: *The paper claims (supposedly quoting Gov. Roy Romer) that "parents and voters oppose" Goals 2000 (p. 7).*

Response: In fact, parent organizations, business groups, and educational organizations representing states and local communities have endorsed and continue to support Goals 2000. It supports their efforts to set challenging standards that will strengthen education in their states—teaching, curriculum, and testing aligned with the higher standards. The Goals 2000 Act provides support for effective change. It creates a partnership with states and local school systems to help our students achieve the high standards they will need if they are to meet the challenges of the 21st century.

Assertion: *Goals 2000 "lists the strategies that they [states] must follow in order to meet the goals," including 'one-stop shopping' and other ways of providing social services, health care, and other nonacademic activities in schools (p. 11).*

Response: The Goals 2000 Act provides a broad and very flexible framework for state education improvement plans. It does not, however, in any way determine the specific content of the plans. Nor does it require any specific practices, such as provision of social services or the use of particular types of textbooks or instructional materials. The authors are simply wrong about this. These are local or state decisions.

Goals 2000 does not require any particular strategies; this is up to state and local discretion. Children who are hungry, need eye glasses or are encountering other problems do not learn well; ignoring these problems only leads to more problems in educating children. Fragmenting and duplicating bureaucracies is not a very effective way to solve such problems; many states and localities have found that coordination of services is a key to solving complex problems and using tax dollars more effectively. This legislation simply encourages states to build on what they have already decided works for them.

Assertion: *Goals 2000 creates "new bureaucracies" to advance federal control over education; "resisting federal 'advice' will not be as easy as it may seem" (p. 6). They include:*
—*the National Education Goals Panel ["charged with an advocacy mission" (p. 6) to ensure that local leaders are "educated and propagandized until they come around. The federal goals will drive local reforms, not the other way around" (p. 7)],*
—*the National Education Standards and Improvement Council (NESIC) ["the NESIC's possible demise does not eliminate the national standards themselves, or the fact that*

states receiving federal funds will have to meet those standards" (p. 7)],
—the Regional Laboratories ["another group of bureaucracies created by the Act, which have so far received little attention"; they "have the potential to impose their will on local schools" (p. 8)], and
—the federal research institutes ["the mission outlined for them . . . contains provisions that would turn them into advocacy organizations" and prevent efforts to develop single-sex schools for African American males from receiving "a fair hearing and analysis" (p. 8)].

Response: Once again, the authors demonstrate a fundamental misunderstanding of various provisions of the Act and the extent to which they interrelate. They also demonstrate ignorance of ongoing national activities in support of educational improvement by states and localities—some dating back three decades or more.

- None of these entities has authority over state and local matters; they are a set of resources that can be used at the discretion of states, local communities or individual schools.
- The National Education Goals Panel was established in 1990 by President Bush as a result of the President's education summit with the nation's governors. This independent, bipartisan panel has 18 members, nine Democrats and nine Republicans. Of the eight governors who are members, five of them (David Beasley of South Carolina, John Rowland of Connecticut, John Engler of Michigan, Kirk Fordice of Mississippi, and Christine Whitman of New Jersey) are Republicans. The Panel's primary purpose is to measure the nation's and states' progress toward the National Education Goals and to highlight successful community and state efforts to improve student performance.
- Concerning national standards, the authors have done what they accuse others of doing: confusing a national effort to improve education with a federal mandate. The U.S. Department of Education is encouraging states to set their own standards for what students should know and be able to do in core academic areas. While there are national efforts under way by various organizations to establish model standards, in many cases supported by funds provided by the Bush Administration, these are nationally-developed models, not federal standards. The Department will not promulgate or endorse them, and states and localities are not under any obligation to adopt them, regardless of whether or not they participate in Goals 2000.
- The regional labs and research institutes are part of the Office of Educational Research and Improvement—which has been in existence for

over 30 years, and which is independent of Goals 2000 or any other federal education program. Their role in schools is determined by local and state needs, not federal dictates. They provide assistance only upon request.

Assertion: *The National Skills Standards Board creates "federal entanglement in local education and the private sector job market" (p. 14). Furthermore, "the education standards created by the National Education Goals Panel will be incorporated into the national skills standards. . . . [T]he Clinton administration wants the business community to pressure local schools to use the education standards contained in the Act" (p. 14).*

Response: Once again, the authors are confused. The National Education Goals Panel is not creating standards and imposing them on states, and the business community is not being deputized to enforce federal changes to local school curricula. Federal funds are not contingent upon the use of skill standards in any way. Educational improvement is an issue of national importance and interest, and there is need for national leadership—from governors, legislators, educators, employers, and the public—on various aspects of education reform. The Goals Panel and the National Skills Standards Board provide the structure for this leadership, using modest amounts of federal funds to provide tools for supporting local and state education reform, with limited involvement of federal officials.

Response: The National Skill Standards Board (NSSB) and the business community's support for education standards are not about pressuring local schools to use a specific set of standards. NSSB is a group of private citizens -- business, education, and labor leaders -- that will facilitate a process whereby employers can articulate the skills they need from workers. Local schools can use that information to choose the curriculum and programs they think will prepare their students to meet the demands of employers. There is no federal entanglement. Local schools want the best futures for their children, and skill standards will provide them more information they can use to better prepare their students for their futures.

Assertion: *If the government is handing out skill certificates to select students, then these students will have an advantage [over students who attend private schools, home schools, and schools not participating in Goals 2000] in getting a job or perhaps getting into college.*

Response: Skill certificates give industry an opportunity to let students, parents, and teachers know what skills are required for employment. Skill certificates give students an opportunity to let potential employers know what skills they have. The government does not hand out skill certificates. A skill certificate is a credential issued by the local school-to-work program. What kinds of credentials to issue are decided on by the state through its planning process. Skill certificates only matter if employers look for them in hiring and employers will only look for

them if they certify the skills employers are looking for anyway. Therefore, students benefit from the opportunity to acquire the skills that industries are demanding. Individuals will also have the opportunity to acquire skill certificates through postsecondary education, union and apprenticeship programs, professional associations, and from employers -- not just from public schools.

Assertion: School-to-work exists in large part simply to further the reach of Goals 2000.

Response: The School-to-Work Act exists to provide states and communities resources to help their youth develop the skills they need for citizenship, career opportunities, and higher education. It is part of the Act's purpose to support academic achievement and, to that end, it simply says that state school-to-work activities should not operate at cross purposes with state academic requirements: if there are state academic standards, school-based school-to-work activities should be consistent with them. None of these provisions specify what those standards must be.

Assertion: *"Even though compliance with Goals 2000 is 'voluntary' for states, the law holds disadvantaged children hostage to its dictates" (p. 2) because states that receive funds under the Improving America's Schools Act (IASA) must align their curriculum, assessments, and teacher professional development with Goals 2000 standards.*

Response: Neither disadvantaged students nor states are "held hostage" by either Goals 2000 or the Improving America's Schools Act, which provides assistance to disadvantaged students under the Title 1 program. Quite to the contrary, the provisions in both Goals 2000 and Title 1 clearly place the states and local school districts in charge of determining academic standards and educational policy. They also both serve to encourage states and local communities to set more rigorous academic standards for all students, including economically disadvantaged students.

- Goals 2000 requires that participating states establish their own academic standards in basic and advanced skills for students, and develop tests to measure student progress toward achieving these standards. The Title 1 program also requires that states set their own academic standards in basic and advanced skills for participating students, and test to determine progress toward achieving those standards. When the two programs operate together, the result will be that disadvantaged students served by the Title 1 program will be expected to reach for the same academic standards as are other students in the state. Rather than being "held hostage", disadvantaged students are freed from a tyranny of low expectations, and will be challenged to work harder and learn more.

- There are no "goals 2000" standards, only state or local standards, determined by state or local authorities. The same is true of curriculum, assessments, and ways of preparing and upgrading the skills of teachers. These are all determined at the state and local level, without federal direction or control.
- According to a recent report by the American Federation of Teachers, 49 states are setting their own academic standards for its students. The U.S. Department of Education independently counts all 50 states engaged in this process. For states participating in Goals 2000 and Title 1, they too will use the standards they are setting themselves. In either case, the academic standards that student will be held to are determined by the state, not by the federal government. And standards used for Goals 2000 and Title 1 are those same standards.
- No state is required to participate in Goals 2000 in order to continue to receive Title 1 funds or funds under IASA or any other federal education programs. This is stated explicitly in Section 213 of the Goals 2000 Act.
- This situation represents an increase in state and local control and a decrease in federal requirements. The federal government exercises no control over the resources that states and communities spend on education or over school and classroom practices. Therefore, if federal programs are to be effective, they must work in tandem with state and local reform efforts. The new legislation recognizes this and responds to concern that in the past compliance with rules and regulations surrounding federal education programs has often constrained the flexibility necessary to achieve improvement. For example, reliance on nationally-normed testing in the Title I program was often redundant with state testing and consequently cut into instructional time for students who needed extra help the most. The new Title I allows states to use their own state assessments that measure performance in attaining the skills and standards they deem to be important.

Assertion: *"The objectives of Goals 2000 are already mirrored in California's subject frameworks and its statewide assessment" (p. 2). California's math and English frameworks "have resulted in the de-emphasis of basic math skills and phonics" (p. 21). The "connection between these state Math and English frameworks and the Goals 2000 debate over measuring standards . . . lies with the California Learning Assessment*

System (CLAS). . . . The link is that the CLAS test was designed to measure the effectiveness of education reforms envisioned under Goals 2000 programs" (p. 22). This type of "performance-based" test "bases its scoring on non-academic benchmarks" not "right and wrong answers" (p. 22).

Response: Standards and testing procedures are determined by the state and by local school districts and schools, not by the federal government. This has been true in the past and will continue to be true under Goals 2000.

- Any flaws in previous curriculum frameworks and assessments in California were the complete responsibility of the state, not of the federal government, and correcting any problems is also California's responsibility, without regard to whether or not California participates in Goals 2000. California is in the midst of revising its curriculum frameworks, and Governor Wilson has just signed legislation calling for the development of a new testing program. The state can use Goals 2000 funds to support its own activities in these areas, if it chooses to. Because education is so important, some aspects of reform are bound to generate controversy, but how these issues are addressed in California will be determined by the citizens of California, not by federal requirements—whether or not the state participates in Goals 2000.
- Goals 2000 promotes assessments that are aligned with each state's **content** standards in academic subjects. These use valid and reliable academic performance measures to provide coherent information about student attainments relative to the state content standards.

Assertion: *Goals 2000 promotes outcomes-based education: (1) The Regional Laboratories have "a primary duty" to promote school restructuring, which is "a buzz word in many education circles . . . for promoting the controversial principles of outcomes-based education" (pp. 8-9); (2) One purpose of the Act is to provide "a national framework for education reform" and "the term 'frameworks' . . . is the buzzword for California's troubled experiment with outcome-based education" (p. 20).*

Response: These are transparent and illogical attempts to generate objections to Goals 2000 by purporting to find a link to the outcomes-based education controversy. To set the record straight: (1) The provision that allows the labs to respond to a school's request for help with its restructuring efforts is not intended to promote outcomes-based education; (2) A national "framework" for education reform means a structure of support and is not a secret code for OBE.

Goals 2000 doesn't promote any particular education philosophy or approach; that is a local decision. GOALS 2000 focuses on upgrading **academic** achievement and

preparing students for the world of work. Each state, school district, and school determines what content it wants students to learn, and whether that content should focus strictly on core academic and basic skills or should also include other areas. The federal government will not be involved in those kinds of local decisions.

Assertion: *One California school district plans to use its Goals 2000 funds to hire school counselors to address "the supposed emotional and social needs of district children" and focus on "'soft' areas of school management and school environment" rather than academics (p. 23). Therefore, Goals 2000 "will mean a significant expansion" in these areas, "with no assurance as to improved student performance or a higher quality classroom instruction" (p. 23).*

Response: Whatever the strengths or weaknesses of the program in this one district, it effectively illustrates the ability of local schools and communities to use Goals 2000 resources in ways not required by the statute or imposed by the federal government. By providing flexibility for states and localities to decide how best to use their Goals 2000 funds, the Act supports local control and decision making, rather than federal mandates. When control is decentralized, funds will be used to support a variety of initiatives. The point of establishing state standards and carrying out a state and local planning process, as Goals 2000 calls for, is to allow individuals and groups who are concerned about education reform to help decide how best to improve instruction and student performance.

It is ironic that the authors call for local control of education, and at the same time they criticize a local district's use of the authority and resources at its disposal. Supporters of local control in theory should also support it in practice.

Assertion: *Rigorous academic standards will only be established by involving the public in a broad-based deliberation on the subject, thereby building a genuine and informed consensus. Goals 2000 obfuscates and delays that public debate by purveying the myth that new federal goals, standards, and strategies are meeting these needs.*

Response: We agree completely that academic standards must be established through a broad-based process, and rest on an informed consensus. That is precisely what Goals 2000 supports-broad-based, grass roots involvement in the development of academic standards and the necessary education reforms so that students can reach those standards. It is the authors of this report who have been purveying myths and obfuscating the public debate. While their attacks are aimed at the federal law, if successful they will deny resources and opportunities to students, teachers and parents in California.