

NATIONAL EDUCATION GOALS PANEL
Holiday Inn Capitol
550 C Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20024

AGENDA

June 15, 1993
10:30 a.m. – 12:15 p.m.

Clark Room

PAGES

Status Reports and Discussion:

- Legislative Update 1
- Panel Work Agenda/Staffing Plans 3
- Outreach Initiative for 1993 12
- Proposed 1993 Report Theme 15
- Proposed Plans for the 1993 Report 18
 - Discussion on maintenance of two-part Report format

Overview of Afternoon Agenda

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

June 3, 1993

Dear Mr. Chairman:

On April 22 I transmitted to you my education reform bill, "Goals 2000: Educate America Act." As you approach full committee mark-up, I want to reiterate my strong support for the bill and the principles on which it is based.

Secretary Riley and I have both spent a tremendous amount of time and energy during our years in public service focusing on education reform. As Governors, we understood that in order to improve the economy of our states we had to improve the quality of education. We recognize your own longstanding commitment to improving education for every child. The question is how best to promote the goals we all share. Right now, many schools are not meeting the needs of our students or the demands of our economy for a more skilled, more adaptable work force. Without successful school reform across America, our nation's character and its economic strength are in peril.

The Goals 2000 bill builds on the lessons we have all learned during the past decade of school reform:

- o It provides national leadership and sets national benchmarks, but it recognizes that education remains primarily a state and local responsibility. We believe that for reform to be successful, it has to be bottom-up and that the states must play the coordinating role. We have an obligation at the national level to support states and communities in their efforts to help all children, including those with special needs, but we cannot mandate a state's fiscal priorities. We believe our approach to opportunity-to-learn standards achieves this balance. Amendments which require states, as a condition of federal support, to commit to specific corrective actions for schools that fail to meet these standards go too far. These requirements will impede states' efforts to focus accountability on results. In addition, they will require states to commit to specific actions even before the nature of the problem is known. For these reasons, this type of requirement will be a disincentive for states to participate in reform efforts. I urge you not to support amendments that expand the definition or role of opportunity-to-learn standards.
- o Education is not a partisan issue. This bill sets out to forge new partnerships not only between the different levels of government, but between our two parties. Without

bipartisan support across all levels of government, our reform efforts will fail. The National Education Goals Panel, charged with measuring our progress toward reaching the National Education Goals, must remain a bipartisan body. Any amendments to change its partisan balance will undermine the Panel's credibility and I urge you to oppose them.

o The National Education Goals Panel was established to hold states and the federal government accountable for their efforts to achieve the National Education Goals. As outlined in the bill, it is comprised of representatives from the Administration, Congress, the Governors and State Legislatures. It is the vehicle through which these representatives can agree on the credible measures that will be used to judge progress. I might add that I led the fight to establish this Panel, so that we could ensure that those responsible for establishing the goals could not walk away from them when it was time to judge progress toward achieving them. Any amendments which alter the composition or limit the responsibilities of the Panel, including its role in nominating members for the National Education Standards and Improvement Council, will undermine the Panel and I oppose them.

o The six National Education Goals established in 1990 have served as a rallying point in communities all across this country. The goals have been widely accepted by states and communities as well as by education and business groups. Many of the major education and business organizations have adopted and are currently using the six goals as benchmarks for linking their own education reform efforts to a national framework. Over 2,000 communities have created task forces and their own action plans to reach the six goals. Changes in the goals at this time will unnecessarily disrupt these ongoing efforts. I urge you to endorse the six goals as they stand and allow the nation to continue its progress toward reaching them.

We have a tremendous opportunity to provide national leadership on education reform. Together, we can build the kind of education system that will help our students succeed. The "Goals 2000: Educate America Act" is a critical step in the right direction. I urge you to take prompt and favorable action on this legislation.

With best wishes,

Sincerely,



The Honorable William D. Ford
Chairman
Committee on Education and Labor
House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

June 15, 1993

Page 2

Agenda Topics by Panel Meeting (tentative)
Revised 6/93

June 15

- o 1993 NEGP Report Issues. Panel select the 1993 Goals Report theme and decides on other outstanding NEGP Report format and content issues.
- o Collegiate Assessment (Goal 5). Panel hears summary of feedback to the Collegiate Assessment Task Force Report and questions leaders in the field on this topic.
- o Criteria for Standard-setting (Goals 3/4). Panel hears presentation from the Technical Planning Group developing criteria for reviewing and certifying nationwide content standards.
- o Special Topic: State Approaches to Opportunity-to-Learn Standards. Panel participates in a dialogue with officials from four states currently developing opportunity-to-learn standards.

July 27

- o Collegiate Assessment (Goal 5). Panel considers endorsement of the recommendations of the Collegiate Assessment Task Force for establishing national collegiate assessment system.
- o Disciplined Environment Conducive to Learning (Goal 6). Panel considers endorsement of a definition of "disciplined environment conducive to learning" to be used as a basis for monitoring progress in achieving Goal 6.
- o Task Force Report on Building a National Education Technology Infrastructure. Panel receives and discusses Task Force Report on how network technology can help to achieve the national education Goals. Report will include a blueprint for creating a national education technology infrastructure linking educators, parents and students nationwide to rich and useful sources of information to facilitate teaching and learning.
- o Special Topic: Public Hearing on Criteria for Standard-setting (Goals 3/4). Panel and the Technical Planning Group developing criteria for reviewing and certifying nationwide content standards will receive public testimony. Hearing will include testimony from those wishing to ensure that the process take into account students with special educational needs (e.g., Chapter 1, migrant, children with disabilities, Limited English Proficient).

NEGP 1993 WORKPLAN BY TOPIC AREA - June 1993 Update

A. GOAL 1: SCHOOL READINESS

LEADERS: Senator Bingaman, Representative Goodling, Governor Carlson and Governor Nelson

PRINCIPAL NEGP STAFF LIAISON: Emily Wurtz

MAJOR ISSUES: Establishing a mechanism for guiding early childhood assessments; refining definition of "readiness for school" and promoting its adoption by local communities.

WORKPLAN STATUS:

1) Establishing mechanism for guiding early childhood assessments. The Goal 1 Resource Group last met in Princeton on January 11. Their objective is to develop a paper for outlining alternative missions and structures for serving an early childhood assessment oversight function as outlined in legislation proposed by Representative Goodling. The next meeting of the group is scheduled for **June 16** in Washington DC.

2) Elaborating on the definition of five dimensions of readiness and promoting its adoption. The Technical Planning Group for this purpose last met on May 19 under the leadership of Dr. Lynn Kagan. A draft document has been created and is currently undergoing internal review and critique. The group also advises NEGP staff on indicators to profile in the 1993 Goals Report and will assist in outreach strategies for promoting the adoption and use of the five readiness dimensions in early childhood policies nationwide.

B. GOAL 2: SCHOOL COMPLETION

LEADERS: Governor Branstad and Governor Nelson

PRINCIPAL NEGP STAFF LIAISON: Leslie Lawrence

MAJOR ISSUES: Adopting a core set of definitions related to measures of dropouts, school completion and other Goals-related indicators as part of a voluntary student record system.

WORKPLAN STATUS:

At the April 21 NEGP meeting, a resolution based on the work of the Technical Planning Group on Core Data Elements was adopted by the Panel. Some of the specific recommendations of the Resolution include: 1) that administrative record systems in education contain a minimum set of data elements with which to measure progress toward the six national Education Goals; 2) that the definitions of these elements be consistent with those currently being established by the National Center for Education Statistics and the Council of Chief State School Officers; and, 3) that the National Education Goals Panel reviews this minimum set of recommended data elements periodically, taking into account emerging information technologies and data needs.

C. GOALS 3 & 4: CHALLENGING SUBJECT MATTER AND CITIZENSHIP

LEADERS: Representative Kildee and Governors Bayh, Campbell and Carlson

PRINCIPAL NEGP STAFF LIAISON: Edward Fuentes

MAJOR ISSUES: Use of NAEP achievement levels to monitor progress, indicators for monitoring citizenship, expansion of NAEP by Congress, ESEA Chapter 1 re-authorization related to the Goals, standards and assessments.

WORKPLAN STATUS:

1) Measuring progress in student achievement. A new Technical Planning Group headed by Dr. Ramsay Selden was formed in April to recommend to the Panel how to report new NAEP data in the 1993 Goals Report. Among the specific issues addressed by the group is the alignment of the NAEP math assessment with the NCTM standards, the reporting of NAEP scores using the achievement levels developed by the National Assessment Governing Board (NAGB), and the potential for linking state NAEP scores with international data from the International Assessment of Educational Progress (IAEP). The group met in late April and has had several subsequent conference calls. A group progress report will be presented at the June 15 Panel meeting.

2) Citizenship. A resolution on the subject of citizenship was adopted by the NEGP at the April 21 NEGP meeting. It includes recommendations for improved data collections and reporting in the areas of student knowledge, voter participation and service learning.

3) Relevant Federal Legislation. Staff and the Leadership Team will review relevant legislation in areas such as the future of Chapter 1 and NAEP. One or more Panel resolutions may be drafted for future NEGP consideration.

D. GOALS 3 & 4: ESTABLISHING A NATIONAL EDUCATION STANDARDS
AND IMPROVEMENT COUNCIL

LEADERS: Secretary Riley, Representative Goodling, Governor Campbell
and Governor Romer

PRINCIPAL NEGP STAFF LIAISON: Emily Wurtz

MAJOR ISSUES: Legislative authorization, appointment of NESIC
members, criteria for Panel adoption of national standards.

WORKPLAN STATUS:

A new Technical Planning Group under the leadership of Dr. Shirley Malcom has been established to recommend review criteria and processes for certifying national education standards and to consider their implications for assessment. Among the specific topics to be explored are how these standards might be benchmarked to those of other nations, defining the consensus-building process that needs to be employed in creating the standards, and the general processes and guidelines that should be used for judging their adequacy. The Group will report its progress at the June 15 NEGP meeting. Both the workplan and schedule could be affected by legislation establishing the NESIC. The intent is for this group's work to contribute directly and constructively to NESIC's initial work agenda.

E. GOAL 5: ADULT LITERACY/WORKFORCE SKILLS

LEADER: Senator Cochran, Presidential Assistant Rasco, Governor Engler and Governor Romer

PRINCIPAL NEGP STAFF LIAISON: Cindy Prince

MAJOR ISSUES: Panel response to the Resource Group recommendations on workplace literacy, development of multiple definitions of adult literacy for purposes of monitoring progress.

WORKPLAN STATUS:

A Resource Group meeting was held on March 22. The group was asked to help the Panel profile indicators of literacy from the new National Adult Literacy Survey in the 1993 Goals Report and advise the Panel on how to proceed with the recommendations of the Technical Planning Group recommendations on international workforce comparisons released last summer, and help to develop a conceptual definition of literacy and its key dimensions that can be used nationwide to assess progress and guide program development. Panel staff are working closely with the newly established National Institute for Literacy on potential joint initiatives in this area. Panel staff are attempting to get access to new and comprehensive adult literacy data in 11 states so that they may be profiled in the 1993 Goals Report.

F. GOAL 5: COLLEGIATE ASSESSMENT

LEADER: Governor Bayh and Governor Carlson

PRINCIPAL NEGP STAFF LIAISON: Edward Fuentes

MAJOR ISSUES: Whether to pursue the creation of a national collegiate assessment system; and if so, in what form?

WORKPLAN STATUS:

A series of four national public hearings were held during April and May to review and critique the recommendations made last year by the Task Force on Collegiate Assessment for creating a new national collegiate assessment system. A summary report on the feedback received to the task force proposal has been prepared and will be presented on June 15, along with a draft Panel resolution. The resolution is scheduled for Panel action at the July 27 meeting.

G. GOAL 6: DISCIPLINED ENVIRONMENT

LEADERS: Governor McKernan and Presidential Assistant Rasco

PRINCIPAL NEGP STAFF LIAISON: Leslie Lawrence

MAJOR ISSUES: Develop new indicators for a "disciplined school environment."

WORKPLAN STATUS:

A subset of the Goal 6 Resource Group will be meeting on June 22 to review a draft document on the characteristics of a "disciplined environment conducive to learning." This report, and an accompanying Panel resolution, is scheduled to be discussed at the July 27 meeting. After further discussions with the data providers at the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), the NEGP staff have decided not to include the Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS) Goal 6 state data in the 1993 *Goals Report*. NEGP staff will be working closely with NCES on strategies for reporting information of this type in future Goals reports.

H. REPORT ON THE FEDERAL ROLE RELATED TO EDUCATION FUNDING, PROGRAM FLEXIBILITY AND THE IMPACT OF FEDERAL MANDATES ON THE STATES.

LEADERS: Secretary Riley, Senator Cochran, Representative Kildee, Governors Branstad, Engler and Nelson

PRINCIPAL NEGP STAFF LIAISON: Edward Fuentes

MAJOR ISSUES: What to include in the Report.

WORKPLAN STATUS:

NEGP staff are currently analyzing data from the Office of Management and Budget updating the financial information reported annually on the Federal contribution to achieving the Goals. In addition new program information is being updated from Federal agencies with initiatives supporting the Goals. A meeting will be scheduled within the next month of the Leadership Group staff and invited experts on the Federal role to plan what other information should be reported on this topic in the 1993 Report or in other NEGP publications.

I. **ROLE OF EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY IN ACHIEVING THE GOALS.**

LEADER: Senator Bingaman and Governor McKernan

MAJOR ISSUES: Investigate how interactive communications networks can be established and used to improve the quality of teaching and learning.

PRINCIPAL NEGP STAFF LIAISON: Martin Orland

WORKPLAN STATUS:

The Task Force on Educational Technology, led by Dr. Bob Palaich, held their second meeting on May 13. The group is developing a monograph for the Panel on the role of telecommunications networking in achieving the national Goals. The report is expected to outline a vision of how teaching and learning can be enhanced by employing these new technologies, identify outstanding issues that must be adequately addressed to realize this vision, develop a core set of general principles to guide the development of these systems, and determine whether more detailed national education technology standards are needed. The group is expected to make extensive use of the INTERNET to create, review and modify drafts of its Report. Report presentation to the NEGP is scheduled for the July 27 NEGP meeting.

ASSIGNMENTS BY PANELIST.

Governor Bayh -- Goals 3 & 4 (challenging subject matter ...), Goal 5 (collegiate)

Governor Branstad -- Goal 2, Federal Role

Governor Campbell -- Goals 3 & 4 (challenging subject matter ...), NESIC

Governor Carlson -- Goal 1, Goals 3 & 4 (challenging subject matter ...), Goal 5 (collegiate)

Governor Engler -- Goal 5 (adult literacy/workforce), Federal role

Governor McKernan -- Goal 6, Education technology

Governor Nelson -- Goal 1, Goal 2, Federal role

Governor Romer -- NESIC, Goal 5 (adult literacy/workforce)

Secretary Riley -- NESIC, Federal role

Presidential Assistant Rasco -- Goal 5 (adult literacy/workforce), Goal 6

Senator Bingaman -- Goal 1, education technology

Senator Cochran -- Goal 5 (adult literacy/workforce), Federal role

Representative Goodling -- Goal 1, NESIC

Representative Kildee -- Goals 3 & 4 (challenging subject matter ...), Federal role

**Overview of Objectives
Towards Developing
The National Education Goals Panel
Communications and Outreach Strategy**

"With enough publicity, even the most difficult task of consciousness raising can be achieved... For consciousness raising, one must perform two basic tasks: make the public aware of an issue and arouse their concern that something must be done about it." (Daniel Yankelovich)

The launch of this summer's communication and outreach strategy for the National Education Goals Panel can significantly improve US education and economic competitiveness by accomplishing three main objectives:

- Elevate public awareness and understanding of the National Education Goals.
- Generate consensus and a sense of urgency around the need to support the Goals.
- Motivate and empower people to take necessary and appropriate actions.

Communications Mission

Public opinion research shows broad support for national goals and standards, but a huge gap between citizen and expert definitions of the problems and solutions of US education. The public is increasingly frustrated by the slow pace of change and even more skeptical about prospects for progress as they feel insufficiently involved in the discussions and decisions made by experts in education policy.

The Goals Panel can bridge this gap with communications designed to achieve several broad goals:

- Underscore how and why high standards can improve the quality and nature of learning.
- Create opportunities for citizens to gain and exercise the knowledge and discretion that leads to informed public judgment.
- Stimulate bottom-up, community-based reform that addresses local needs within the context of national priorities.
- Sustain political support for achieving the Goals, particularly in communities with leaders elected since the historic Charlottesville summit.
- Strengthen relations with the education, business, labor, civic, association and government communities whose involvement is vital to education improvement.
- Spark public imagination and inventiveness with "pictures" of excellence that help media and citizens effect change by envisioning the range of possibilities.
- Boost identification with the Goals so stake-holders and end-users pose and answer the "so what," "why care," and "how will this help me" questions that are vital to sustained public commitment.

Overt Assumptions

Several underlying principles must guide the development and implementation of Goals Panel outreach and communications:

- 1) NEGP communications must be designed to shape public behavior, as well as influence attitudes.
- 2) Among the different audiences we must engage are the general public, the "activist" public, decision-makers in policy and governance circles and media.
- 3) Appropriate use of all forms of media-- print and electronic, news and editorial, specialized and general interest-- is integral to maximize exposure and reach targeted audiences.
- 4) Activities must be aligned with opportunities in the external environment, expand upon past success and build on organizational assets; e.g., the strong history and commitment to the Goals, current initiatives in states and localities, passage of federal and state legislation, and complementary efforts of other organizations.
- 5) Communications must be designed in clear, direct and accessible language and vehicles that media and the public can easily understand and use.
- 6) Media coverage can not be spurious-- the Goals Panel will make news and keep the issues in the public limelight as it makes progress in accomplishing its mission.
- 7) Form follows function: the vehicles and tools we use to communicate will be determined according to the audiences, messages and actions we seek to influence.
- 8) Outreach is predicated on healthy two-way communications-- a feedback loop and sensitive scanning system that keeps the public apprised of the Goals Panel work and the Panel members and staff in close touch with changing public sentiment and concern.

Phases of Activity

There will be three initial phases of the Goals Panel communications and outreach campaign. Phase I will focus on *capacity development*, including:

- Develop and test salient messages for media and public outreach;
- Create appropriate audio, video and print communications;
- Identify and strengthen new and existing alliances and resources to create opportunity.
- Determine baseline information about public attitudes and awareness to account for our effectiveness.

Phase II will be marked by *release of the 1993 Goals Report* and will include:

- Highly visible launch activities to generate excitement, bring political and media attention to the Goals and invigorate an advocacy base among the public and educators for further national, state and local initiatives.
- Securing partnerships for widespread dissemination of grassroots and media products such as posters, activity kits or newspaper and magazine supplements to reach more communities.

Phase III calls for *focused and sustained media and public outreach* at the national, state and local levels to secure ongoing coverage and visibility, build further strategic alliances and leverage the interest generated during the summer months for continued impact.

Communication Tools and Tactics

The Goals Panel staff will recommend, design and direct an appropriate and cost-effective mix of tools and tactics for all three phases of the campaign that may include:

- Polling and public opinion research-- at the outset of Phase I and midway through Phase III-- to guide our efforts and measure effectiveness.
- Presentations to education, business, labor, civic and government leaders and groups.
- Leading and participating in joint projects and coalitions at the national and international levels, and stimulating similar activities among constituent groups at the state and local levels.
- Creating public hearings and special events to generate visibility and touch the lives of more individuals in communities across the country.
- Public service advertising to convey select messages to the public at large.
- Placement of op-ed articles, feature stories and a monthly column in flagship media and news outlets across the nation.
- Setting-up editorial and informational meetings with reporters and editors.
- Securing sustained news coverage of issues related to the Goals, its outreach activities and progress towards achieving the Goals-- especially through identification of stories with national, state and local "news pegs."
- Public speaking/media training and preparation of materials to aid leaders in communicating the priorities of the National Education Goals Panel.
- Innovative use of technology to develop a series of information networks linking reporters, editors, citizens and policy-makers in public forums, town meetings and databases.
- Incorporating the National Education Goals in television shows and other entertainment programming.
- Working with constituent groups to promote Goals Panel activities, to get more people to use the annual Goals Report, and to design and disseminate smaller target-audience publications tailored to their unique informational needs.

To coordinate and maximize efforts and resources, activities will be congruent with Goals Panel work with other groups such as the National Governors' Association, US Department of Education and the content standards projects of the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, Public Agenda Foundation, Alliance to Restructure Schools, Keep the Promise Campaign and many others committed to education renewal.

...

NATIONAL EDUCATION GOALS PANEL

June 9, 1993

TO: National Education Goals Panel Members

FROM: Wilmer S. Cody, Executive Director
Martin E. Orland, Associate Director

SUBJECT: Proposed Theme for the 1993 Report: Understanding Nation-wide Standards in Student Achievement

Background

In each of its first two years the NEGP established a "theme" reflecting an important message it wished to communicate to the American people. The 1991 Report theme highlighted the new 1990 NAEP math achievement data using the NAGB proficiency levels, and indicated that our educational performance was "not good enough". In 1992, the theme was the complacency Americans seemed to have about their educational performance shortcomings. A special introductory section to the Report was prepared highlighting international comparative outcome and attitudinal data across the Goal areas.

The proposed 1993 NEGP Report theme "Understanding Nation-wide Standards in Student Achievement", would focus on our efforts to measure progress in achieving Goals 3. As last year, the theme would be developed in the opening section of the Report. The intent would be to clarify the rampant confusion and misunderstanding permeating the standard-setting process by clearly explaining what nation-wide education standards are, their importance and place in the context of systemic educational reform, and the future role of the NEGP and NESIC in the standards process.

Rationale

Despite the enormous progress made in recent years in launching the national standard-setting movement in education, many policymakers, professionals and (especially) members of the general public are still confused about what standards represent, how the process of setting standards is to be managed and why these efforts deserve our attention and support. As the Panel and NESIC begin their standards review and ratification efforts, it is particularly timely to clarify this movement's nature and import as well as describe the future role of the NEGP and NESIC in these efforts.

Proposed Approach

This theme will be developed in a short (5-7) page narrative section at the beginning of the 1993 Goals Report. The language will be simple and conversational, perhaps organized in a question and answer format. The idea would be for the theme to not only introduce the 1993 Report, but also serve as a stand-alone document highlighting the Panel's commitment to national standard-

1850 M Street, NW Suite 270 Washington, DC 20036
(202) 632-0952 FAX (202) 632-0957

setting and clarifying common areas of confusion and misunderstanding.

Among the specific areas to be addressed in the theme discussion are the following:

- Clear and concise descriptions of nation-wide education standards, including specific examples and definitions of content vs. performance standards;
- Simple depictions of how American students perform against nation-wide standards, perhaps using selected NAEP items consistent with the NCTM standards as illustrative benchmarks;
- Explanation of why education standards need to be national in scope;
- Discussion of how the development of new nation-wide education standards is both related to and distinct from other current efforts to alter what's being taught in our schools such as new state curriculum frameworks and new performance based assessments;
- Rationales for the importance of standard-setting efforts as centerpieces of educational reform; and
- A brief description of who is involved in nation-wide standard setting efforts, how they are being developed, and the limited but vital role to be played by the NEGP and the NESIC in this process.

Special Concerns

- Treatment of opportunity to learn standards. While focusing on the history and potential of nation-wide content and student performance standards for both monitoring and helping to achieve Goal 3, the theme discussion would also recognize the emerging concept of opportunity to learn standards and their place in achieving Goal 3 and stimulating education reform.
- Recognition of outstanding legislation. The theme narrative would be updated and modified to reflect the most recent status of pending relevant legislation.
- Other areas of special emphasis. It is neither expected or desired that this theme represent the sole area of substantive emphasis associated with the 1993 Goals Report release. We expect both major new Report findings on our progress and possible new legislated roles for the NEGP – such as potential new responsibilities for identifying actions that would enhance progress toward achieving the Goals – to also receive special emphasis in both written Report materials and the oral presentations of the Panelists.

Options for Consideration

1. Agree on "Understanding Nation-wide Standards in Student Achievement" as a central theme for the 1993 Goals Report. Work on this theme can begin immediately and can be closely coordinated with the efforts of the Technical Planning Group developing guidelines for reviewing national content standards.

2. Select alternate or additional themes for the 1993 Report. Panelists may have other suggestions about themes for the 1993 Report.

3. Decide not to have a predetermined theme for the 1993 Report. Instead, determine the central message(s) to highlight in conjunction with the Report's release exclusively on the basis of the most interesting data to be contained in the Report. Work on these messages would need to begin after staff data analysis and profiling of indicators has taken place this summer.

NATIONAL EDUCATION GOALS PANEL

June 9, 1993

TO: National Education Goals Panel Members

FROM: Leslie Lawrence, Research Associate
Martin Orland, Associate Director
Cynthia Prince, Senior Education Associate

SUBJECT: Proposed plans for the *1993 National Education Goals Report*

Background

The purpose of this memorandum is to inform Goals Panel Members of proposed plans for the *1993 National Education Goals Report* and progress toward its production. Changes are planned in three areas: design, format, and content. Many of the proposed improvements to the *1993 Report* were prompted by feedback received last year. All changes are driven by a commitment to make the document more user-friendly.

Design

We are planning to make four changes to the design of the Report, provided that they can be made at a reasonable cost and within our established timelines. The following changes are intended to make information easier to locate and to make the document more visually attractive and easier to use:

- 1) Spiral binding;
- 2) Several small graphics for each state's pages;
- 3) Larger print size on state pages and in Executive Summary;
- 4) Tabs to separate major sections of the Report.

Format

We are also planning to make two format changes to the 1993 Report:

- 1) Split the Report into two volumes: national and state
 - a) Documents would be smaller and easier to handle;
 - b) Information would be easier to find;
 - c) State volume would have an introductory section summarizing the national findings in order to link state and national results.

2) **Double the number of state pages**

We plan to increase the number of pages of state data from 2-per-state to 4-per-state in order to:

- a) Add new indicators at the state level that will be available for the first time in 1993 (e.g., adult literacy, Grade 4 mathematics achievement, etc.);
- b) Increase the size of the print and avoid crowding the pages;
- c) Add graphics; and
- d) Avoid placing any states' data on facing pages.

Outstanding Format Issue: Should the 1993 Goals Report alter its two-part report structure?

Background

In 1991, and again in 1992, the *National Education Goals Report* contained separate parts distinguishing (a) direct measures of progress toward achieving the Goals from (b) additional important information related to achieving the Goals and objectives. All indicators related to Part 1 (direct measures) appear in the annual *Goals Report* prior to any indicators in Part 2.

The decision to format the Report in this manner was explicitly made by the Panel in July 1991. It represented a compromise between Panelists wanting to report multiple indicators of progress related to each Goal and the objectives under the Goals vs. those wanting only a small number of direct progress measures for each Goal. The Panel reiterated its commitment to this Report structure again at its July 1992 meeting.

Issue

From the perspective of clearly communicating the Panel's findings, placing Goal-specific information in two separate parts of the Report several pages apart is a less than ideal strategy. Some of those providing feedback on the annual *Goals Report* commented specifically on the Part 1/Part 2 approach (see Attachment A). Among the criticisms:

- 1) that this format tended to fragment the analysis;
- 2) that it is distracting and confusing to the reader;
- 3) that it leads some to conclude that we lack any relevant information on Goal progress when, in fact, we have interesting if not ideal findings to report. (This has been especially true in press accounts of progress in Goal 1.)

Analysis

In an effort to clarify the kinds of data usually reported by the Panel in Parts 1 and 2 of the annual Report, staff analyzed each indicator likely to be profiled in 1993 (see Attachment B). The results were as follows:

- In Part 1, all planned indicators (consisting of 24 measures) represent direct measures of achieving the Goals as outlined in the Goal statements;
- In Part 2, the indicators fall into four categories;
 - direct measures of the Goal (6 measures),
 - direct measures of the objective(s) (48 measures),
 - background indicators considered closely related to achieving the Goals or (in some cases) the objectives (18 measures),
 - measures intended to be eventually replaced with better Part I indicators (7 measures).

In summary, all planned Part 1 indicators directly measure progress toward achieving the Goals. The majority of indicators planned for Part 2 of the Goals Report (roughly 60%) represent direct measures of achieving one of the objectives outlined underneath the Goal statements, while most of the remaining indicators in this Part consist of important background information (such as student coursetaking patterns or factors relating to dropping out of school) considered critically important for understanding Goal or objective attainment.

Options for Consideration

Assuming the Panel wishes to continue distinguishing direct measures of progress toward the Goal from data on progress toward objectives and other useful data, there are three basic options to consider:

1) Report Part 1 data only.

This option would resolve the issue by eliminating all measures of the objectives and additional important information from the annual *Goals Report*. It would shorten the report substantially, but would also lessen the amount of useful information appearing in it. Some of the most interesting NEGP findings have appeared in Part 2.

2) Continue with the current two-part reporting format.

- a) Part 1 Measures
 - Goal 1
 - Goal 2, etc.

- b) Part 2 Measures
 - Goal 1
 - Goal 2, etc.

This option preserves the compromise agreed to in 1991 and 1992, but at some cost to the Report's overall clarity and conciseness.

3) Place all findings in one section under a Goal heading, clearly distinguishing direct measures of the Goal and objectives under the Goal from other important information.

- a) Goal 1 Measures
 - direct Goal and objectives measures
 - other important information related to achieving the Goals or objectives
- b) Goal 2 Measures
 - direct Goal and objectives measures
 - other important information related to achieving the Goals or objectives, etc.

This option would alter the Panel's approach of the last two years. It would clearly distinguish direct measures of goals, objectives and other information, placing these distinctions within each Goal area. Under this option, all exhibits and accompanying text under a Goal area would appear in one place. The distinction between direct Goal measures, direct objective measures and other information would be highlighted through the creative use of graphics.

Recommendation

The Working Group has reviewed each of these options and recommends Option 3. The option preserves the Goals Panel's emphasis on performance (ie., outcome) indicators but does so in a way that is clearer and more coherent to readers of the Report than past arrangements. The aim is for the Report's readers to be easily able to answer the following questions related to each Goal area:

- 1) What direct evidence do we have about our current status and progress in achieving this Goal?
- 2) What direct evidence do we have about our current status and progress in achieving one or more of the objectives under this Goal?
- 3) What other important information do we have that helps us to more clearly understand our status and progress in reaching this Goal or its objectives?

Answering each of these questions in a single location, while at the same time distinguishing which of the questions is being addressed, should result in improved clarity and readability of the document.

Content

Approximately 120 exhibits are expected to be included in the national volume in 1993. (This total does not include exhibits for the theme section or the Federal Role section.) Of these 120 exhibits:

- 1) 19 are new;
- 2) 54 update exhibits in last year's Report with more recent data;
- 3) 38 repeat information in last year's Report which can not yet be updated; and
- 4) 9 replace or substantially modify exhibits in last year's Report.

New exhibits are expected to include:

- 1) Reading and writing achievement (from 1992 NAEP);
- 2) Adult literacy (from the 1992 National Adult Literacy Survey);
- 3) A new Child Health Index that combines several indicators from standard birth certificates to measure the percentage of children who begin life with multiple health risks related to later school success.

Twelve of the nineteen new exhibits are expected to be new direct measures of Goals 3 and 5.

Outstanding Content Issue: The use of NAEP data in the *1993 Report*

See separate memorandum and Progress Report under **Tab B** of the briefing book.

Next Steps

Panel staff will be working closely and continuously with Working Group members throughout the summer in profiling the specific indicators and accompanying textual materials for the 1993 Report. As was the case last year, our intent is for Working Group members to review and critique every exhibit and text entry in the Report. We plan to update the Panel on the status of our efforts at the July 27 meeting.

ATTACHMENT A

Memorandum

TO: Marty Orland/Cindy Prince
FROM: Ernie Boyer, Goal 1
RE: Comments on the 1992 Goals Report
DATE: February 19, 1993

The following is a synopsis of the feedback received from Ernest Boyer, Convener of the Goal 1 Resource Group. Dr. Boyer conveyed his remarks by telephone to Panel staff.

In general, Dr. Boyer believes that the Report is laid out clearly, is well written, and presents the reader with a wealth of information through well designed tables. Overall, a splendid piece of work on which he bestows an A+.

If there is a weakness, however, it is the Report's two-part format. In Dr. Boyer's opinion, it would be more logical to move the data to the front of the document. Dr. Boyer enumerates three disadvantages of the two Part format:

1. it results in a structure that is bifurcated and confusing;
2. data in Part II may be overlooked;
3. there is a feeling among critics that the two part format is an attempt to deny that indirect data do exist and avoid the realities of this in any political sense.

Dr. Boyer realizes that the two-part issue has been considered by the Panel on more than one occasion and need not be revisited yet again. He does suggest, however, that it would be fair to state, for example for Goal 1, that there are some indirect data that have relevance to children's preparedness for school dealing with health, preschool, and family life. While these data are not judged to be direct measures of the Goal, they were judged to be important enough to appear elsewhere in the Report.

For example, the 1992 Report statement that "as was the case last year, we do not have a direct measure of readiness" could be followed by:

We have, however, included general trend lines in another section of the Report that indicate whether we are providing a good climate for school readiness. These data are not as powerful as a direct measure of readiness, but they do say something about the environment in which children are growing up and do have an effect on their readiness for school.

In this way, Dr. Boyer believes, the critics could not diminish the importance of the Report and the data within it.

**NATIONAL EDUCATION GOALS PANEL
FEEDBACK FORM FOR CHIEF STATE SCHOOL OFFICERS
1992 NATIONAL EDUCATION GOALS REPORT**

PLEASE FAX TO LAURA LANCASTER, PUBLIC INFORMATION OFFICER,
NATIONAL EDUCATION GOALS PANEL AT (202) 632-0957

NAME Nancy S. Grasmick
TITLE State Superintendent of Schools
STATE Maryland
ADDRESS 200 W. Baltimore Street, Baltimore, MD 21201
PHONE (410) 333-2200 FAX (410) 333-2226

1) CONTENT

Is the content of the report informative? useful?

The report imparts a wealth of information useful in understanding the state of American education today. Particularly instructive is Chapter 4, which delineates the central role the federal government plays in supporting education. I am, however, concerned with the emphasis on international comparisons. Rather than highlighting the "global context" of American education, it is our imperative as leaders and guardians to focus on the individual and social contexts of education.

2) FORMAT/DESIGN

Was it clear? Were the different sections divided in a clear way?

Were the graphs understandable?

The format is clear and understandable, under-scoring the comprehensiveness of the report. However, the compartmentalization of Chapter 2 into national data, supporting information, and state-by-state data tends to fragment the analysis. A more *comprehensive* look at each goal would produce more robust findings and aid the reader to understand where, geographically, problems are more or less acute. Remember that many states have gone beyond the national goals to produce annual reports on their own progress.

3) TEXT

Was the text "reachable" to the average reader? Was it consistent, concise?

The Panel should be commended for producing a document accessible both to highly-skilled researchers and to the general public.

4) DATA--(Please keep in mind state data reported in the Goals Report was limited to what the Panel considered quality data on a state-by-state comparable basis.)
Were the data reported in a clear way? Any changes to the way the data was presented?

I commend the Panel for its recognition of the importance of identifying indicators for a number of the goals. From the perspective of data collection and reporting, setting indicators is critical not only to the efficacy of the national goals report, but also to the efforts of individual states. Based on my belief in prevention and collaboration, I am particularly interested in the timely identification of readiness assessments to measure whether students are physically, emotionally and intellectually prepared for the rigors of school. Adequate provision of services to children in need requires such accurate measures, and I look to the excellent leadership of the Panel to forge ahead in this and other areas.

NATIONAL EDUCATION GOALS PANEL
FEEDBACK FORM FOR CHIEF STATE SCHOOL OFFICERS
1992 NATIONAL EDUCATION GOALS REPORT

PLEASE FAX TO LAURA LANCASTER, PUBLIC INFORMATION OFFICER,
NATIONAL EDUCATION GOALS PANEL AT (202) 632-0957

NAME Donald B. Spangler
TITLE Exec. Asst. to PA Sec'y of Education
STATE Pennsylvania
ADDRESS Sec'y's Office; PA DOE; 333 Market St. Harrisburg
17126
PHONE (717) 783-9283 FAX (717) 783-4517

CONTENT

Is the content of the report informative? useful?

Yes... at least it is to those who are somewhat familiar with what it is all about.

FORMAT/DESIGN

Was it clear? Were the different sections divided in a clear way?

Were the graphs understandable?

I understand the reasons for separating purely quantitative measures from indicators (ie sections I & II), but I still find it distracting. If it must be continued, I would prefer that the quantitative measures

TEXT and indicators appear serially after each goal. (See # 4 & 5)
Was the text "readable" to the average reader? Was it consistent, concise?

The full report is too long, multi-titled, & dense to be anything other than intimidating to the "avg. reader."

DATA -- (Please keep in mind state data reported in the Goals Report was limited to what the Panel considered quality data on a state-by-state comparable basis.)

Were the data reported in a clear way? Any changes to the way the data were presented?

See # 2. I would combine parts I & II of Chapter 2.

OTHER I know this was contentious within the panel, but I believe it would be much clearer if the two were presented together.

NATIONAL EDUCATION GOALS PANEL
FEEDBACK FORM FOR CHIEF STATE SCHOOL OFFICERS
1992 NATIONAL EDUCATION GOALS REPORT

PLEASE FAX TO LAURA LANCASTER, PUBLIC INFORMATION OFFICER,
NATIONAL EDUCATION GOALS PANEL AT (202) 632-0957

NAME Dr. Jeanne M. Burns

TITLE Coordinator - Louisiana Goals 2000

STATE Louisiana

ADDRESS Office of the Governor P.O. Box 94004 Baton Rouge, LA 70804

PHONE 504-342-1608 FAX 504-342-3060

1) CONTENT

Is the content of the report informative? useful?

The content of the report was very informative and useful. Portions of the report were used for the state progress report. Information from the report will be used for an Electronic Bulletin Board for the state.

2) FORMAT/DESIGN

Was it clear? Were the different sections divided in a clear way?

Were the graphs understandable?

The graphs were very understandable. The summary statements with each graph were very helpful in quickly determining key points. My only suggestion would be to organize the data so that all Goal One data were located in one section, etc.

3) TEXT

Was the text "reachable" to the average reader? Was it consistent, concise?

The text was reachable to the average reader and concise.

4) DATA -- (Please keep in mind state data reported in the Goals Report was limited to what the Panel considered quality data on a state-by-state comparable basis.)

Were the data reported in a clear way? Any changes to the way the data were presented?

Some of the data in the States Section was not clear. I found myself looking in the Appendix and other sections to fully understand the meaning of what was being measured. I realize that is the purpose for the Appendix, but I felt that it could have been clearer.

5) OTHER

PUBLIC RESPONSE TO THE 1992 GOALS REPORT

COMMENTS

Your reactions to the 1992 Goals Report and insights into how we can improve future reports are requested on this form. Please consider commenting on such issues as the organization of the document, the clarity of the data reported, and the value of the information to students, parents, teachers, policymakers, and others concerned about our progress toward the National Education Goals. Use additional sheets, if necessary.

Thank you for your comments.

I strongly recommend that Part 2
 data be consolidated into Part 1,
 especially for Goal 1 where the
 indicators demonstrate progress toward
 achieving the goal's objective.

NAME:

Sue Breckkamp

ADDRESS:

NAEYC

1509 16th St. NW

Washington DC 20036

PHONE:

202-328-2601

DATE:

1-27-93

Please circle one:

STUDENT / PARENT / EDUCATOR / PUBLIC OFFICIAL / BUSINESS OR COMMUNITY LEADER
 POLICYMAKER / CONCERNED CITIZEN

Please return to: National Education Goals Panel, 1850 M Street, N.W., Suite 270, Washington, D.C. 20036.
 Attention: Laura Lancaster, Public Information Officer, fax (202) 632-0957.

ATTACHMENT B

NATIONAL EDUCATION GOALS PANEL

MEMORANDUM

To: National Education Goals Panel Working Group

From: National Education Goals Panel Staff

Date: June 7, 1993

Subject: Analysis of Relationship of NEGP Measures to Goals and Objectives

On the following pages is a table displaying indicators for the *1993 Report*. The table includes four columns describing 1) the indicator; 2) whether the indicator is a direct measure of the Goal; 3) whether the indicator is a direct measure of the Objective(s); and, 4) which Goal or Objective the indicator measures.

In Part I, all indicators (consisting of 24 measures) are direct measures of the Goal. In Part II, the indicators come under four categories. These categories are:

- o Direct measure of the Goal (6 measures);
- o Direct measure of the Objective(s) (48 measures);
- o Background indicator considered closely related to achieving the Goal and (in some cases) some or all of the Objectives (18 measures); and,
- o Measure intended to eventually be replaced with better Part I indicator (7 measures).

Exhibit/Data as Measures of the Goals and Objectives - as of 6/3/93

Exhibit/Data	Direct Measure of Goal	Direct Measure of Objective	Which Goal or Objective?
PART I - GOAL 2			
High School Completion - Update	Yes		Goal 2
Trends in High School Completion - Update	Yes		Goal 2
Dropouts Who Returned to High School - Repeat	Yes	Yes	Goal 2; The nation must dramatically reduce its dropout rate, and 75 percent of those students who do drop out will successfully complete a high school degree or its equivalent.
PART I - GOAL 3			
Competency in Math (grades 4, 8, and 12) - Update	Yes		Goal 3
Competency in Reading (grades 4, 8, and 12) - New	Yes		Goal 3
Competency in Writing (grades 4, 8, and 12) - New	Yes		Goal 3
AP Results in Core Subjects - Update	Yes		Goal 3

Exhibit/Data as Measures of the Goals and Objectives - as of 6/3/93

Exhibit/Data	Direct Measure of Goal	Direct Measure of Objective	Which Goal or Objective?
AP Trends in Core Subjects - <i>Update</i>	Yes		Goal 3
Knowledge of Civics - <i>Repeat</i>	Yes	Yes	Goal 3; All students will be involved in activities that promote and demonstrate good citizenship, community service, and personal responsibility.
Community Service (10th grade) - <i>Repeat</i>	Yes	Yes	Goal 3; All students will be involved in activities that promote and demonstrate good citizenship, community service, and personal responsibility.
Community Service (12th grade) - <i>New</i>	Yes	Yes	Goal 3; All students will be involved in activities that promote and demonstrate good citizenship, community service, and personal responsibility.
Young Adult Voting and Registering - <i>Update</i>	Yes	Yes	Goal 3; All students will be involved in activities that promote and demonstrate good citizenship, community service, and personal responsibility.
PART I - GOAL 4			
International Science and Math Achievement - <i>Repeat</i>	Yes		Goal 4

June 15, 1993

Page 33

Exhibit/Data as Measures of the Goals and Objectives - as of 6/3/93

Exhibit/Data	Direct Measure of Goal	Direct Measure of Objective	Which Goal or Objective?
PART I - GOAL 5			
NALS Literacy Achievement - New	Yes		Goal 5
PART I - GOAL 6			
Obtaining Drugs at School - Modified	Yes		Goal 6
Use of Drugs at School (grades 8 and 10) - Update	Yes		Goal 6
Use of Drugs At-School (grade 12) - Update	Yes		Goal 6
Trends in At-School Drug Use - Update	Yes		Goal 6
Overall Use of Drugs - Update	Yes		Goal 6
Trends in Overall Use of Drugs - Update	Yes		Goal 6
Student Victimization - Update	Yes		Goal 6
Trends in Victimization - Update	Yes		Goal 6
School Safety - Repeat	Yes		Goal 6

June 15, 1993

Page 34

Exhibit/Data as Measures of the Goals and Objectives - as of 6/3/93

Exhibit/Data	Direct Measure of Goal	Direct Measure of Objective	Which Goal or Objective?
Teacher Victimization - Repeat	Yes		Goal 6
PART II - GOAL 1			
Prenatal Care - Update		Yes	Children will receive the nutrition and health care needed to arrive at school with healthy minds and bodies; and the number of low-birthweight babies will be significantly reduced through enhanced prenatal health systems.
Trends in Prenatal Care - Update		Yes	Children will receive the nutrition and health care needed to arrive at school with healthy minds and bodies; and the number of low-birthweight babies will be significantly reduced through enhanced prenatal health systems.
Birthweight - Update		Yes	Children will receive the nutrition and health care needed to arrive at school with healthy minds and bodies; and the number of low-birthweight babies will be significantly reduced through enhanced prenatal health systems.

June 15, 1993

Page 35

Exhibit/Data as Measures of the Goals and Objectives - as of 6/3/93

Exhibit/Data	Direct Measure of Goal	Direct Measure of Objective	Which Goal or Objective?
Trends in Birthweight - Update		Yes	Children will receive the nutrition and health care needed to arrive at school with healthy minds and bodies; and the number of low-birthweight babies will be significantly reduced through enhanced prenatal health systems.
Health Index - New		Yes	Children will receive the nutrition and health care needed to arrive at school with healthy minds and bodies; and the number of low-birthweight babies will be significantly reduced through enhanced prenatal health systems.
Routine Health Care - Modified		Yes	Children will receive the nutrition and health care needed to arrive at school with healthy minds and bodies; and the number of low-birthweight babies will be significantly reduced through enhanced prenatal health systems.

June 15, 1993

Page 36

Exhibit/Data as Measures of the Goals and Objectives - as of 6/3/93

Exhibit/Data	Direct Measure of Goal	Direct Measure of Objective	Which Goal or Objective?
Continuity of Health Care - <i>Modified</i>		Yes	Children will receive the nutrition and health care needed to arrive at school with healthy minds and bodies; and the number of low-birthweight babies will be significantly reduced through enhanced prenatal health systems.
Health Insurance/Medicaid* - <i>Modified</i>			* Background indicator considered closely related to achieving Goal 1 and Objective 3.
Immunizations - <i>Modified</i>		Yes	Children will receive the nutrition and health care needed to arrive at school with healthy minds and bodies; and the number of low-birthweight babies will be significantly reduced through enhanced prenatal health systems.
Child Nutrition - <i>Modified</i>		Yes	Children will receive the nutrition and health care needed to arrive at school with healthy minds and bodies; and the number of low-birthweight babies will be significantly reduced through enhanced prenatal health systems.

June 15, 1993

Page 37

Exhibit/Data as Measures of the Goals and Objectives - as of 6/3/93

Exhibit/Data	Direct Measure of Goal	Direct Measure of Objective	Which Goal or Objective?
Family-Child Literacy Activities - <i>Update</i>		Yes	Every parent in America will be a child's first teacher and devote time each day to helping his or her preschool child learn; parents will have the access to the training and support they need.
Family-Child Arts Activities - <i>Update</i>		Yes	Every parent in America will be a child's first teacher and devote time each day to helping his or her preschool child learn; parents will have the access to the training and support they need.
Family-Child Learning Opportunities - <i>Modified</i>		Yes	Every parent in America will be a child's first teacher and devote time each day to helping his or her preschool child learn; parents will have the access to the training and support they need.
Preschool Participation - <i>Update</i>		Yes	All disadvantaged and disabled children will have access to high quality and developmentally appropriate preschool program that help prepare children for school.

June 15, 1993

Page 38

Exhibit/Data as Measures of the Goals and Objectives - as of 6/3/93

Exhibit/Data	Direct Measure of Goal	Direct Measure of Objective	Which Goal or Objective?
Trends in Nursery School Enrollment - <i>Update</i>		Yes	All disadvantaged and disabled children will have access to high quality and developmentally appropriate preschool program that help prepare children for school.
Preschool Participation for Disabled Children - <i>Update</i>		Yes	All disadvantaged and disabled children will have access to high quality and developmentally appropriate preschool program that help prepare children for school.
Quality of Preschool Centers - <i>Repeat</i>		Yes	All disadvantaged and disabled children will have access to high quality and developmentally appropriate preschool program that help prepare children for school.
Quality of Home-Based Settings - <i>Repeat</i>		Yes	All disadvantaged and disabled children will have access to high quality and developmentally appropriate preschool program that help prepare children for school.

June 15, 1993

Page 39

Exhibit/Data as Measures of the Goals and Objectives - as of 6/3/93

Exhibit/Data	Direct Measure of Goal	Direct Measure of Objective	Which Goal or Objective?
PART II - GOAL 2			
Trends in High School Dropout Rates - <i>Update</i>		Yes	The nation must dramatically reduce its dropout rate, and 75 percent of those students who do drop out will successfully complete a high school degree or its equivalent.
Intergenerational Analysis of Dropouts - <i>Repeat</i>		Yes	The gap in high school graduation rates between American students from minority backgrounds and their non-minority counterparts will be eliminated.
Factors Related to Dropping Out* - <i>Repeat</i>			* Background indicator considered closely related to achieving Goal 2 and Objectives 1 and 2.
Reasons for Dropping Out by Sex* - <i>Repeat</i>			* Background indicator considered closely related to achieving Goal 2 and Objectives 1 and 2.
Reasons for Dropping Out by Race/ethnicity* - <i>Repeat</i>			* Background indicator considered closely related to achieving Goal 2 and Objectives 1 and 2.
Reasons for Returning by Sex* - <i>Repeat</i>			* Background indicator considered closely related to achieving Goal 2 and Objectives 1 and 2.

June 15, 1993

Page 40

Exhibit/Data as Measures of the Goals and Objectives - as of 6/3/93

Exhibit/Data	Direct Measure of Goal	Direct Measure of Objective	Which Goal or Objective?
Reasons for Returning by Race/ethnicity* - Repeat			* Background indicator considered closely related to achieving Goal 2 and Objectives 1 and 2.
PART II - GOAL 3			
Math Achievement (Grades 4, 8, and 12) - Update		Yes	The academic performance of elementary and secondary students will increase significantly in every quartile, and the distribution of minority students in each level will more closely reflect the student population as a whole.
Reading Achievement (Grades 4, 8, and 12) - New		Yes	The academic performance of elementary and secondary students will increase significantly in every quartile, and the distribution of minority students in each level will more closely reflect the student population as a whole.
Writing Achievement (Grades 4, 8, and 12) - New		Yes	The academic performance of elementary and secondary students will increase significantly in every quartile, and the distribution of minority students in each level will more closely reflect the student population as a whole.

Exhibit/Data as Measures of the Goals and Objectives - as of 6/3/93

Exhibit/Data	Direct Measure of Goal	Direct Measure of Objective	Which Goal or Objective?
Growth in Reading Achievement from 8th to 10th grade* - Repeat			* Background indicator considered closely related to achieving Goal 3 and Objectives 1 and 2.
Growth in Writing Achievement from 8th to 10th grade* - Repeat			* Background indicator considered closely related to achieving Goal 3 and Objectives 1 and 2.
Growth in Science Achievement from 8th to 10th grade* - Repeat			* Background indicator considered closely related to achieving Goal 3 and Objectives 1 and 2.
Trends in Reading Proficiency* - Repeat			* In Part II, because intent is to eventually replace measure with a Part I indicator.
Trends in Writing Proficiency* - Repeat			* In Part II, because intent is to eventually replace measure with a Part I indicator.
Trends in Math Proficiency* - Repeat			* In Part II, because intent is to eventually replace measure with a Part I indicator.
Trends in Science Proficiency* - Repeat			* In Part II, because intent is to eventually replace measure with a Part I indicator.
AP Results in Foreign Languages and Fine Arts - Update	Yes		Goal 3

June 15, 1993

Page 42

Exhibit/Data as Measures of the Goals and Objectives - as of 6/3/93

Exhibit/Data	Direct Measure of Goal	Direct Measure of Objective	Which Goal or Objective?
Trends in AP Foreign Language and Fine Arts - Update	Yes		Goal 3
High School Course Completion in English and Science* - Update			* Background indicator considered closely related to achieving Goal 3 and Objectives 1 and 2.
High School Course Completion in Math* - Update			* Background indicator considered closely related to achieving Goal 3 and Objectives 1 and 2.
High School Course Completion in History/Geography* - Update			* Background indicator considered closely related to achieving Goal 3 and Objectives 1 and 2.
High School Completion in Foreign Languages and Fine Arts* - Update			* Background indicator considered closely related to achieving Goal 3 and Objectives 1 and 2.
PART II - GOAL 4			
International Science Characteristics* - Repeat			* Background indicator considered closely related to achieving Goal 4.
International Math Characteristics* - Repeat			* Background indicator considered closely related to achieving Goal 4.

June 15, 1993

Page 43

Exhibit/Data as Measures of the Goals and Objectives - as of 6/3/93

Exhibit/Data	Direct Measure of Goal	Direct Measure of Objective	Which Goal or Objective?
Science Instructional Practices - Repeat		Yes	Math and science education will be strengthened throughout the system, especially in the early grades.
Science Instructional Practices, by race/sex - Repeat		Yes	Math and science education will be strengthened throughout the system, especially in the early grades.
Math Instructional Practices - Update		Yes	Math and science education will be strengthened throughout the system, especially in the early grades.
Math Instructional Practices, by race/sex - Update		Yes	Math and science education will be strengthened throughout the system, especially in the early grades.
Attitudes in Math and Science* - Update Math			* Background indicator closely related to achieving Goal 4.
Priority of Math and Science in School - Update Math		Yes	Math and science education will be strengthened throughout the system, especially in the early grades.
AP Trends - Science Examinations, by Sex - Update		Yes	Math and science education will be strengthened throughout the system, especially in the early grades.

June 15, 1993

Page 44

Exhibit/Data as Measures of the Goals and Objectives - as of 6/3/93

Exhibit/Data	Direct Measure of Goal	Direct Measure of Objective	Which Goal or Objective?
AP Trends - Math Examinations, by Sex - Update		Yes	Math and science education will be strengthened throughout the system, especially in the early grades.
AP Trends - Science Examinations, by race/ethnicity - Update		Yes	Math and science education will be strengthened throughout the system, especially in the early grades.
AP Trends - Math Examinations, by race/ethnicity - Update		Yes	Math and science education will be strengthened throughout the system, especially in the early grades.
Science and Math Degrees Awarded - Update		Yes	The number of U.S. undergraduate and graduate students, especially women and minorities, who complete degrees in mathematics, science, and engineering will increase substantially.
Trends in Science Degrees, by Sex - Update		Yes	The number of U.S. undergraduate and graduate students, especially women and minorities, who complete degrees in mathematics, science, and engineering will increase substantially.

June 15, 1993

Page 45

Exhibit/Data as Measures of the Goals and Objectives - as of 6/3/93

Exhibit/Data	Direct Measure of Goal	Direct Measure of Objective	Which Goal or Objective?
Trends in Math Degrees, by Sex - Update		Yes	The number of U.S. undergraduate and graduate students, especially women and minorities, who complete degrees in mathematics, science, and engineering will increase substantially.
Trends in Science Degrees, by Race/ethnicity - Update		Yes	The number of U.S. undergraduate and graduate students, especially women and minorities, who complete degrees in mathematics, science, and engineering will increase substantially.
Trends in Math Degrees, by race/ethnicity - Update		Yes	The number of U.S. undergraduate and graduate students, especially women and minorities, who complete degrees in mathematics, science, and engineering will increase substantially.
Science and Math Teacher Preparation - Repeat		Yes	The number of teachers with a substantive background in mathematics and science will increase to 50 percent.
PART II - GOAL 5			
Usefulness of Skills in the Future - Repeat	Yes		Goal 5

June 15, 1993

Page 46

Exhibit/Data as Measures of the Goals and Objectives - as of 6/3/93

Exhibit/Data	Direct Measure of Goal	Direct Measure of Objective	Which Goal or Objective?
Responsibility for Improving Job Performance - Repeat	Yes		Goal 5
Participation in Adult Education - Repeat		Yes	All workers will have the opportunity to acquire the knowledge and skills, from basic to highly technical, needed to adapt to emerging new technologies, work methods, and markets through public and private educational, vocation, technical, workplace, or other programs.
Participation in Adult Education by Occupation - Repeat		Yes	All workers will have the opportunity to acquire the knowledge and skills, from basic to highly technical, needed to adapt to emerging new technologies, work methods, and markets through public and private educational, vocation, technical, workplace, or other programs.
Reasons for Participating in Adult Education* - Repeat			* Background indicator closely related to achieving Goal 5 and Objective 2.

June 15, 1993

Page 47

Exhibit/Data as Measures of the Goals and Objectives - as of 6/3/93

Exhibit/Data	Direct Measure of Goal	Direct Measure of Objective	Which Goal or Objective?
Providers of Adult Education - Repeat		Yes	All workers will have the opportunity to acquire the knowledge and skills, from basic to highly technical, needed to adapt to emerging new technologies, work methods, and markets through public and private educational, vocation, technical, workplace, or other programs; The number of quality programs, including those at libraries, that are designed to serve more effectively the needs of the growing number of part-time and mid-career students will increase substantially.
Barriers to Adult Education - Repeat		Yes	All workers will have the opportunity to acquire the knowledge and skills, from basic to highly technical, needed to adapt to emerging new technologies, work methods, and markets through public and private educational, vocation, technical, workplace, or other programs.

June 15, 1993

Page 48

Exhibit/Data as Measures of the Goals and Objectives - as of 6/3/93

Exhibit/Data	Direct Measure of Goal	Direct Measure of Objective	Which Goal or Objective?
Employer Support for Adult Education - Repeat		Yes	All workers will have the opportunity to acquire the knowledge and skills, from basic to highly technical, needed to adapt to emerging new technologies, work methods, and markets through public and private educational, vocation, technical, workplace, or other programs.
Worker Training - Repeat		Yes	All workers will have the opportunity to acquire the knowledge and skills, from basic to highly technical, needed to adapt to emerging new technologies, work methods, and markets through public and private educational, vocation, technical, workplace, or other programs.
Post-Secondary Enrollment - Repeat		Yes	The proportion of those qualified students (especially minorities) who enter college, who complete at least two years, and who complete their degree programs will increase substantially.

June 15, 1993

Page 49

Exhibit/Data as Measures of the Goals and Objectives - as of 6/3/93

Exhibit/Data	Direct Measure of Goal	Direct Measure of Objective	Which Goal or Objective?
College Enrollment - Update		Yes	The proportion of those qualified students (especially minorities) who enter college, who complete at least two years, and who complete their degree programs will increase substantially.
Trends in College Enrollment - Update		Yes	The proportion of those qualified students (especially minorities) who enter college, who complete at least two years, and who complete their degree programs will increase substantially.
College Completion - Modified		Yes	The proportion of those qualified students (especially minorities) who enter college, who complete at least two years, and who complete their degree programs will increase substantially.
Trends in College Completion - Modified		Yes	The proportion of those qualified students (especially minorities) who enter college, who complete at least two years, and who complete their degree programs will increase substantially.

June 15, 1993

Page 50

Exhibit/Data as Measures of the Goals and Objectives - as of 6/3/93

Exhibit/Data	Direct Measure of Goal	Direct Measure of Objective	Which Goal or Objective?
Voter Registration/Voting - Update	Yes		Goal 5
Trends in Voter Registration/Voting - Update	Yes		Goal 5
PART II - GOAL 6			
Attitudes Toward Drug Use* - Update			* Background indicator closely related to achieving Goal 6.
Teacher Control Over the Classroom* - Repeat			* In Part II, because intent is to eventually replace measure with Part I indicator.
Teacher Beliefs of the School Environment* - Repeat			* In Part II, because intent is to eventually replace measure with Part I indicator.
Skipping Class/School* - Update			* In Part II, because intent is to eventually replace measure with Part I indicator.

June 15, 1993

Page 51