

NATIONAL EDUCATION GOALS PANEL

TO: National Education Goals Panel
FROM: Ken Nelson, Executive Director
SUBJECT: February 1 Meeting

Einstein once said, "We can not begin to solve the complex problems we face today with the same level of thinking we had when we created them."

I believe the National Education Goals Panel is strategically and structurally positioned to provide the new level of thinking and acting which will help this nation effectively solve the complex problems of education reform by achieving the national Goals.

As your new Executive Director I pledge to do whatever I can to work with you to provide this new level of thinking and acting.

Our first step is to establish our strategic direction. The strategic planning process was designed to enable the Panel to fulfill the expectations of the Goals 2000 legislation. The agenda of our February 1 meeting and the enclosed materials represent the distilled and refined recommendations of the Panel Staff, the Strategic Planning Committee and the Working Group. Consideration of the Decision Memorandum on Strategic Directions will be the principal action item on our agenda.

Governor McKernan will convene the Panel from 1:00 to 3:00 in Salon F of the J.W.Marriott. The Executive Committee will meet in Salon H from 3:00 to 3:30.

We look forward to your active participation.

NATIONAL EDUCATION GOALS PANEL

CAROL RASCO

*Assistant to the President
for Domestic Policy*



Goals
meeting
McKernan

K Nelson -

Coulson - How does this affect parents

Nelson

Engler

Edgar

For reservations call toll free **800-228-9290**

NATIONAL EDUCATION GOALS PANEL
JW Marriott
Salon F
1331 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20004
February 1, 1994

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
I. Agenda (<i>White Section</i>)	1
II. Decision Memorandum: Strategic Decisions for the National Education Goals Panel (<i>White Section</i>)	1-4
 <u>APPENDICES</u>	
I. Appendix A: Strategic Options for the National Education Goals Panel ○ Options Paper (<i>Yellow Section</i>)	1-12
II. Appendix B: Legislation: ○ NEGP Bill -- Legislative Comparison (<i>Blue Section</i>) ○ NEGP Bill -- House Version (<i>Blue Section</i>) ○ NEGP Bill -- Senate Version (<i>Blue Section</i>)	1-2 1-51 1-28
III. Appendix C: November 15 Meeting Summary (<i>Green Section</i>)	1-19

NATIONAL EDUCATION GOALS PANEL

J.W. Marriott Hotel

Salon F

1331 Pennsylvania Avenue NW

Washington D.C. 20004

FEBRUARY 1, 1994

1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.*

AGENDA

1:00 to 1:20 WELCOME AND INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

- o Introduction of new Panelists and new Executive Director (NEGP Chair McKernan)
- o Approval of November 15, 1993 meeting summary (NEGP Chair McKernan)
- o Status report of Goals 2000 legislation and its implications for the NEGP (Secretary Riley)
- o Introduction to the Panel's strategic planning process (NEGP Chair McKernan)

1:20 to 2:50 ACTION ITEM: REVIEW AND POTENTIAL ADOPTION OF DECISION MEMORANDUM ON STRATEGIC DIRECTIONS FOR THE NEGP

- o Introductory comments (Executive Director Nelson)
- o Review for adoption, Decision Memorandum outlining future Panel functioning in six specific areas:
 - 1) Reporting Progress in Goal Attainment
 - 2) Reviewing and Approving Content Standards, Performance Standards and Assessment Systems
 - 3) Reviewing and Approving Opportunity to Learn Standards
 - 4) Reporting on Promising or Effective Actions to meet the Goals
 - 5) Building a Bipartisan Nationwide Consensus on the Necessity of Achieving the Goals and on Ways to Reach Them
 - 6) Panel Governance and Overall Role(Executive Director Nelson with NEGP Consultants Brizius and Foster)

2:50 to 3:00 DISCUSSION OF NEXT STEPS: TRANSITION FROM STRATEGIC TO TACTICAL PLANNING (NEGP Chair McKernan and Executive Director Nelson)

***3:00 to 3:30 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING (*Salon H*)**

DECISION
MEMORANDUM

Strategic Decisions
for the
National Education
Goals Panel

February 1, 1994 Meeting
of the
National Education Goals Panel

STRATEGIC DECISIONS FOR THE NATIONAL EDUCATION GOALS PANEL

INTRODUCTION

In late December, Governor John McKernan, Chair of the National Education Goals Panel (NEGP), created a Strategic Planning Committee. He asked that the Committee "develop options and recommendations" concerning the new roles that the Panel will take on as a result of impending passage of federal legislation.

This paper outlines options for decisions on strategic directions over the next five years.

- (1) *What should be the vision and mission of the NEGP?*
- (2) *How should the Panel respond to new legislative mandates?*
- (3) *What other changes in the Panel's operations and strategies are necessary to achieve the mission?*

VISION & MISSION

The National Education Goals Panel provides the nation with a unique intergovernmental body focused on the achievement of ambitious education goals. Impending passage of federal legislation will reconstitute the Panel and add several new charges to its charter. The Goals Panel needs a vision, mission statement and strategic directions to fulfill its legislative charter and set its course for the future.

The Vision:

The Strategic Planning Committee proposes this vision statement for the National Education Goals Panel:

The Goals Panel will be the premier champion and catalyst in the country for achieving the National Education Goals. States and communities will make continuous improvement toward goal achievement through the Year 2000. Students, parents, workers and businesses will realize tangible improvements as the result of increased educational performance.

The Mission:

The Strategic Planning Committee proposes this mission statement for the Goals Panel:

The mission of the National Education Goals Panel is to catalyze fundamental change in schools, communities, states and the nation in order to achieve the national education goals.

The Goals Panel will achieve this mission by reporting on goal achievement, encouraging the development of voluntary educational content standards, performance standards, assessment systems and opportunity to learn standards, as well as reporting on promising or effective policies and practices.

The Goals Panel will strive to build a nationwide, bipartisan consensus on the necessity of achieving the National Education Goals and on effective ways to achieve them.

STRATEGIC DIRECTIONS

Based on this vision and mission, the National Education Goals Panel will develop a strategic plan. The plan will be based on consideration of both the Panel's strategic directions and available resources. Choosing among the following options is the first step in setting the strategic direction for the Panel. When completed, the strategic plan will be reviewed by the Executive Committee and submitted to the Panel for final approval.

• REPORTING

(1) How should the Panel upgrade current reporting efforts and meet new obligations in reporting progress toward the National Education Goals?

Publish an annual report and restructure the summary into an assessment of progress clearly understandable by the American public. Prepare specialized but short reports aimed at audiences concerned with individual Goals or specialized subject areas.

(2) What, if any, role should the Panel adopt in stimulating states, localities, school districts and others to engage in reporting on the National Education Goals in their own jurisdictions?

Encourage state and local reporting, provide handbooks and limited technical assistance to states and communities.

(3) How should the Panel support long-term data improvement?

The Panel should adopt additional policy positions urging particular gaps in data to be closed by either the federal government or the states. It should reiterate its support for useful data improvement.

• CONTENT STANDARDS, PERFORMANCE STANDARDS AND STATE ASSESSMENT SYSTEMS

(1) How should the Panel organize to review and approve or disapprove criteria for and the actual content standards, student performance standards and state assessment systems certified by the National Education Standards and Improvement Council (NESIC)?

Upon signature of Goals 2000 legislation and working in partnership with NESIC, clarify the basis on which the Panel will review and approve or disapprove criteria and NESIC-certified standards and assessment systems.

• OPPORTUNITY TO LEARN STANDARDS

(1) How should the Goals Panel organize itself to meet its responsibilities under the Goals 2000 legislation regarding Opportunity to Learn Standards?

Upon signature of the Goals 2000 legislation, the Panel will carefully consider the legislative charge within the context of voluntary content and performance standards.

• REPORTING ON PROMISING OR EFFECTIVE ACTIONS

(1) How can the Panel use limited resources to identify credibly "promising or effective actions" and report them?

Working in conjunction with other organizations, identify large-scale policies, programs, trends and governmental changes that could have nationwide impact on Goal attainment.

(2) How can the Panel serve as a catalyst for airing powerful ideas and making recommendations to the federal, state and local levels for specific actions and implementation strategies required to achieve the National Education Goals?

Organize forums — including regional and state hearings — with Panel members, a variety of education reform professionals, and thinkers from other disciplines to explore more dramatic options for reaching the Goals. Prepare recommendations from these discussions and communicate results through a variety of strategies.

• BUILDING A NATIONWIDE, BIPARTISAN CONSENSUS ON NECESSARY REFORMS

(1) In building a nationwide, bipartisan consensus, who should the audience be and what message(s) should be stressed?

Option 1: Continue to focus on policymakers, extending the message to include necessary reforms.

Option 2: Expand the target audience to include educators, parents and others concerned with education at the state and local levels, expanding the message to include specific reforms, implementation strategies, and the urgency of action.

Option 3: Expand the audience to include policymakers, educators, parents and all citizens, preparing a series of targeted messages for each audience. Communicate an understanding of the Goals, the urgency of action and the need for commitment to systemic reform and higher expectations.

• GOVERNANCE AND ROLES

(1) How should the Panel adopt policy positions or make other decisions?

Option 1: Operate in a consensus mode except where the law clearly requires a vote.

Option 2: Conform to the law with regard to votes on standards, and adopt a 2/3 vote approval rule for other positions.

(2) What overall role should the Panel strive to play in the drive for educational improvement? Are there structural changes that would enhance the chosen role?

Option 1: The Panel would cast its role as a low profile institution communicating to and through a system of policymakers. The Panel would approve broad, general statements that reflect consensus among elected leaders, educators and many others.

Option 2: The Panel would strive to develop a higher profile and engage in higher levels of outreach activity. It would approve broad statements and undertake more targeted activities aimed at specialized audiences and the general public. To enhance this role, a committee structure would be developed to process issues for full Panel review.

Option 3: The Panel would take an activist, high profile role in convening others and raising cutting-edge education reform ideas. It would serve as an advocate for systemic education reform and other changes necessary to achieve the Goals. It would also serve as a convenor of other groups committed to education reform. Policy and other statements would be specific and dynamic. The audience would range from policymakers to the general public.

CROSS REFERENCE FROM DECISION MEMORANDUM TO OPTIONS PAPER

Area	Decision Memorandum	Options Paper
Vision and Mission	Page 1	Page 1
Reporting	Page 2	Page 2
Content Standards, Performance Standards and Assessments	Page 2	Page 4
Opportunity to Learn Standards	Page 2	Page 6
Reporting on Promising of Effective Practices	Page 2-3	Page 7-8
Building a Nationwide, Bipartisan Consensus	Page 3	Page 9
Governance and Roles	Page 3	Page 10

APPENDIX A

Strategic Options for the National Education Goals Panel

Options Paper

Strategic Options
for the
National Education
Goals Panel

February 1, 1994 Meeting
of the
National Education Goals Panel

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Vision and Mission	1
Strategic Directions	2
Reporting	2
Content Standards, Performance	
Standards and Assessment Systems	4
Opportunity To Learn Standards	6
Reporting on Promising or Effective	
Actions	7
Building A Nationwide, Bipartisan	
Consensus	9
Governance and Roles	10
Tactical Principles	12

STRATEGIC OPTIONS FOR THE NATIONAL EDUCATION GOALS PANEL

INTRODUCTION

In late December, Governor John McKernan, Chair of the National Education Goals Panel (NEGP), created a Strategic Planning Committee. He asked that the Committee "develop options and recommendations" concerning the new roles that the Panel will take on as a result of impending passage of federal legislation.

This paper outlines options for decisions on strategic directions over the next five years.

- (1) *What should be the vision and mission of the NEGP?*
- (2) *How should the Panel respond to new legislative mandates?*
- (3) *What other changes in the Panel's operations and strategies are necessary to achieve the mission?*

VISION & MISSION

The National Education Goals Panel provides the nation with a unique intergovernmental body focused on the achievement of ambitious education goals. Impending passage of federal legislation will reconstitute the Panel and add several new charges to its charter. The Goals Panel needs a vision, mission statement and strategic directions to fulfill its legislative charter and set its course for the future.

The Vision:

The Strategic Planning Committee proposes this vision statement for the National Education Goals Panel:

The Goals Panel will be the premier champion and catalyst in the country for achieving the National Education Goals. States and communities will make continuous improvement toward goal achievement through the Year 2000. Students, parents, workers and businesses will realize tangible improvements as the result of increased educational performance.

The Mission:

The Strategic Planning Committee proposes this mission statement for the Goals Panel:

The mission of the National Education Goals Panel is to catalyze fundamental change in schools, communities, states and the nation in order to achieve the National Education Goals.

The Goals Panel will achieve this mission by reporting on goal achievement, encouraging the development of voluntary educational content standards, performance standards, assessment systems and opportunity to learn standards, as well as reporting on promising or effective policies and practices.

The Goals Panel will strive to build a nationwide, bipartisan consensus on the necessity of achieving the National Education Goals and on effective ways to achieve them.

STRATEGIC DIRECTIONS

Based on this vision and mission, the National Education Goals Panel will develop a strategic plan. The plan will be based on consideration of both the Panel's strategic directions and available resources. Choosing among the following options is the first step in setting the strategic direction for the Panel. When completed, the strategic plan will be reviewed by the Executive Committee and submitted to the Panel for final approval.

• REPORTING

(1) How should the Panel upgrade current reporting efforts and meet new obligations in reporting progress toward the National Education Goals?

Background: The Panel has spent many hours choosing indicators and developing a high quality report, including a summary with wide distribution. The report gets high marks from those who follow education issues and from some state policymakers. At the same time, the report is relatively complex, uses only data previously reported, and is of limited utility among some policymakers and the public. The Chair has appointed a Reporting Committee to guide and monitor the Panel's reporting function.

Option 1: Continue to publish an annual report and summary, targeted to policymakers.

Through this option, the Panel would reduce the total number of indicators, identify implications for action, and add commentary. Fewer full reports would be printed, but new ways of distributing the summary would be developed, including electronic means, video, forums, town meetings, seminars and other methods.

Advantages: This option would tighten the annual report and make it more useful, adding commentary that interprets the data.

Disadvantages: This option would meet only minimally the new law's requirement that reporting be cast in a way that the average person can understand progress toward the goals.

Resource Implications: This option would not require new resources.

Option 2: Publish an annual report and restructure the summary into an assessment of progress clearly understandable by the American public.

Through this option, the Panel would continue to publish the large report, reduce the total number of indicators, identify implications for action, add commentary, and reduce the number of copies printed. The report would include a section on promising or effective practices, and actions that the federal government, states and localities can take to achieve the goals. The summary document would be easy-to-grasp and highly graphic. The reports would be distributed through a broad range of communications vehicles, including video, networks and bulletin boards, and other means.

Advantages: This option would meet the legislative requirement for reporting in a way that is understandable to the public.

Disadvantages: The Panel might have to engage in further debate about indicators.

Resource Implications: This option would cost more than Option 1 because of the wide distribution of the new summary document and the new ways of getting it out. Part of the cost increase could be offset by printing fewer full reports.

Option 3: Publish an annual report and restructure the summary into an assessment of progress clearly understandable by the American public. Prepare specialized but short reports aimed at audiences concerned with individual Goals or specialized subject areas. (Recommended)

Under this option, the Panel would publish an annual report and a summary aimed at a wide audience. In addition, the Panel would produce specialized reports either by goal or targeted to specific issues. These reports could be accomplished in conjunction with other interested parties, and — if possible — costs would be shared. These additional reports would be distributed through education interest groups, partnerships with the business community and through a wide range of communications strategies.

Advantages: This option would provide specialized information to groups concerned primarily with a single Goal, or those concerned with special populations.

Disadvantages: The effort of creating new documents could be overwhelming for the reporting staff. This option would also necessitate more effort by the Reporting Committee and Panel staffs to deal with possibly controversial issues raised by these reports.

Resource Implications: This option would require a shift in responsibilities so that reporting staff would be devoted almost entirely to these tasks.

(2) What, if any, role should the Panel adopt in stimulating states, localities, school districts and others to engage in reporting on the National Education Goals in their own jurisdictions?

Background: Part of the reporting responsibility of the Panel is to stimulate others to track progress toward the National Education Goals. The Panel has published a handbook for local officials outlining how they can generate their own reports on the Goals. After an initial interest in state and local goals reports, interest has waned. The passage of the Goals 2000 legislation should encourage more states and communities to report on their progress toward the Goals.

Option 1: The Panel should continue to recommend that states and communities issue reports on the extent to which the Goals are achieved. The Panel staff should distribute the existing handbook more widely and develop a handbook for use by citizen groups.

Under this option, the Panel would reiterate its support for state and local reporting, urging citizens groups and others to report.

Advantages: This option keeps pressure on states and communities to report progress. It also provides help in structuring reports.

Disadvantages: This option does not provide hands-on assistance for state and local officials in developing reporting documents.

Resource Implications: This option would have only a small impact on current staffing or budget allocations, since the development of the citizens' handbook would be derivative of the existing handbook for local officials.

Option 2: Encourage state and local reporting, provide handbooks and limited technical assistance to states and communities. (Recommended)

Under this option, the Panel would commit itself to finding incentives and providing more assistance to encourage states, localities, school districts and citizen groups to develop their own goals reports, and in demonstrating the value of reporting. The Panel would develop this capacity through collaboration with other groups.

Advantages: This option would show that the Panel takes very seriously the need for communities and states to focus attention on performance.

Disadvantages: This option might divert too many resources to hands-on technical assistance.

Resource Implications: This option would have to be achieved through partnerships with other groups and agencies.

Option 3: The Panel should ask Congress and/or the Department of Education to require that state and local goals reports be generated as part of the process for receiving funds under federal programs. The Panel should also provide handbooks and technical assistance.

The Panel would attempt to leverage nationwide action on reporting through incentives and requirements of the federal government.

Advantages: If successful, this option would generate thousands of goals reports across the nation.

Disadvantages: This option contradicts the basic voluntary nature of the goals achievement process, and puts the federal government in the position of mandating reporting.

Resource Implications: This option would have little impact on the Panel's budget, but Panel members would have to commit more time on this issue.

(3) How should the Panel support long-term data improvement?

Background: Despite some improvements, the data on which education policy is made in the United States is thin at best. Currently, Panel staff is actively pursuing the improvement of the National Assessment of Educational Progress, adult literacy and international comparative data. In addition, the new legislation charges the Panel with supporting the work of its advisers to oversee improvements in early childhood assessments.

Option 1: The Panel should leave this issue to staff discussion.

Under this option, the Panel would authorize the staff to continue discussions with federal agencies, the states and others to urge improvement of the data system to support reporting.

Advantages: This option would give the Panel more time to deal with other issues.

Disadvantages: Long-term data improvement is the key to better reporting. The Panel may want to continue to be involved in this issue.

Resource Implications: Minimal.

Option 2: The Panel should adopt additional policy positions urging particular gaps in data to be closed by either the federal government or the states. It should reiterate its support for useful data improvement. (Recommended)

Under this option, the Panel would ask agencies of the federal government, the states and others to produce better data related to goal reporting and education policymaking. Members of the Panel would commit to using their influence in their own jurisdictions for producing better data series.

Advantages: This option would put the Panel strongly on record that data needs to be improved for goals reporting and better policymaking.

Disadvantages: This option could cause agencies difficulty in balancing resource constraints with the need for better data.

Resource Implications: This option would require staff attention of Panel members.

• CONTENT STANDARDS, PERFORMANCE STANDARDS AND STATE ASSESSMENT SYSTEMS

(1) How should the Panel organize to review and approve or disapprove criteria for and the actual content standards, student performance standards and state assessment systems certified by the National Education Standards and Improvement Council (NESIC)?

Background: The Goals Panel has exerted leadership in developing high standards for curricular content, student performance and assessments that are aligned with standards. Recently, the Panel commissioned work to propose review criteria and processes for the certification of national standards

(the Malcom Report). This report examined a variety of issues related to content standards, performance standards and related assessment systems. In November, 1993, the Panel adopted a Statement on Voluntary National Education Content Standards that emphasized that standards should be voluntary, address only core academic subjects, be at least as challenging as academic expectations in other countries, be developed from the bottom-up, and be useful and adaptable.

Under the new law, the Panel will be responsible for reviewing and approving or disapproving the criteria developed by NESIC for certification of voluntary national content standards, performance standards and assessment systems. The Panel will also approve or disapprove actual voluntary national content and student performance standards certified by NESIC. Content and performance standards would be submitted by various groups, including states, to NESIC. Standards certified by NESIC would then be forwarded to the Panel for approval or disapproval.

Option 1: After NESIC is established, communicate the Statement on Voluntary National Education Content Standards to NESIC. Wait for NESIC to propose criteria and refer specific standards to the Panel. Approve or disapprove criteria and specific standards.

Under this option, the Panel would provide only the most general guidance to NESIC, taking no more detailed positions than were adopted in November, 1993.

Advantages: This approach would allow NESIC time to get organized and avoid disputes over criteria and standards.

Disadvantages: The Panel could find itself responding to issues that could have been resolved earlier if the Panel had taken a more active role.

Resource Implications: This option would have minimal impact on resources in the short run.

Option 2: Upon signature of Goals 2000 legislation and working in partnership with NESIC, clarify the basis on which the Panel will review and approve or disapprove criteria and NESIC-certified standards and assessment systems. (Recommended).

Through this option, the Panel would reexamine the Malcom Report, reach out to other groups for comment, and clarify the basis on which the Panel will take action. The Panel's staff would work closely with NESIC.

Advantages: This option places the Panel in a more proactive role, assisting NESIC and giving them guidance. This option would also allow the Panel to consult more broadly with minorities and other groups.

Disadvantages: This option might signal to some that the Panel will have great influence on standards, which some believe should be left to "experts."

Resource Implications: This would require additional resources to reach out more broadly.

Option 3: Utilize advisory groups and detailed information on prototype criteria for standards as well as examples of proposed standards. Provide detailed guidance to NESIC on what types of standards and assessments will be approved.

Under this approach, the Panel would take an involved and active role in developing criteria for content and performance standards. It would attempt to set the groundrules for NESIC's deliberations in advance. The Panel would serve as a convener to gather further information on standards.

Advantages: This option would place the Panel in a prominent leadership position in the standards movement, and would provide better information to NESIC about the Panel's view of content and performance standards.

Disadvantages: This option could interfere with NESIC, cause controversy in advance of the submission of standards, and lead to criticism about meddling in standard setting.

Resource Implications: This option would require a substantial additional staff effort to work with NESIC on criteria development and reviewing proposed standards. Panel members and their staffs would have to devote considerably more time to this issue as well.

• OPPORTUNITY TO LEARN STANDARDS

(1) How should the Goals Panel organize itself to meet its responsibilities under the Goals 2000 legislation regarding Opportunity to Learn Standards?

Background: According to the proposed legislation, the newly established National Education Standards and Improvement Council must certify voluntary opportunity to learn standards that “establish a basis for providing all students a fair opportunity to achieve the knowledge and skills described in the voluntary national content standards certified by the Council.” These OTL standards must address factors such as the quality and availability of curricula, instructional materials and technologies, the capability of teachers, professional development, best practices, alignment of curriculum, instructional practices and assessments to content standards and several other factors.

Option 1: The Panel should wait for NESIC to be established, taking no position on OTL criteria and standards in advance of NESIC's recommendations.

Under this option, the Panel would take a “wait-and-see” attitude toward the OTL standards debate.

Advantages: The Panel will not have to face difficult controversies about OTL standards until the NESIC debate over these issues is fully aired and positions are well known.

Disadvantages: The Panel will cede influence over this key debate to nonelected officials. The Panel may find itself in a reactive mode and may limit its choices in the future.

Resource Implications: This option would put the least stress on Panel resources. The Panel itself would not have to deal with the OTL issue during the first year.

Option 2: Upon signature of the Goals 2000 legislation, the Panel will carefully consider the legislative charge within the context of voluntary content and performance standards. (Recommended)

This option assures that the Panel does not preempt the decisions of Congress or the authority of the NESIC in this important but potentially difficult area. It would enable the Panel to review with great care Congressional committee reports that detail the expected roles of the Panel and NESIC with regard to the OTL criteria and standards prior to determining its course of action.

Advantages: This option provides the most flexibility to the Panel.

Disadvantages: The Panel will have to revisit this issue at a later date.

Resource Implications: This option delays a consideration of resource implications.

Option 3: The Panel should convene experts and state leaders to hear their positions on OTL criteria and standards.

Through this option, the Panel would take the initiative in seeking state and expert opinion on what OTL standards should be. It would also prepare the Panel for its future role in approving or disapproving OTL criteria and standards.

Advantages: This option would help the Panel develop a basis for deciding on OTL standards when they are presented by NESIC. It would also show that the Panel is taking the initiative to help clarify this difficult area.

Disadvantages: The Panel may be perceived as preempting the responsibilities of NESIC.

Resource Implications: This option would require additional staff time to convene experts and state leaders and would also require more meeting time on the part of the Panel members.

• REPORTING ON PROMISING OR EFFECTIVE ACTIONS

(1) How can the Panel use limited resources to identify credibly “promising or effective actions” and report them?

Background: The Goals 2000 legislation expands the role of the Goals Panel by requiring it to “report on promising or effective actions being taken at the national, State and local levels, and in the public and private sectors, to achieve the National Education Goals.” The law may also require that the Panel “identify actions that should be taken by Federal, State, and local governments to enhance progress toward achieving the National Education Goals.”

This mandate presents both challenges and opportunities. The Panel must make judgments about what are “effective” and “promising” actions and develop the basis for recommending specific actions for various levels of government. This is a major change in the charter of the Panel.

Option 1: Develop advisory groups to validate “promising or effective actions” and report these judgments annually.

Through this option, a system of “vetting” promising or effective actions would be set up, using advisory committees. The Panel would publish these ideas annually.

Advantages: This option would enable the Panel to start slowly and carefully, allowing promising and effective actions to be credibly identified and published.

Disadvantages: The Panel would not place its *imprimatur* on important actions.

Resource Implications: Panel staff would have to be assigned to manage advisory panels and deal with a wide variety of issues raised in setting criteria for what is “promising or effective.” Panel members and their staffs would also have to spend more time on this issue.

Option 2: Working in conjunction with other organizations, identify large-scale policies, programs, trends and governmental changes that could have nationwide impact on Goal attainment. (Recommended).

Under this option, the Panel will identify broad systemic changes related to the Goals. The Panel would build upon criteria and processes developed by other organizations to determine what is “promising or effective” and to make recommendations for action.

Advantages: This would exert leadership on large-scale changes, and would avoid getting the Panel bogged down in discussion of narrow innovations. It would build upon work already done in other organizations.

Disadvantages: This option would place the Panel in the position of judging other organizations’ criteria and methods for recommending systemic reforms.

Resource Implications: This option would require a reallocation of staff or new staff to handle the relationships with other organizations and to structure Panel consideration of promising or effective actions and making recommendation on reforms.

Option 3: Develop the Panel’s own criteria for effectiveness and promise, focusing on nationwide applicability and impact on each of the Goals. Limit Panel *imprimatur* to a few large changes.

Under this option, the Panel would develop its own criteria for judging the promise or effectiveness of action. The Panel would make broad generalizations concerning key innovative techniques with nationwide application. A variety of communications vehicles would be used to get the word out about the Panel’s view.

Advantages: This option would provide leadership without having to judge whether hundreds or thousands of particular innovative programs were promising or effective.

Disadvantages: This approach could degenerate into platitudes and least-common-denominator recommendations. It would also require a major investment of time and resources of the Panel.

Resource Implications: Panel staff would have to be increased to create a whole new activity within the Panel operation.

(2) How can the Panel serve as a catalyst for airing powerful ideas and making recommendations to the federal, state and local levels for specific actions and implementation strategies required to achieve the National Education Goals?

Background: The National Education Goals Panel is a unique intergovernmental body with high-level participation from respected public figures. Under the new law, the Panel will be authorized to recommend specific actions to reform education. This charter could be a powerful tool with which to speak to the nation about neglected issues and advocate more serious approaches to reform.

Option 1: With strong involvement of Panel members, develop and communicate widely a report on what state and local leaders should do to achieve the goals.

Under this option, the Panel would grapple with specific reforms that are necessary to achieve the National Education Goals. These reforms would not be limited to education reforms, but would include a wide array of potential actions.

Advantages: This option would produce a document that provides examples of ways federal, state and local leaders can help the nation meet the National Education Goals. Panel members could use the document as part of their efforts to encourage involvement of these leaders.

Disadvantages: Panel members might not be comfortable with a high profile effort encouraging state, federal and local leaders to take specific actions.

Resource Implications: Additional staff time would be required to produce the report. It would also involve more time on the part of Panel members.

Option 2: Organize forums — including regional and state hearings — with Panel members, a variety of education reform professionals, and thinkers from other disciplines to explore more dramatic options for reaching the Goals. Prepare recommendations from these discussions and communicate results through a variety of strategies. (Recommended).

These forums should stimulate discussion across disciplines and explore strategies for executing ideas. The forums should provide the opportunity for broad-ranging debate over nationwide reforms well beyond traditional educational or schooling issues.

Advantages: The major advantage of this option is that it offers more promise in helping the nation to move toward goal attainment. It places the Panel in the position of convener of the debate on how to meet the Goals.

Disadvantages: It would require much more time on the part of Panel members and staff.

Resource Implications: There would be additional costs associated with preparing for the forums, conducting them and summarizing the ideas generated therein.

Option 3: In addition to regional and statewide forums, hold a significant number of forums on how to achieve the National Education Goals in local communities.

These forums would be extensive and serve to focus community attention on specific actions needed to achieve the Goals. Alternatively, the Panel could cosponsor local forums, lending its prestige to discussions at the local level.

Advantages: This option would help the Panel get the word out into local communities about the importance of goal attainment.

Disadvantages: This option would take considerably more time of Panel members and staff.
Resource Implications: In addition to the time that would be required by Panel members, staff resources for the Panel might have to be expanded.

Option 4: Prepare a document that quantifies the distance between current performance and achieving the Goals on a state-by-state basis. Prepare recommendations for all levels of government focusing on actions necessary to close the gaps.

Advantages: This would quantify the debate at the state level, clearly showing where the greatest effort needs to be directed and where resources should be focused on a goal-by-goal and state-by-state basis.

Disadvantages: It is unclear whether we can responsibly quantify the gaps.

Resource Implications: Resource requirements for this option would be substantial.

• BUILDING A NATIONWIDE BIPARTISAN CONSENSUS ON NECESSARY REFORMS

(1) In building a nationwide, bipartisan consensus, who should the audience be and what message(s) should be stressed?

Background: During its formative period, the Panel has addressed policymakers with a message largely restricted to reporting on goal achievement and the need for high standards. The new law will challenge the Panel to build a nationwide, bipartisan consensus not only on achieving the goals but also on reforms necessary to achieve them. This will require a comprehensive communications strategy that addresses audience, message and communications techniques.

Option 1: Continue to focus on policymakers, extending the message to include necessary reforms.

Through this option, the Panel would focus attention on elected officials and administrators within the education system. It would work more closely with groups such as NGA, NCSL, CCSSO, and others in a bipartisan manner. It would make specific recommendations to policymakers, including the Administration and Congress, on how to improve educational outcomes.

Advantages: This option focuses limited Panel resources where there will be most leverage for changing the educational system.

Disadvantages: This option ignores vast numbers of people who will be necessary to motivate if the goals are to be reached.

Resource Implications: This option has only limited impact on resource allocation.

Option 2: Expand the target audience to include educators, parents and others concerned with education at the state and local levels, expanding the message to include specific reforms, implementation strategies, and the urgency of action.

Under this option, the Panel would work more closely with education and citizen groups to reach their constituencies. It would focus communication strategies on getting people in the system to embrace systemic education reform.

Advantages: This option extends the Panel communications strategy to educators, parents and others directly concerned about education. It focuses energy on motivating them to change toward a performance orientation.

Disadvantages: This option gives less attention to citizens and others not directly connected to the education system.

Resource Implications: Expanding the audience to more of the education community and state and local reformers would require more funds to be allocated to communications, mainly in new communications vehicles and through collaboration with education interest groups.

Option 3: Expand the audience to include policymakers, educators, parents and all citizens, preparing a series of targeted messages for each audience. Communicate an understanding of the Goals, the urgency of action and the need for commitment to systemic reform and higher expectations.

Through this option, the Panel would devote substantial time and effort to a major national communications campaign. The purpose would be to explain the goals and generate enthusiasm for change, not only in the education system but in families, neighborhoods, and communities. This option would require partnerships with other groups and building a broad coalition to work with the Panel in this endeavor.

Advantages: This option has the potential of engendering change through direct communication with the public.

Disadvantages: This option may be far beyond the capacity of the Panel.

Resource Implications: This option would require not only a reallocation of internal funds toward communication but also raising funds and in-kind help from a variety of outside sources. Panel members themselves would have to commit more time to public activities on behalf of the national goals.

• GOVERNANCE AND ROLES

Meeting the challenges of the Goals 2000 legislation will require many changes in the activities of the Goals Panel. In this section, questions of governance and issues of the overall role and structure of the Panel are addressed.

(1) How should the Panel adopt policy positions or make other decisions?

Background: The National Education Goals Panel has made decisions by consensus. Under the new law, the Panel will be called upon to take votes relating to the approval or disapproval of standards. The Panel may want to change procedures regarding voting as well as majority and minority opinions. While the Executive Committee may want to address this issue separately, the Strategic Planning Committee raises the following options:

Option 1: Operate in a consensus mode except where the law clearly requires a vote.

Under this option, the Panel would maintain the tradition of acting unanimously or through a consensus process, except where the new law requires votes.

Advantages: This option would present a united front from a diverse group of policymakers on a variety of key educational issues.

Disadvantages: Maintaining the requirement for consensus might water down many of the recommendations of the Panel. It might also strengthen the tendency of Panel members to defer to the judgment of one or a few members of the Panel whose responsibilities are affected by a policy position or approach.

Resource Implications: Reaching consensus takes up large amounts of staff time, both of the Panel staff and the staff to Panel members.

Option 2: Conform to the law with regard to votes on criteria and standards, and adopt a 2/3 vote approval rule for other positions.

This option would achieve near-consensus but would allow more direct statements than might be achieved through a requirement for unanimity.

Advantages: This option would promote debate and would allow the Panel to take more controversial positions.

Disadvantages: This option might promote dissension and might put some members of the Panel in a difficult position of publicly opposing Panel decisions. In the long run, this could undermine the authority of the Panel.

Resource Implications: Panel members and staff would spend less time on consensus building and more time debating options.

(2) What overall role should the Panel strive to play in the drive for educational improvement? Are there structural changes that would enhance the chosen role?

Background: In order to carry out its mission, the National Education Goals Panel should reflect on the role of the Panel as an institution as well as the commitment of Panel members and the relationship of the Panel to organizational staff and member staff. Under the new law, there will be many opportunities for expanding the role of the Panel on the public stage and in building the Panel as an institution. Two questions emerge: (1) What general role does the Panel as an institution want to play? (2) What structure is appropriate to support the Panel as it plays its chosen role?

Option 1: The Panel would cast its role as a low profile institution communicating to and through a system of policymakers. The Panel would approve broad, general statements that reflect consensus among elected leaders, educators and many others.

Under this option the basic system would remain unchanged. The institution would continue to be relatively staff-driven under the leadership of the Chair and the Executive Director. The new Executive Committee would take on the role of governance of the institution and would guide the development of broad policy statements. It would also preview submissions from NESIC and generally work to achieve consensus before full Panel meetings.

Advantages: This would cause the least disruption in the short run and would allow time to digest new mandates within current resource parameters.

Disadvantages: This option risks losing an opportunity to lead.

Resource Implications: Panel members will not have to spend much more time than they do now on Panel activities. Staff would be reorganized and some staff would be added, depending on how the Panel chooses to conduct activities through the strategic plan.

Option 2: The Panel would strive to develop a higher profile and engage in substantial outreach activity. It would approve broad statements and undertake more targeted activities aimed at specialized audiences and the general public. To enhance this role, a committee structure would be developed to process issues for full Panel review.

Under this option, the Panel would establish a limited committee structure and engage in activities in their own jurisdictions. The Panel would also confer often by telephone or electronically.

Advantages: This option would allow for a smooth transition to a more active role over about a year and allow Panel members to become more substantively involved.

Disadvantages: This option risks being too middle-of-the road. The danger of falling back into a staff-driven mode would be great.

Resource Implications: This option would require Panel members to increase their current allocation of staff time to the organization. Some new staff resources at headquarters would also be required.

Option 3: The Panel would take an activist, high profile role in convening others and raising cutting-edge education reform ideas. It would serve as an advocate for systemic education reform and other changes necessary to achieve the goals. It would also serve as a convener of other groups committed to education reform. Policy and other statements would be specific and dynamic. The audience would range from policymakers to the general public.

Under this option, the Panel would constitute itself with a full committee structure, probably divided by the key issues raised in the legislation. Panel members would commit to significant activities on behalf of the Panel about once a month, either in their jurisdictions or elsewhere. The full range of audiences would be addressed, necessitating a very active communications strategy. Part of the role

of the Panel would be advocacy for education reform generally. It would seek to form partnerships and produce collaborative products with many other groups.

Advantages: This option would place the Panel at the forefront of education reform in America and would have the best chance of influencing the achievement of National Education Goals.

Disadvantages: This option might be far beyond the capacity of the Panel as an institution and exceed the time and energy that individual Panel members are able to put into Panel activities.

Resource Implications: The budget of the Panel would have to be increased, probably by asking the Department of Education not to reduce in-kind services as the appropriation comes on line. This would involve additional commitment of time by Panel members and their staffs.

TACTICAL PRINCIPLES FOR PLAN IMPLEMENTATION

As schools and businesses become high performance workplaces through the implementation of techniques such as Total Quality Management and the application of Baldrige quality standards, the Goals Panel can serve as a model for these reforms. Within the Panel staff and in the working relationships among Panel staff, member staff and members themselves, the following tactical principles for plan implementation should be employed:

(1) Adopt a long term vision. Making changes of the magnitude envisioned in this report requires a commitment to change that will take many years to fully implement.

(2) Develop measurable goals for the Goals Panel. The National Education Goals Panel has always believed in setting measurable goals and determining whether progress is taking place. This same principle should be applied to the Goals Panel itself.

(3) Focus on outcomes. The activities of the staff and Panel must derive from the intended outcomes and these actions should be reviewed regularly to make sure that they support the achievement of the strategic plan.

(4) Redesign staff systems and practices. If the organization is focused on a vision and goals, new models for organizing work will have to be developed as well as new alliances with other organizations. The staff should strive to create a positive and supportive environment.

(5) Establish clear expectations of the roles, relationships and performance of staff members. Institute team decisionmaking practices. Panel staff, member staff and Panel members can work cooperatively to implement the strategic plan. By clarifying roles and responsibilities, a team approach will lead to greater productivity.

(6) Know our customers. In all the strategies adopted by the Panel, it is important for staff and Panel members to clarify who the customer is. This will help to focus scarce resources and make the Panel more responsive and effective.

(7) Reinvent citizenship. Just as many organizations are attempting to reinvent government, organizations needs to help define new roles for citizens. This will be particularly important for the Goals Panel as it strives to build a nationwide, bipartisan consensus for goal attainment.

APPENDIX B:
Legislative Comparison

APPENDIX B

Legislation:

Legislative Comparison

Major differences between the House and Senate versions of the Goals 2000 legislation relevant to the NEGP

1. Teacher Education and Professional Development

[House: Section 102(4) on page 7] adds this Goal.

2. Parental Participation

[House: Section 102(8) on page 12] adds a Goal entitled "School and Home Partnership."

[Senate: Section 102(7) on page 15] adds a Goal entitled "Parental Participation."

3. Review the National Goals and Objectives

[Senate: Section 201(3) on page 17] Adds a purpose for the Panel to periodically review the goals and objectives.

4. Approve/Disapprove language (See #11 below)

[House: Section 201(3) on pages 13 & 14] Directs the Panel to review standards certified by NESIC 'with the option of disapproving'.

[Senate: Section 201(4) on page 17] Directs the Panel to review and approve standards certified by NESIC. This is also the Administration version.

5. Chairperson

[House: Section 202(i) page 17] In the House version the President appoints the Chair for a period of one year, alternating political parties.

[Senate: Section 202(i) on page 21] In the Senate version the members of the Panel choose the Chair from among themselves for a period of one year, alternating political parties.

6. Conflict of Interest

[House: Section 202(j) page 17] This clause prohibits a Panel member who is an elected official of a State from participating in the Panel's consideration of content, student performance, or OTL Standards from that State.

7. Ex Officio Member

[House: Section 202(k) on page 18] Requires the Secretary of Education be an ex-officio non-voting member of the Panel if s/he has not been designated by the President to be a voting member of the panel.

8. Duties: Report/Report Card (Also see #12 below)

[House: Section 203(a)(1) on page 18] requires the Panel to issue an annual report.

[Senate: Section 203(a)(1) on page 21] requires the Panel to issue an annual report card.

9. Duties: Report on State opportunity-to-learn standards

[House: Section 203(b)(a)(2) on page 18] adds a report on State Opportunity to Learn Standards.

10. NESIC membership

[House: Section 212(b)(4) on page 27] states that 4 members of NESIC shall be appointed by the Panel.

[Senate: Section 203(a)(2) on page 22] states that Panel shall submit to the President nominations for appointment to NESIC

11. Approve or disapprove standards certified by NESIC

[House: Section 203(a)(3) on page 18] directs the Panel to review with the option of disapproving by a 2/3 vote of the full membership the criteria for standards and the standards themselves.

[Senate: Section 203(a)(3) on page 22] directs the Panel to review and approve (or explain why not) the criteria for standards and the standards themselves certified by NESIC.

12. National Report Card/Report

[House Section 203(b) on page 19] describes the Goals Panel Report.

[Senate: Section 203(b) on page 22] describes the "National Report Card."

13. Gift Authority

Although Gift Authority was in an early House version in section 204, it is not present in either the current House or Senate version.

14. Evaluation by non-governmental organization

[House: Section 221, page 50] Authorizes \$500,000 for the National Academy of Education, National Academy of Sciences or the Commission on Behavioral and Social Sciences to evaluate the technical quality of the work of the Panel and NESIC and the process the Panel uses to approve certification criteria and voluntary standards. It also requires that the evaluator periodically provide information to the Panel and report their findings to the Congress, the Secretary and the public (There are also evaluations of NESIC included in this section).

APPENDIX B

Legislation:
House Version

Calendar No. 231

103D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION**H. R. 1804**

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

OCTOBER 18 (legislative day, OCTOBER 13), 1993

Received; read twice and place on the calendar

AN ACT

To improve learning and teaching by providing a national framework for education reform; to promote the research, consensus building, and systemic changes needed to ensure equitable educational opportunities and high levels of educational achievement for all American students; to provide a framework for reauthorization of all Federal education programs; to promote the development and adoption of a voluntary national system of skill standards and certifications; and for other purposes..

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

3 **SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

4 This Act may be cited as the "Goals 2000: Educate
5 America Act".

1 **SEC. 2. PURPOSE.**

2 The purpose of this Act is to provide a framework
3 for meeting the National Education Goals established by
4 title I of this Act by—

5 (1) promoting coherent, nationwide, systemic
6 education reform;

7 (2) improving the quality of learning and teach-
8 ing in the classroom and in the workplace;

9 (3) defining appropriate and coherent Federal,
10 State, and local roles and responsibilities for edu-
11 cation reform and lifelong learning;

12 (4) establishing valid, reliable, and fair mecha-
13 nisms for—

14 (A) building a broad national consensus on
15 American education reform;

16 (B) assisting in the development and cer-
17 tification of high-quality, internationally com-
18 petitive content and student performance stand-
19 ards;

20 (C) assisting in the development and cer-
21 tification of opportunity-to-learn standards; and

22 (D) assisting in the development and cer-
23 tification of high-quality assessment measures
24 that reflect the internationally competitive con-
25 tent and student performance standards;

1 (5) supporting new initiatives at the Federal,
2 State, local, and school levels to provide equal edu-
3 cational opportunity for all students to meet high
4 standards and to succeed in the world of employ-
5 ment and civic participation;

6 (6) providing a framework for the reauthoriza-
7 tion of all Federal education programs by—

8 (A) creating a vision of excellence and eq-
9 uity that will guide all Federal education and
10 related programs;

11 (B) providing for the establishment of
12 high-quality, internationally competitive content
13 and student performance standards that all stu-
14 dents will be expected to achieve;

15 (C) providing for the establishment of high
16 quality, internationally competitive opportunity-
17 to-learn standards that all States, local edu-
18 cational agencies, and schools should achieve;

19 (D) encouraging and enabling all State
20 educational agencies and local educational agen-
21 cies to develop comprehensive improvement
22 plans that will provide a coherent framework
23 for the implementation of reauthorized Federal
24 education and related programs in an inte-
25 grated fashion that effectively educates all chil-

1 dren enabling them to participate fully as work-
2 ers, parents, and citizens; and

3 (E) providing resources to help individual
4 schools, including those serving students with
5 high needs, develop and implement comprehen-
6 sive improvement plans;

7 (7) stimulating the development and adoption
8 of a voluntary national system of skill standards and
9 certification to serve as a cornerstone of the national
10 strategy to enhance workforce skills; and

11 (8) assisting every elementary and secondary
12 school that receives funds under this Act to actively
13 involve parents and families in supporting the aca-
14 demic work of their children at home and in provid-
15 ing parents with skills to advocate for their children
16 at school.

17 **TITLE I—NATIONAL EDUCATION** 18 **GOALS**

19 **SEC. 101. PURPOSE.**

20 The purpose of this title is to establish national edu-
21 cation goals.

22 **SEC. 102. NATIONAL EDUCATION GOALS.**

23 The Congress declares that the National Education
24 Goals are the following:

1 (1) SCHOOL READINESS.—(A) By the year
2 2000, all children in America will start school ready
3 to learn.

4 (B) The objectives for this goal are that—

5 (i) all children will have access to high-
6 quality and developmentally appropriate pre-
7 school programs that help prepare children for
8 school;

9 (ii) every parent in America will be a
10 child's first teacher and devote time each day to
11 helping his or her preschool child learn, and
12 parents will have access to the training and
13 support they need; and

14 (iii) all children will receive the nutrition
15 and health care needed to arrive at school with
16 healthy minds and bodies, and to maintain the
17 mental alertness necessary to be prepared to
18 learn, and the number of low-birthweight babies
19 will be significantly reduced through enhanced
20 prenatal health systems.

21 (2) SCHOOL COMPLETION.—(A) By the year
22 2000, the high school graduation rate will increase
23 to at least 90 percent.

24 (B) The objectives for this goal are that—

1 (i) the Nation must dramatically reduce its
2 dropout rate, and 75 percent of those students
3 who do drop out will successfully complete a
4 high school degree or its equivalent; and

5 (ii) the gap in high school graduation rates
6 between American students from minority back-
7 grounds and their non-minority counterparts
8 will be eliminated.

9 (3) STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT AND CITIZEN-
10 SHIP.—(A) By the year 2000, all students will leave
11 grades 4, 8, and 12 having demonstrated com-
12 petency over challenging subject matter including
13 English, mathematics, science, foreign languages,
14 civics and government, arts, history, and geography,
15 and every school in America will ensure that all stu-
16 dents learn to use their minds well, so they may be
17 prepared for responsible citizenship, further learn-
18 ing, and productive employment in our modern econ-
19 omy.

20 (B) The objectives for this goal are that—

21 (i) the academic performance of all stu-
22 dents at the elementary and secondary level will
23 increase significantly in every quartile, and the
24 distribution of minority students in each level

1 will more closely reflect the student population
2 as a whole;

3 (ii) the percentage of all students who
4 demonstrate the ability to reason, solve prob-
5 lems, apply knowledge, and write and commu-
6 nicate effectively will increase substantially;

7 (iii) all students will be involved in activi-
8 ties that promote and demonstrate good citizen-
9 ship, community service, and personal respon-
10 sibility;

11 (iv) all students will have access to phys-
12 ical education and health education to ensure
13 they are healthy and fit;

14 (v) the percentage of all students who are
15 competent in more than one language will sub-
16 stantially increase; and

17 (vi) all students will be knowledgeable
18 about the diverse cultural heritage of this Na-
19 tion and about the world community.

20 (4) TEACHER EDUCATION AND PROFESSIONAL
21 DEVELOPMENT.—(A) By the year 2000, the Na-
22 tion's teaching force will have access to programs for
23 the continued improvement of their professional
24 skills and the opportunity to acquire the knowledge

not in
Senate
or
Administrative
versions.

1

1 and skills needed to instruct and prepare all Amer-
2 ican students for the next century.

3 (B) The objectives of this goal are that—

4 (i) every State will establish opportunity-
5 to-learn standards and create an integrated
6 strategy to attract, recruit, prepare, retrain,
7 and support the continued professional develop-
8 ment of teachers, administrators, and other
9 educators, so that there is a highly talented
10 workforce of professional educators to teach
11 challenging standards;

12 (ii) subgrants for preservice teacher edu-
13 cation and professional development activity will
14 be made to local educational agencies, institu-
15 tions of higher education, private nonprofit or-
16 ganizations, or consortia of such organizations,
17 to support continuing, sustained, professional
18 development activities for all educators; and

19 (iii) partnerships shall be established,
20 whenever possible, between local educational
21 agencies, institutions of higher education, local
22 labor, business, and professional associations to
23 provide and support programs for the profes-
24 sional development of educators, particularly in

1 the area of emerging new technologies in edu-
2 cation.

3 (5) MATHEMATICS AND SCIENCE.—(A) By the
4 year 2000, United States students will be first in the
5 world in mathematics and science achievement.

6 (B) The objectives for this goal are that—

7 (i) math and science education, including
8 the metric system of measurement, will be
9 strengthened throughout the system, especially
10 in the early grades;

11 (ii) the number of teachers with a sub-
12 stantive background in mathematics and
13 science, including the metric system of meas-
14 urement, will increase by 50 percent; and

15 (iii) the number of United States under-
16 graduate and graduate students, especially
17 women and minorities, who complete degrees in
18 mathematics, science, and engineering will in-
19 crease significantly.

20 (6) ADULT LITERACY AND LIFELONG LEARN-
21 ING.—(A) By the year 2000, every adult American
22 will be literate and will possess the knowledge and
23 skills necessary to compete in a global economy and
24 exercise the rights and responsibilities of citizenship.

25 (B) The objectives for this goal are that—

1 (i) every major American business will be
2 involved in strengthening the connection be-
3 tween education and work;

4 (ii) all workers will have the opportunity to
5 acquire the knowledge and skills, from basic to
6 highly technical, needed to adapt to emerging
7 new technologies, work methods, and markets
8 through public and private educational, voca-
9 tional, technical, workplace, or other programs;

10 (iii) the number of quality programs, in-
11 cluding those at libraries, that are designed to
12 serve more effectively the needs of the growing
13 number of part-time and midcareer students
14 will increase substantially;

15 (iv) the proportion of those qualified stu-
16 dents, especially minorities, who enter college,
17 who complete at least two years, and who com-
18 plete their degree programs will increase sub-
19 stantially;

20 (v) the proportion of college graduates who
21 demonstrate an advanced ability to think criti-
22 cally, communicate effectively, and solve prob-
23 lems will increase substantially; and

24 (vi) schools, in implementing comprehen-
25 sive parent involvement programs, will offer

1 more adult literacy, parent training and life-
2 long learning opportunities to improve the ties
3 between home and school, and enhance parents'
4 work and home lives.

5 (7) SAFE, DISCIPLINED, AND DRUG-FREE
6 SCHOOLS.—(A) By the year 2000, every school in
7 America will be free of drugs and violence and will
8 offer a disciplined environment conducive to learn-
9 ing.

10 (B) The objectives for this goal are that—

11 (i) every school will implement a firm and
12 fair policy on use, possession, and distribution
13 of drugs and alcohol;

14 (ii) parents, businesses, and community or-
15 ganizations will work together to ensure the
16 rights of students to study in a safe and secure
17 environment that is free of drugs and crime;

18 (iii) every school district will develop a
19 comprehensive K-12 drug and alcohol preven-
20 tion education program. Drug and alcohol cur-
21 ricula should be taught as an integral part of
22 health education. In addition, community-based
23 teams should be organized to provide all stu-
24 dents and teachers with needed support; and

1 (iv) every school district will develop and
2 implement a policy to ensure that all schools
3 are free of weapons and violence.

4 (8) SCHOOL AND HOME PARTNERSHIP.—(A) By
5 the year 2000, every school and home will engage in
6 partnerships that will increase parental involvement
7 and participation in promoting the social, emotional,
8 and academic growth of children.

9 (B) The objectives for this goal are that—

10 (i) every State will develop policies to as-
11 sist local schools and local educational agencies
12 to establish programs for increasing partner-
13 ships that respond to the varying needs of par-
14 ents and the home, including parents of chil-
15 dren who are disadvantaged, bilingual, or dis-
16 abled;

17 (ii) every school will actively engage par-
18 ents and families in a partnership which sup-
19 ports the academic work of children at home
20 and shared educational decisionmaking at
21 school;

22 (iii) every home will be responsible for cre-
23 ating an environment of respect for education
24 and providing the physical and emotional sup-
25 port needed for learning; and

2

1 (iv) parents and families will help to en-
2 sure that schools are adequately supported and
3 will hold schools and teachers to high standards
4 of accountability.

5 **TITLE II—NATIONAL EDUCATION**
6 **REFORM, LEADERSHIP,**
7 **STANDARDS, AND ASSESS-**
8 **MENTS**

9 **PART A—NATIONAL EDUCATION GOALS PANEL**

10 **SEC. 201. PURPOSE.**

11 It is the purpose of this part to establish a bipartisan
12 mechanism for—

13 (1) building a national consensus for education
14 improvement;

15 (2) reporting on progress toward achieving the
16 National Education Goals; and

17 (3) reviewing the voluntary national content
18 and student performance standards and opportunity-
19 to-learn standards certified by the National Edu-
20 cation Standards and Improvement Council, as well
21 as the criteria for their certification, and the criteria
22 for the certification of State assessments by the Na-
23 tional Education Standards and Improvement Coun-
24 cil with the option of disapproving such standards

4

1 and criteria not later than 60 days after receipt
2 from such Council.

3 **SEC. 202. NATIONAL EDUCATION GOALS PANEL.**

4 (a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—There is established in the ex-
5 ecutive branch a National Education Goals Panel (referred
6 to in this Act as the “Goals Panel”) to advise the Presi-
7 dent, the Secretary, and the Congress.

8 (b) **COMPOSITION.**—The Goals Panel shall be com-
9 posed of eighteen members (referred to in this part as
10 “members”), including—

11 (1) two members appointed by the President;

12 (2) eight members who are Governors, three of
13 whom shall be from the same political party as the
14 President and five of whom shall be of the opposi-
15 political party of the President, appointed by the
16 Chairperson and Vice Chairperson of the National
17 Governors’ Association, with each appointing rep-
18 resentatives of his or her respective political party,
19 in consultation with each other;

20 (3) four Members of Congress appointed as
21 follows—

22 (A) one member appointed by the majority
23 leader of the Senate from among the Members
24 of the Senate;

1 (B) one member appointed by the minority
2 leader of the Senate from among the Members
3 of the Senate;

4 (C) one member appointed by the majority
5 leader of the House of Representatives from
6 among the Members of the House of Represent-
7 atives; and

8 (D) one member appointed by the minority
9 leader of the House of Representatives from
10 among the Members of the House of Represent-
11 atives; and

12 (4) four members of State legislatures ap-
13 pointed by the President of the National Conference
14 of State Legislatures, of whom not more than two
15 may be of the same political party as the President
16 of the United States.

17 (c) SPECIAL APPOINTMENT RULES.—(1) The mem-
18 bers appointed pursuant to subsection (b)(2) shall be ap-
19 pointed as follows:

20 (A) If the Chairperson of the National Gov-
21 ernors' Association is from the same political party
22 as the President, the Chairperson shall appoint three
23 individuals and the Vice Chairperson shall appoint
24 five individuals.

1 (B) If the Chairperson of the National Gov-
2 ernors' Association is from the opposite political
3 party as the President, the Chairperson shall ap-
4 point five individuals and the Vice Chairperson shall
5 appoint three individuals.

6 (2) If the National Governors' Association has ap-
7 pointed a panel that meets the requirements of subsections
8 (b) and (c), except for the requirements of subsection
9 (b)(4), prior to the date of enactment of this title, then
10 the members serving on such panel shall be deemed to be
11 in compliance with subsections (b) and (c) and shall not
12 be required to be reappointed pursuant to such sub-
13 sections.

14 (3) To the extent feasible, the membership of the
15 Goals Panel shall be geographically representative and re-
16 flect the racial, ethnic, and gender diversity of the United
17 States.

18 (d) TERMS.—The terms of service of members shall
19 be as follows:

20 (1) Members appointed under subsection (b)(1)
21 shall serve at the pleasure of the President.

22 (2) Members appointed under subsection (b)(2)
23 shall serve a two-year term, except that the initial
24 appointments under such paragraph shall be made

1 to ensure staggered terms with one-half of such
2 members' terms concluding every two years.

3 (3) Members appointed under subsection (b) (3)
4 and (4) shall serve a term of two years.

5 (e) DATE OF APPOINTMENT.—The initial members
6 shall be appointed not later than sixty days after the date
7 of enactment of this Act.

8 (f) INITIATION.—The Goals Panel may begin to carry
9 out its duties under this part when ten members of the
10 Goals Panel have been appointed.

11 (g) VACANCIES.—A vacancy on the Goals Panel shall
12 not affect the powers of the Goals Panel, but shall be filled
13 in the same manner as the original appointment.

14 (h) TRAVEL.—Each member may be allowed travel
15 expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as au-
16 thorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code,
17 for each day the member is engaged in the performance
18 of duties away from the home or regular place of business
19 of the member.

20 (i) CHAIRPERSON.—From among the members, the
21 President shall appoint the Chairperson who shall serve
22 a one-year term and shall alternate between political par-
23 ties.

5

24 (j) CONFLICT OF INTEREST.—A member of the Goals
25 Panel who is an elected official of a State which has devei-

House only 6

1 oped content, student performance, or opportunity-to-
2 learn standards may not participate in Goals Panel consid-
3 eration of such standards.

⑦ House only.

4 (k) EX OFFICIO MEMBER.—If the President has not
5 appointed the Secretary of Education as 1 of the 2 mem-
6 bers he appoints pursuant to subsection (b)(1), then the
7 Secretary shall serve as a nonvoting ex officio member of
8 the Goals Panel.

9 SEC. 203. DUTIES.

10 (a) DUTIES.—The Goals Panel shall—

⑧

11 (1) report to the President, the Secretary, and
12 the Congress regarding the progress the Nation and
13 the States are making toward achieving the National
14 Education Goals established under title I of this Act,
15 including issuing an annual report;

⑨ House only

16 (2) report on State opportunity-to-learn stand-
17 ards and the progress of States in meeting such
18 standards;

⑪

19 (3) review, after taking into consideration the
20 public comments received pursuant to section 216,
21 with the option of disapproving by a two-thirds ma-
22 ajority vote of the full membership not later than 60
23 days after receipt of the—

24 (A) criteria developed by the National
25 Education Standards and Improvement Council

1 (C) report on State opportunity-to-learn stand-
2 ards and the progress of States in meeting such
3 standards.

4 (2) Reports shall be presented in a form, and include
5 data, that is understandable to parents and the general
6 public.

7 **SEC. 204. POWERS OF THE GOALS PANEL.**

8 (a) HEARINGS.—(1) The Goals Panel shall, for the
9 purpose of carrying out this part, conduct such hearings,
10 sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony,
11 and receive such evidence, as the Goals Panel considers
12 appropriate.

13 (2) In carrying out this part, the Goals Panel shall
14 conduct hearings to receive reports, views, and analyses
15 of a broad spectrum of experts and the public on the es-
16 tablishment of voluntary national content and student per-
17 formance standards, assessments, and opportunity-to-
18 learn standards.

19 (b) INFORMATION.—The Goals Panel may secure di-
20 rectly from any department or agency of the United States
21 information necessary to enable the Goals Panel to carry
22 out this part. Upon request of the Chairperson of the
23 Goals Panel, the head of a department or agency shall
24 furnish such information to the Goals Panel to the extent
25 permitted by law.

1 for the certification of content and student per-
 2 formance standards, assessments, and oppor-
 3 tunity-to-learn standards; and

4 (B) voluntary national content and student
 5 performance standards and opportunity-to-learn
 6 standards certified by the National Education
 7 Standards and Improvement Council;

8 (4) report on promising or effective actions
 9 being taken at the national, State, and local levels,
 10 in the public and private sectors, to achieve the Na-
 11 tional Education Goals; and

12 (5) help build a nationwide, bipartisan consen-
 13 sus for the reforms necessary to achieve the Na-
 14 tional Education Goals.

15 (b) REPORT.—(1) The Goals Panel shall annually
 16 prepare and submit to the President, the Secretary, the
 17 appropriate committees of Congress, and the Governor of
 18 each State a report that shall—

19 (A) report on the progress of the United States
 20 toward achieving the National Education Goals;

21 (B) identify actions that should be taken by
 22 Federal, State, and local governments to enhance
 23 progress toward achieving the National Education
 24 Goals and State opportunity-to-learn standards; and

*not in Senate or
 Administration.*

12

1 (c) **POSTAL SERVICES.**—The Goals Panel may use
2 the United States mail in the same manner and under the
3 same conditions as other departments and agencies of the
4 United States.

5 (d) **USE OF FACILITIES.**—The Goals Panel may, with
6 consent, use the research, equipment, services, and facili-
7 ties of any agency or instrumentality of the United States,
8 or of any State or political subdivision thereof.

9 (e) **ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENTS AND SUP-**
10 **PORT.**—(1) The Secretary shall provide to the Goals
11 Panel, on a reimbursable basis, such administrative sup-
12 port services as the Goals Panel may request.

13 (2) The Secretary shall, to the extent appropriate,
14 and on a reimbursable basis, make contracts and other
15 arrangements that are requested by the Goals Panel to
16 help it compile and analyze data or carry out other func-
17 tions necessary to the performance of such responsibilities.

18 **SEC. 205. ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS.**

19 (a) **MEETINGS.**—The Goals Panel shall meet on a
20 regular basis, as necessary, at the call of the Chairperson
21 of the Goals Panel or a majority of its members.

22 (b) **QUORUM.**—A majority of the members shall con-
23 stitute a quorum for the transaction of business.

24 (c) **VOTING.**—No individual may vote, or exercise any
25 of the powers of a member, by proxy.

1 (d) PUBLIC ACCESS.—The Goals Panel shall ensure
2 public access to its proceedings (other than proceedings,
3 or portions of proceedings, relating to internal personnel
4 and management matters) and make available to the pub-
5 lic, at reasonable cost, transcripts of such proceedings.

6 **SEC. 206. DIRECTOR AND STAFF; EXPERTS AND CONSULT-**
7 **ANTS.**

8 (a) DIRECTOR.—The Chairperson of the Goals Panel
9 shall, without regard to the provisions of title 5, United
10 States Code, relating to the appointment and compensa-
11 tion of officers or employees of the United States, appoint
12 a Director to be paid at a rate not to exceed the rate of
13 basic pay payable for level V of the Executive Schedule.

14 (b) APPOINTMENT AND PAY OF EMPLOYEES.—
15 (1)(A) The Director may appoint not more than four addi-
16 tional employees to serve as staff to the Goals Panel with-
17 out regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code,
18 governing appointments in the competitive service.

19 (B) The employees appointed under paragraph (1)(A)
20 may be paid without regard to the provisions of chapter
21 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of that title relating
22 to classification and General Schedule pay rates, but shall
23 not be paid a rate that exceeds the maximum rate of basic
24 pay payable for GS-15 of the General Schedule.

1 (2) The Director may appoint additional employees
2 to serve as staff to the Goals Panel consistent with title
3 5, United States Code.

4 (c) EXPERTS AND CONSULTANTS.—The Goals Panel
5 may procure temporary and intermittent services of ex-
6 perts and consultants under section 3109(b) of title 5,
7 United States Code.

8 (d) STAFF OF FEDERAL AGENCIES.—Upon the re-
9 quest of the Goals Panel, the head of any department or
10 agency of the United States may detail any of the person-
11 nel of such agency to the Goals Panel to assist the Goals
12 Panel in its duties under this part.

13 **SEC. 207. EARLY CHILDHOOD ASSESSMENT.**

14 (a) GENERAL.—(1) The Goals Panel shall support
15 the work of its Resource and Technical Planning Groups
16 on School Readiness (referred to in this section as the
17 Groups) to improve the methods of assessing the readiness
18 of children for school that would lead to alternatives to
19 currently used norm-referenced early childhood assess-
20 ments.

21 (2) The Groups shall—

22 (A) create clear guidelines regarding the na-
23 ture, functions, and uses of early childhood assess-
24 ments, including a model of school readiness that

1 addresses a broad range of early childhood d
2 opmental needs;

3 (B) monitor and evaluate early childhood as-
4 sessments, including the ability of existing assess-
5 ments to provide valid information on the readiness
6 of children for school; and

7 (C) monitor and report on the long-term collec-
8 tion of data on the status of young children to im-
9 prove policy and practice, including the need for new
10 sources of data necessary to assess the broad range
11 of early childhood developmental needs.

12 (b) ADVICE.—The Groups shall advise and assist the
13 Congress, the Secretary, the Goals Panel, and others
14 garding how to improve the assessment of young children
15 and how such assessments can improve services to chil-
16 dren.

17 (c) REPORT.—The Goals Panel shall provide reports
18 on the work of the Groups to the Congress, the Secretary,
19 and the public.

20 **PART B—NATIONAL EDUCATION STANDARDS**
21 **AND IMPROVEMENT COUNCIL**

22 **SEC. 211. PURPOSE.**

23 The purpose of this part is to establish a mechanism
24 to—

1 (1) certify and regularly review voluntary na-
2 tional content and student performance standards
3 that define what all students should know and be
4 able to do;

5 (2) certify content and student performance
6 standards submitted by States on a voluntary basis,
7 if such standards are of equal or higher quality to
8 the voluntary national content and student perform-
9 ance standards certified by the National Education
10 Standards and Improvement Council;

11 (3) certify and regularly review voluntary na-
12 tional opportunity-to-learn standards that describe
13 the conditions of teaching and learning necessary for
14 all students to have a fair opportunity to achieve the
15 knowledge and skills described in the voluntary na-
16 tional content and student performance standards
17 certified by the National Education Standards and
18 Improvement Council;

19 (4) certify opportunity-to-learn standards sub-
20 mitted by States on a voluntary basis, if such stand-
21 ards are of equal or higher quality as compared with
22 the voluntary national opportunity-to-learn stand-
23 ards; and

24 (5) certify assessment systems submitted by
25 States on a voluntary basis, if such systems are

1 aligned with State content standards certified by the
2 National Education Standards and Improvement
3 Council and if such systems are valid, reliable, and
4 consistent with relevant, nationally recognized, pro-
5 fessional and technical standards for assessment
6 when used for their intended purposes.

7 **SEC. 212. NATIONAL EDUCATION STANDARDS AND IM-**
8 **PROVEMENT COUNCIL.**

9 (a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—There is established in the ex-
10 ecutive branch a National Education Standards and Im-
11 provement Council (referred to in this title as the
12 “Council”).

13 (b) **COMPOSITION.**—The Council shall be composed
14 of twenty members (referred to in this part as “mem-
15 bers”) who shall be appointed as follows:

16 (1) 8 members (2 from each of subparagraphs
17 (A) through (D) of subsection (c)(1)) shall be ap-
18 pointed by the President;

19 (2) 4 members (1 from each of subparagraphs
20 (A) through (D) of subsection (c)(1)) shall be ap-
21 pointed by the Speaker of the House of Representa-
22 tives, in consultation with the majority and minority
23 leaders of the House;

24 (3) 4 members (1 from each of subparagraphs
25 (A) through (D) of subsection (c)(1)) shall be ap-

1 pointed by the majority leader of the Senate, in con-
 2 sultation with the minority leader of the Senate; and

3 (4) 4 members (1 from each of subparagraphs
 4 (A) through (D) of subsection (c)(1)) shall be ap-
 5 pointed by the National Education Goals Panel.] (10)

6 (c) QUALIFICATIONS.—(1) The members of the
 7 Council shall include—

8 (A) 5 professional educators, including elemen-
 9 tary and secondary classroom teachers, preschool
 10 educators and other school-based professionals, local
 11 district or State administrators, related service per-
 12 sonnel, and other educators;

13 (B) 5 representatives of business and industry,
 14 organized labor, and postsecondary educational insti-
 15 tutions, including at least 1 representative of post-
 16 secondary educational institutions, at least 1 rep-
 17 resentative of organized labor, and at least 1 rep-
 18 resentative of business who is also a member of the
 19 National Skill Standards Board;

20 (C) 5 representatives of the public, including
 21 representatives of advocacy, civil rights and disabil-
 22 ity groups, parents, civic leaders, and local and State
 23 education policymakers (including State, local, or
 24 tribal school boards); and

1 (D) 5 education experts, including experts in
2 measurement and assessment, curriculum, school fi-
3 nance and equity, and school reform.

4 (2) To the extent feasible, the membership of the
5 Council shall be geographically representative of the
6 United States and reflect the diversity of the United
7 States with regard to race, ethnicity, gender, and disability
8 characteristics.

9 (3) One-third of the Council shall consist of individ-
10 uals with expertise in the educational needs of children
11 who are from low-income families, minority backgrounds,
12 have limited-English proficiency, or have disabilities.

13 (d) TERMS.—(1) Members shall be appointed for 3-
14 year terms, with no member serving more than 2 consecu-
15 tive terms.

16 (2) The Council shall establish by lot initial terms
17 for individuals of one, two, or three years in order to es-
18 tablish a rotation in which one-third of the members are
19 selected each year.

20 (e) DATE OF APPOINTMENT.—The initial members
21 shall be appointed not later than 120 days after the date
22 of enactment of this Act.

23 (f) INITIATION.—The Council shall begin to carry out
24 the duties of the Council under this part when all 20 mem-
25 bers have been appointed.

1 SEC. 221. EVALUATION.

2 (a) GRANT.—From funds reserved under section
3 304(a)(2), the Secretary annually shall make a grant, in
4 an amount not to exceed \$500,000, to the Commission on
5 Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education of the Na-
6 tional Academy of Sciences or to the National Academy
7 of Education to—

8 (1) evaluate—

9 (A) the technical quality of the work per-
10 formed by the Goals Panel and the Council;

11 (B) the process the Council uses to develop
12 criteria for certification of standards and as-
13 sessments;

14 (C) the process the Council uses to certify
15 voluntary national standards as well as stand-
16 ards and assessments voluntarily submitted by
17 States; and

18 (D) the process the Goals Panel uses to
19 approve certification criteria and voluntary na-
20 tional standards;

21 (2) periodically provide to the Goals Panel and
22 the Council, as appropriate, information from the
23 evaluation under paragraph (1); and

24 (3) report on the activities authorized under
25 sections 219 and 220.

14

Not in
Senate

1 (b) REPORT.—The grant recipient shall periodically
2 report to the Congress, the Secretary, and the public re-
3 garding findings and shall make a final report not later
4 than January 1, 1998.

5 **PART C—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS**

6 **SEC. 231. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**

7 (a) NATIONAL EDUCATION GOALS PANEL.—There
8 are authorized to be appropriated \$3,000,000 for fiscal
9 year 1994 and such sums as may be necessary for each
10 of the four succeeding fiscal years to carry out part A of
11 this title.

12 (b) NATIONAL EDUCATION STANDARDS AND IM-
13 PROVEMENT COUNCIL.—There are authorized to be ap-
14 propriated \$3,000,000 for fiscal year 1994 and such sums
15 as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 1995
16 through 1998 to carry out part B of this title.

17 (c) OPPORTUNITY-TO-LEARN DEVELOPMENT
18 GRANT.—There are authorized to be appropriated
19 \$3,000,000 for fiscal year 1994 and such sums as may
20 be necessary for fiscal year 1995 to carry out the Oppor-
21 tunity-to-Learn Development Grant Program established
22 under section 219 of this title.

23 (d) ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION
24 GRANTS.—There are authorized to be appropriated
25 \$5,000,000 for fiscal year 1994 and such sums as may

APPENDIX B

Legislation:
Senate Version

AMENDMENT NO. _____ Calendar No. _____

Purpose: To provide a committee amendment.

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES—103d Cong., 1st Sess.

S. 1150

To improve learning and teaching by providing a national framework for education reform: to promote the research, consensus building, and systemic changes needed to ensure equitable educational opportunities and high levels of educational achievement for all American students; to provide a framework for reauthorization of all Federal education programs; to promote the development and adoption of a voluntary national system of skill standards and certifications; and for other purposes.

Referred to the Committee on _____
and ordered to be printed

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

AMENDMENT intended to be proposed by Mr. KENNEDY

Viz:

- 1 Strike all after the enacting clause, and insert the
- 2 following:
- 3 **SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.**
- 4 (a) **SHORT TITLE.**—Titles I through IV of this Act
- 5 may be cited as the "Goals 2000: Educate America Act".

1 (b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents is
2 as follows:

- Sec. 1. Short title: table of contents.
- Sec. 2. Purpose.
- Sec. 3. Definitions.

TITLE I—NATIONAL EDUCATION GOALS

- Sec. 101. Purpose.
- Sec. 102. National education goals.

TITLE II—NATIONAL EDUCATION REFORM LEADERSHIP,
STANDARDS, AND ASSESSMENTS

PART A—NATIONAL EDUCATION GOALS PANEL

- Sec. 201. Purpose.
- Sec. 202. National education goals panel.
- Sec. 203. Duties.
- Sec. 204. Powers of the goals panel.
- Sec. 205. Administrative provisions.
- Sec. 206. Director and staff: experts and consultants.

PART B—NATIONAL EDUCATION STANDARDS AND IMPROVEMENT COUNCIL

- Sec. 211. Purpose.
- Sec. 212. National Education Standards and Improvement Council.
- Sec. 213. Duties.
- Sec. 214. Annual reports.
- Sec. 215. Powers of the council.
- Sec. 216. Administrative provisions.
- Sec. 217. Director and staff: experts and consultants.
- Sec. 218. Opportunity-to-learn development grant.

PART C—LEADERSHIP IN EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY

- Sec. 221. Purposes.
- Sec. 222. Federal leadership.
- Sec. 223. Office of Educational Technology.
- Sec. 224. Uses of funds.
- Sec. 225. Non-Federal share.
- Sec. 226. Office of Training Technology Transfer.

PART D—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

- Sec. 231. Authorization of appropriations.

TITLE III—STATE AND LOCAL EDUCATION SYSTEMIC
IMPROVEMENT

- Sec. 301. Findings.
- Sec. 302. Purpose.
- Sec. 303. Authorization of appropriations.
- Sec. 304. Allotment of funds.
- Sec. 305. State applications.
- Sec. 306. State improvement plans.

- Sec. 307. Secretary's review of applications: payments.
- Sec. 308. State use of funds.
- Sec. 309. Subgrants for local reform and professional development.
- Sec. 310. Availability of information and training.
- Sec. 311. Waivers of statutory and regulatory requirements.
- Sec. 312. Progress reports.
- Sec. 313. National leadership.
- Sec. 314. Assistance to the outlying areas and to the Secretary of the Interior.
- Sec. 315. Clarification regarding State standards and assessments.
- Sec. 316. State planning for improving student achievement through integration of technology into the curriculum.

TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS

- Sec. 401. Public schools.
- Sec. 402. Construction.

TITLE V—NATIONAL SKILL STANDARDS BOARD

- Sec. 501. Short title.
- Sec. 502. Purpose.
- Sec. 503. Establishment of National Board.
- Sec. 504. Functions of the National Board.
- Sec. 505. Deadlines.
- Sec. 506. Reports.
- Sec. 507. Authorization of appropriations.
- Sec. 508. Definitions.
- Sec. 509. Sunset provision.

1 SEC. 2. PURPOSE.

2 It is the purpose of this Act to provide a framework
3 for meeting the National Education Goals described in
4 title I of this Act by—

5 (1) promoting coherent, nationwide, systemic
6 education reform;

7 (2) improving the quality of teaching and learn-
8 ing in the classroom;

9 (3) defining appropriate and coherent Federal,
10 State, and local roles and responsibilities for edu-
11 cation reform;

12 (4) establishing valid, reliable, and fair mecha-
13 nisms for—

1 (A) building a broad national consensus on
2 United States education reform:

3 (B) assisting in the development and cer-
4 tification of high-quality, internationally com-
5 petitive content and student performance stand-
6 ards:

7 (C) assisting in the development and cer-
8 tification of opportunity-to-learn standards: and

9 (D) assisting in the development and cer-
10 tification of high-quality assessment measures
11 that reflect the internationally competitive con-
12 tent and student performance standards:

13 (5) supporting new initiatives at the Federal.
14 State, local, and school levels to provide equal edu-
15 cational opportunity for all students to meet high
16 standards; and

17 (6) providing a framework for the reauthoriza-
18 tion of all Federal education programs by—

19 (A) creating a vision of excellence and eq-
20 uity that will guide all Federal education and
21 related programs;

22 (B) providing for the establishment of
23 high-quality, internationally competitive content
24 and student performance standards that all stu-
25 dents, including disadvantaged students, stu-

1 dents with diverse racial, ethnic, and cultural
2 backgrounds, students with disabilities, stu-
3 dents with limited-English proficiency, and aca-
4 demically talented students, will be expected to
5 achieve:

6 (C) providing for the establishment of high
7 quality, internationally competitive opportunity-
8 to-learn standards that all States, local edu-
9 cational agencies, and schools should achieve:

10 (D) encouraging and enabling all State
11 educational agencies and local educational agen-
12 cies to develop comprehensive improvement
13 plans that will provide a coherent framework
14 for the implementation of reauthorized Federal
15 education and related programs in an inte-
16 grated fashion that effectively educates all chil-
17 dren: and

18 (E) providing resources to help individual
19 schools, including schools serving students with
20 high needs, develop and implement comprehen-
21 sive improvement plans.

22 **SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.**

23 As used in this Act (other than in title V)—

24 (1) the term “all children” means children from
25 all backgrounds and circumstances, including dis-

1 advantaged children. children with diverse racial,
2 ethnic, and cultural backgrounds. children with dis-
3 abilities. children with limited-English proficiency.
4 children who have dropped out of school, and aca-
5 demically talented children:

6 (2) the term "all students" means students
7 from a broad range of backgrounds and cir-
8 cumstances, including disadvantaged students, stu-
9 dents with diverse racial, ethnic, and cultural back-
10 grounds, students with disabilities, students with
11 limited-English proficiency, students who have
12 dropped out of school, and academically talented
13 students:

14 (3) the term "assessment" means the overall
15 process and instrument used to measure student at-
16 tainment of content standards, except that such
17 term need not include the discrete items that com-
18 prise each assessment:

19 (4) the term "content standards" means broad
20 descriptions of the knowledge and skills students
21 should acquire in a particular subject area;

22 (5) the term "Governor" means the chief execu-
23 tive of the State;

24 (6) the term "local educational agency" has the
25 meaning given such term in section 1471(12) of the

1 Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.
2 except that such term may include a public school
3 council if such council is mandated by State law:

4 (7) the term "opportunity-to-learn standards"
5 means the conditions of teaching and learning nec-
6 essary for all students to have a fair opportunity to
7 learn, including ways of measuring the extent to
8 which such standards are being met:

9 (8) the term "outlying areas" means Guam,
10 American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, the Common-
11 wealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, Palau
12 (until the effective date of the Compact of Free As-
13 sociation with the Government of Palau), and the
14 Freely Associated States;

15 (9) the term "performance standards" means
16 concrete examples and explicit definitions of what
17 students have to know and be able to do to dem-
18 onstrate that such students are proficient in the
19 skills and knowledge framed by content standards;

20 (10) the term "related services" includes the
21 types of services described in section 602(17) of the
22 Individuals with Disabilities Education Act;

23 (11) the term "school" means a public school
24 that is under the authority of the State educational
25 agency or a local educational agency or, for the pur-

1 pose of carrying out section 314(b), a school that is
2 operated or funded by the Bureau of Indian Affairs:

3 (12) the term "Secretary", unless otherwise
4 specified, means the Secretary of Education:

5 (13) the term "State" means each of the 50
6 States, the District of Columbia, and the Common-
7 wealth of Puerto Rico; and

8 (14) the term "State educational agency" has
9 the same meaning given such term in section
10 1471(23) of the Elementary and Secondary Edu-
11 cation Act of 1965.

12 **TITLE I—NATIONAL EDUCATION** 13 **GOALS**

14 **SEC. 101. PURPOSE.**

15 It is the purpose of this title to establish National
16 Education Goals.

17 **SEC. 102. NATIONAL EDUCATION GOALS.**

18 The Congress declares the National Education Goals
19 are as follows:

20 (1) SCHOOL READINESS.—

21 (A) GOAL.—By the year 2000, all children
22 in America will start school ready to learn.

23 (B) OBJECTIVES.—The objectives for the
24 goal described in subparagraph (A) are that—

1 (i) all children, including disadvan-
2 taged and disabled children, will have ac-
3 cess to high-quality and developmentally
4 appropriate preschool programs that help
5 prepare children for school;

6 (ii) every parent in the United States
7 will be a child's first teacher and devote
8 time each day to helping such parent's pre-
9 school child learn, and parents will have
10 access to the training and support parents
11 need; and

12 (iii) children will receive the nutrition,
13 physical activity experiences, and health
14 care needed to arrive at school with
15 healthy minds and bodies, and the number
16 of low-birthweight babies will be signifi-
17 cantly reduced through enhanced prenatal
18 health systems.

19 (2) SCHOOL COMPLETION.—

20 (A) GOAL.—By the year 2000, the high
21 school graduation rate will increase to at least
22 90 percent.

23 (B) OBJECTIVES.—The objectives for the
24 goal described in subparagraph (A) are that—

1 (i) the Nation must dramatically re-
2 duce its high school dropout rate, and 75
3 percent of high school students who do
4 drop out of school will successfully com-
5 plete a high school degree or its equivalent:
6 and

7 (ii) the gap in high school graduation
8 rates between United States students from
9 minority backgrounds and their
10 nonminority counterparts will be elimi-
11 nated.

12 (3) STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT AND CITIZEN-
13 SHIP.—

14 (A) GOAL.—By the year 2000, United
15 States students will leave grades 4, 8, and 12
16 having demonstrated competency over challeng-
17 ing subject matter including English, mathe-
18 matics, science, foreign languages, civics and
19 government, economics, arts, history, and geog-
20 raphy, and every school in the United States
21 will ensure that all students learn to use their
22 minds well, so students may be prepared for re-
23 sponsible citizenship, further learning, and pro-
24 ductive employment in our Nation's modern
25 economy.

1 (B) OBJECTIVES.—The objectives for the
2 goal described in subparagraph (A) are that—

3 (i) the academic performance of ele-
4 mentary and secondary students will in-
5 crease significantly in every quartile, and
6 the distribution of minority students in
7 each quartile will more closely reflect the
8 student population as a whole:

9 (ii) the percentage of students who
10 demonstrate the ability to reason, solve
11 problems, apply knowledge, and write and
12 communicate effectively will increase sub-
13 stantially;

14 (iii) all students will be involved in ac-
15 tivities that promote and demonstrate good
16 citizenship, good health, community serv-
17 ice, and personal responsibility;

18 (iv) all students will have access to
19 physical education and health education to
20 ensure all students are healthy and fit;

21 (v) the percentage of students who are
22 competent in more than one language will
23 substantially increase; and

1 (vi) all students will be knowledgeable
2 about the diverse heritage of our Nation
3 and about the world community.

4 (4) MATHEMATICS AND SCIENCE.—

5 (A) GOAL.—By the year 2000, United
6 States students will be first in the world in
7 mathematics and science achievement.

8 (B) OBJECTIVES.—The objectives for the
9 goal described in subparagraph (A) are that—

10 (i) mathematics and science edu-
11 cation, including the metric system of
12 measurement, will be strengthened
13 throughout the educational system, espe-
14 cially in the early grades:

15 (ii) the number of teachers with a
16 substantive background in mathematics
17 and science will increase by 50 percent
18 from the number of such teachers in 1992;
19 and

20 (iii) the number of United States un-
21 dergraduate and graduate students, espe-
22 cially women and minorities, who complete
23 degrees in mathematics, science, and engi-
24 neering will increase significantly.

1 (5) ADULT LITERACY AND LIFELONG LEARN-
2 ING.—

3 (A) GOAL.—By the year 2000, every adult
4 United States citizen will be literate and will
5 possess the knowledge and skills necessary to
6 compete in a global economy and exercise the
7 rights and responsibilities of citizenship.

8 (B) OBJECTIVES.—The objectives for the
9 goal described in subparagraph (A) are that—

10 (i) every major United States business
11 will be involved in strengthening the con-
12 nection between education and work;

13 (ii) all workers will have the oppor-
14 tunity to acquire the knowledge and skills,
15 from basic to highly technical, needed to
16 adapt to emerging new technologies, work
17 methods, and markets through public and
18 private educational, vocational, technical,
19 workplace, or other programs;

20 (iii) the number of quality programs,
21 including programs at libraries, that are
22 designed to serve more effectively the
23 needs of the growing number of part-time
24 and mid-career students, will increase sub-
25 stantially;

1 (iv) the proportion of qualified stu-
2 dents, especially minorities, who enter col-
3 lege, who complete at least 2 years of col-
4 lege, and who complete their degree pro-
5 grams, will increase substantially; and

6 (v) the proportion of college graduates
7 who demonstrate an advanced ability to
8 think critically, communicate effectively,
9 and solve problems will increase substan-
10 tially.

11 (6) SAFE, DISCIPLINED, AND DRUG-FREE
12 SCHOOLS.—

13 (A) GOAL.—By the year 2000, every
14 school in the United States will be free of drugs
15 and violence and will offer a disciplined environ-
16 ment conducive to learning.

17 (B) OBJECTIVES.—The objectives for the
18 goal described in subparagraph (A) are that—

19 (i) every school will implement a firm
20 and fair policy on use, possession, and dis-
21 tribution of drugs and alcohol;

22 (ii) parents, businesses, governmental
23 and community organizations will work to-
24 gether to ensure that schools provide a

1 healthy environment and are a safe haven
2 for all children:

3 (iii) every school district will develop a
4 sequential, comprehensive kindergarten
5 through twelfth grade drug and alcohol
6 prevention education program:

7 (iv) drug and alcohol curriculum
8 should be taught as an integral part of se-
9 quential, comprehensive health education:

10 (v) community-based teams should be
11 organized to provide students and teachers
12 with needed support: and

13 (vi) every school should work to elimi-
14 nate sexual harassment.

15 (7) PARENTAL PARTICIPATION.—

②

16 (A) GOAL.—By the year 2000, every
17 school will promote partnerships that will in-
18 crease parental involvement and participation in
19 promoting the social, emotional and academic
20 growth of children.

21 (B) OBJECTIVES.—The objectives for the
22 Goal established under subparagraph (A) are
23 that—

24 (i) every State will develop policies to
25 assist local schools and school districts to

1 establish programs for increasing partner-
2 ships that respond to the varying needs of
3 parents and the home, including parents of
4 children who are disadvantaged or bilin-
5 gual, or parents of children with disabil-
6 ities;

7 (ii) every school will actively engage
8 parents and families in a partnership
9 which supports the academic work of chil-
10 dren at home and shared educational deci-
11 sion-making at school; and

12 (iii) parents and families will help to
13 ensure that schools are adequately sup-
14 ported and will hold schools and teachers
15 to high standards of accountability.

16 **TITLE II—NATIONAL EDUCATION**
17 **REFORM LEADERSHIP, STAN-**
18 **DARDS, AND ASSESSMENTS**

19 **PART A—NATIONAL EDUCATION GOALS PANEL**

20 **SEC. 201. PURPOSE.**

21 It is the purpose of this part to establish a bipartisan
22 mechanism for—

23 (1) building a national consensus for education
24 improvement;

1 (2) reporting on progress toward achieving the
2 National Education Goals:

3 (3) periodically reviewing the goals and objec-
4 tives described in title I and recommending adjust-
5 ments to such goals and objectives, as needed, in
6 order to guarantee education reform that continues
7 to provide guidance for quality, world class edu-
8 cation for all students; and

3

9 (4) reviewing and approving the voluntary na-
10 tional content standards, voluntary national student
11 performance standards and voluntary national op-
12 portunity-to-learn standards certified by the Na-
13 tional Education Standards and Improvement Coun-
14 cil, as well as the criteria for the certification of
15 such standards, and the criteria for the certification
16 of State assessments or systems of assessments cer-
17 tified by such Council.

4

18 **SEC. 202. NATIONAL EDUCATION GOALS PANEL.**

19 (a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the ex-
20 ecutive branch a National Education Goals Panel (here-
21 after in this title referred to as the “Goals Panel”).

22 (b) COMPOSITION.—The Goals Panel shall be com-
23 posed of 18 members (hereafter in this part referred to
24 as “members”), including—

25 (1) two members appointed by the President;

1 (2) eight members who are Governors. 3 of
2 whom shall be from the same political party as the
3 President and 5 of whom shall be of the opposite po-
4 litical party of the President. appointed by the
5 Chairperson and Vice Chairperson of the National
6 Governors' Association. with the Chairperson and
7 Vice Chairperson each appointing representatives of
8 such Chairperson's or Vice Chairperson's respective
9 political party, in consultation with each other:

10 (3) four Members of the Congress. of whom—

11 (A) one member shall be appointed by the
12 Majority Leader of the Senate from among the
13 Members of the Senate;

14 (B) one member shall be appointed by the
15 Minority Leader of the Senate from among the
16 Members of the Senate;

17 (C) one member shall be appointed by the
18 Majority Leader of the House of Representa-
19 tives from among the Members of the House of
20 Representatives; and

21 (D) one member shall be appointed by the
22 Minority Leader of the House of Representa-
23 tives from among the Members of the House of
24 Representatives; and

1 (4) four members of State legislatures ap-
2 pointed by the President of the National Conference
3 of State Legislatures, of whom 2 shall be of the
4 same political party as the President of the United
5 States.

6 (c) SPECIAL APPOINTMENT RULES.—

7 (1) IN GENERAL.—The members appointed pur-
8 suant to subsection (b)(2) shall be appointed as fol-
9 lows:

10 (A) If the Chairperson of the National
11 Governors' Association is from the same politi-
12 cal party as the President, the Chairperson
13 shall appoint 3 individuals and the Vice Chair-
14 person of such association shall appoint 5 indi-
15 viduals.

16 (B) If the Chairperson of the National
17 Governors' Association is from the opposite po-
18 litical party as the President, the Chairperson
19 shall appoint 5 individuals and the Vice Chair-
20 person of such association shall appoint 3 indi-
21 viduals.

22 (2) SPECIAL RULE.—If the National Governors'
23 Association has appointed a panel that meets the re-
24 quirements of subsections (b) and (c), except for the
25 requirements of paragraph (4) of subsection (b),

1 prior to the date of enactment of this Act. then the
2 members serving on such panel shall be deemed to
3 be in compliance with the provisions of such sub-
4 sections and shall not be required to be reappointed
5 pursuant to such subsections.

6 (d) TERMS.—The terms of service of members shall
7 be as follows:

8 (1) PRESIDENTIAL APPOINTEES.—Members ap-
9 pointed under subsection (b)(1) shall serve at the
10 pleasure of the President.

11 (2) GOVERNORS.—Members appointed under
12 paragraph (2) of subsection (b) shall serve a 2-year
13 term, except that the initial appointments under
14 such paragraph shall be made to ensure staggered
15 terms with one-half of such members' terms conclud-
16 ing every 2 years.

17 (3) CONGRESSIONAL APPOINTEES AND STATE
18 LEGISLATORS.—Members appointed under para-
19 graphs (3) and (4) of subsection (b) shall serve for
20 2-year terms.

21 (e) DATE OF APPOINTMENT.—The initial members
22 shall be appointed not later than 60 days after the date
23 of enactment of this Act.

1 (f) INITIATION.—The Goals Panel may begin to carry
2 out its duties under this part when 10 members of the
3 Goals Panel have been appointed.

4 (g) VACANCIES.—A vacancy on the Goals Panel shall
5 not affect the powers of the Goals Panel, but shall be filled
6 in the same manner as the original appointment.

7 (h) TRAVEL.—Each member may be allowed travel
8 expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as au-
9 thorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code.
10 for each day the member is engaged in the performance
11 of duties for the Goals Panel away from the home or regu-
12 lar place of business of the member.

13 (i) CHAIRPERSON.—

14 (1) IN GENERAL.—The members shall select a
15 Chairperson from among the members described in
16 paragraph (2) of subsection (b).

Also
Administration

5

17 (2) TERM AND POLITICAL AFFILIATION.—The
18 Chairperson of the Goals Panel shall serve a 1-year
19 term and shall alternate between political parties.

20 SEC. 203. DUTIES.

21 (a) IN GENERAL.—The Goals Panel shall—

22 (1) report on the progress the Nation and the
23 States are making toward achieving the National
24 Education Goals described in title I, including issu-
25 ing an annual national report card;

8

10

Same as Administration

1 (2) submit to the President nominations for ap-
 2 pointment to the National Education Standards and
 3 Improvement Council in accordance with subsections
 4 (b) and (c) of section 212:

11

Same as Administration

5 (3) review and approve (or explain why ap-
 6 proval is withheld) the—

7 (A) criteria developed by the National
 8 Education Standards and Improvement Council
 9 for the certification of content and student per-
 10 formance standards, assessments or systems of
 11 assessments, and opportunity-to-learn stand-
 12 ards; and

13 (B) voluntary national content standards,
 14 voluntary national student performance stand-
 15 ards and voluntary national opportunity-to-
 16 learn standards certified by such Council.

17 (4) report on promising or effective actions
 18 being taken at the national, State, and local levels,
 19 and in the public and private sectors, to achieve the
 20 National Education Goals; and

21 (5) help build a nationwide, bipartisan consen-
 22 sus for the reforms necessary to achieve the Na-
 23 tional Education Goals.

12

24 (b) NATIONAL REPORT CARD.—

1 (1) IN GENERAL.—The Goals Panel shall annu-
2 ally prepare and submit to the President, the Sec-
3 retary, the appropriate committees of the Congress,
4 and the Governor of each State a national report
5 card that shall—

6 (A) report on the progress of the United
7 States toward achieving the National Education
8 Goals; and

9 (B) identify actions that should be taken
10 by Federal, State, and local governments to en-
11 hance progress toward achieving the National
12 Education Goals.

13 (2) FORM: DATA.—National report cards shall
14 be presented in a form, and include data, that is un-
15 derstandable to parents and the general public.

16 **SEC. 204. POWERS OF THE GOALS PANEL.**

17 (a) HEARINGS.—

18 (1) IN GENERAL.—The Goals Panel shall, for
19 the purpose of carrying out this part, conduct such
20 hearings, sit and act at such times and places, take
21 such testimony, and receive such evidence, as the
22 Goals Panel considers appropriate.

23 (2) REPRESENTATION.—In carrying out this
24 part, the Goals Panel shall conduct hearings to re-
25 ceive reports, views, and analyses of a broad spec-

1 trum of experts and the public on the establishment
2 of voluntary national content, voluntary national stu-
3 dent performance standards, voluntary national op-
4 portunity-to-learn standards, and State assessments
5 or systems of assessments described in section
6 213(e).

7 (b) INFORMATION.—The Goals Panel may secure di-
8 rectly from any department or agency of the Federal Gov-
9 ernment information necessary to enable the Goals Panel
10 to carry out this part. Upon request of the Chairperson
11 of the Goals Panel, the head of any such department or
12 agency shall furnish such information to the Goals Panel
13 to the extent permitted by law.

14 (c) POSTAL SERVICES.—The Goals Panel may use
15 the United States mail in the same manner and under the
16 same conditions as departments and agencies of the Fed-
17 eral Government.

18 (d) USE OF FACILITIES.—The Goals Panel may use
19 the research, equipment, services, and facilities of any de-
20 partment, agency or instrumentality of the Federal Gov-
21 ernment, or of any State or political subdivision thereof
22 with the consent of such department, agency, instrumen-
23 tality, State or subdivision, respectively.

24 (e) ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENTS AND SUP-
25 PORT.—

1 (1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall provide
2 to the Goals Panel, on a reimbursable basis, such
3 administrative support services as the Goals Panel
4 may request.

5 (2) CONTRACTS AND OTHER ARRANGEMENTS.—
6 The Secretary shall, to the extent appropriate, and
7 on a reimbursable basis, make contracts and other
8 arrangements that are requested by the Goals Panel
9 to help the Goals Panel compile and analyze data or
10 carry out other functions necessary to the perform-
11 ance of the Goals Panel's responsibilities.

12 **SEC. 205. ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS.**

13 (a) MEETINGS.—The Goals Panel shall meet on a
14 regular basis, as necessary, at the call of the Chairperson
15 of the Goals Panel or a majority of the members of the
16 Goals Panel.

17 (b) QUORUM.—A majority of the members shall con-
18 stitute a quorum for the transaction of business.

19 (c) VOTING.—No individual may vote, or exercise any
20 of the powers of a member, by proxy.

21 (d) PUBLIC ACCESS.—The Goals Panel shall ensure
22 public access to the proceedings of the Goals Panel (other
23 than proceedings, or portions of proceedings, relating to
24 internal personnel and management matters) and shall

1 make available to the public. at reasonable cost. tran-
2 scripts of such proceedings.

3 **SEC. 206. DIRECTOR AND STAFF; EXPERTS AND CONSULT-**
4 **ANTS.**

5 (a) **DIRECTOR.**—The Chairperson of the Goals Panel,
6 without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States
7 Code, relating to the appointment and compensation of of-
8 ficers or employees of the United States, shall appoint a
9 Director to be paid at a rate not to exceed the rate of
10 basic pay payable for level V of the Executive Schedule.

11 (b) **APPOINTMENT AND PAY OF EMPLOYEES.**—

12 (1) **IN GENERAL.**—(A) The Director may ap-
13 point not more than 4 additional employees to serve
14 as staff to the Goals Panel without regard to the
15 provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing
16 appointments in the competitive service.

17 (B) The employees appointed under subpara-
18 graph (A) may be paid without regard to the provi-
19 sions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53
20 of that title relating to classification and General
21 Schedule pay rates, but shall not be paid a rate that
22 exceeds the maximum rate of basic pay payable for
23 GS-15 of the General Schedule.

24 (2) **ADDITIONAL EMPLOYEES.**—The Director
25 may appoint additional employees to serve as staff

1 to the Goals Panel in accordance with title 5, United
2 States Code.

3 (c) EXPERTS AND CONSULTANTS.—The Goals Panel
4 may procure temporary and intermittent services of ex-
5 perts and consultants under section 3109(b) of title 5.
6 United States Code.

7 (d) STAFF OF FEDERAL AGENCIES.—Upon the re-
8 quest of the Goals Panel, the head of any department or
9 agency of the United States may detail any of the person-
10 nel of such department to the Goals Panel to assist the
11 Goals Panel in carrying out its responsibilities under this
12 part.

13 **SEC. 207. EARLY CHILDHOOD ASSESSMENT.**

14 (a) IN GENERAL.—The Goals Panel shall support the
15 work of its Resource and Technical Planning Groups on
16 School Readiness (hereafter in this subsection referred to
17 as the "Groups") to improve the methods of assessing the
18 readiness of all children for school that lead to alternatives
19 to currently used norm-referenced early childhood assess-
20 ments.

21 (b) ACTIVITIES.—The Groups shall—

22 (1) develop a model of elements of school readi-
23 ness that address a broad range of early childhood
24 developmental needs;

APPENDIX C:
Meeting Summary

APPENDIX C

November 15 Meeting Summary

MEETING SUMMARY

NATIONAL EDUCATION GOALS PANEL

November 15, 1993

On November 15, 1993, the National Education Goals Panel met in Washington D.C., at the Holiday Inn Capitol, the Honorable John R. McKernan, Jr., presiding. The Goals Panel is charged with monitoring the nation's and the states' progress toward the six National Education Goals; advising the President, Congress, the Governors, and the American people on ways to achieve the goals; and issuing an annual progress report to the nation.

The items on the agenda included:

- 1) Approval of July 27 meeting summary;
- 2) Presentation of a status report on "Goals 2000: Educate America Act," a bill now before Congress;
- 3) Presentation and discussion of the report of the Technical Planning Group (TPG) on reviewing and certifying nationwide education standards;
- 4) Action Item: Resolution on the Goals Panel Statement of Principles on nationwide education standards; and
- 5) Open-microphone session with questions from the media and the public on the standards-setting process.

ATTENDANCE

Members in Attendance:

Governors: John R. McKernan, Jr., Governor of Maine and Goals Panel Chairman; Michael Leavitt, Governor of Utah; Roy Romer, Governor of Colorado.

Administration Officials: Richard W. Riley, Secretary of Education.

Members of Congress: Jeff Bingaman, U. S. Senator, New Mexico; Thad Cochran, U. S. Senator, Mississippi; and William Goodling, U. S. Representative, Pennsylvania.

With Martin Orland, Acting Executive Director, National Education Goals Panel.

Members Absent:

Evan Bayh, Governor of Indiana; Arne H. Carlson, Governor of Minnesota; James Edgar, Governor of Illinois; John Engler, Governor of Michigan; E. Benjamin Nelson, Governor of Nebraska; Carol H. Rasco, Assistant to the President for Domestic Policy; and Dale Kildee, U. S. Representative, Michigan.

Guest Speakers:

Shirley M. Malcom, Chairperson, Technical Planning Group on Standards Review (TPG).

PANEL ACTIONS

The Panel voted unanimously to adopt a Statement of Principles concerning the voluntary adoption of standards.

PANEL DISCUSSION

Governor John McKernan, Jr.:

Governor McKernan welcomed everyone to the 19th meeting of the National Education Goals Panel, his first meeting as 1993–1994 Chairman. The first order of business was the unanimous approval of the meeting summary from the last Panel meeting, which took place on July 27, 1993.

Governor McKernan then welcomed one of the new Panel members, Michael Leavitt, Governor of Utah, and regretted that the other new member, James Edgar, Governor of Illinois, was unable to attend.

He noted that the Panel's 1993 report, *Building a Nation of Learners*, which was issued on September 30, 1993, was extremely well done and also well-received around the country. He thanked all of those involved in making the report, particularly the 1992–1993 Chair of the Panel, Governor Ben Nelson. The notion of the report as a workbook for parents, educators, and others interested in helping the states meet their education goals was particularly well-received; it garnered the Panel a great deal of attention, which they hope to translate into increased momentum in achieving their goals at the state level. He also thanked Martin Orland and the staff of the NEGP for their work.

Governor McKernan noted that over the years, the Panel's emphasis has been on measuring the nation's progress toward the education goals. Although this is perhaps the Panel's primary function, its role in the coming years will expand so that it not only comments on the success or

failure of education reform, but also helps identify the factors that lead to success. Rather than simply serving as an objective bystander, the Panel hopes to document and make available to others specific strategies to achieve the goals. The Panel is in the process of developing a strategic plan to allow it to take on this more active role.

He said that the "Goals 2000: Educate America Act," which is now working its way through Congress, will have an impact on the Panel's role, and called on Panel representatives from the Senate and the House to report on the Act's status.

Senator Jeff Bingaman:

Senator Bingaman said that the Senate Majority Leader plans to bring up the Goals 2000 legislation later in the week and that the Senate will probably take action on it before the annual recess.

Secretary Richard Riley:

Secretary Riley noted that the measure's strong bipartisan support is very encouraging. By shaping the debate in a positive and bipartisan way, Representatives Kildee and Goodling played a critical role in ensuring its success in the House. He added that the House-approved Goals 2000 legislation will be good for American school children, which is what really counts.

The Secretary observed that a national consensus in support of comprehensive school reform and higher standards has emerged, and that the Goals 2000 measure formalizes this consensus into law.

He emphasized that the Panel's unique bipartisan makeup and intergovernmental membership will ensure that it continues to play a critical role in the process of certifying standards in content, performance, and opportunities to learn standards. Both the House-approved bill and the Senate bill that emerged from committee and are awaiting floor action maintain the Panel's authority in these areas.

Secretary Riley stated that the nation's governors have endorsed the Senate bill, and it is critical to have their support. If the Goals 2000 bill is considered in the Senate and passes soon, Congress can move to consider the Conference Report, possibly even before the end of the year. He thanked Representatives Kildee and Goodling for being extremely helpful.

Senator Thad Cochran:

Senator Cochran said he hoped the bill would be taken up by the full Senate before adjournment, but that if it were crowded out by other legislation, the Panel can be assured it will be taken up early next year.

He stated that some people worry that the legislation will impose a Federal mandate on states and on school districts, even though the Panel has tried to make it clear that this is an effort to develop voluntary standards. The Panel is holding up the challenge to the states for to elevate their expectations of students, who will rise to that expectation and give a higher level of performance and meet these goals. He assured the Panel that a bipartisan array of Senators and Congressmen are working to get this legislation passed so the voluntary standards will carry greater weight.

Governor McKernan:

Governor McKernan asked the Secretary about the "sticking points" in the bill, and whether the Panel should be concerned about or act on any differences between the House and Senate versions.

Secretary Riley:

The Secretary responded that he is hopeful that any changes made to the bill on the floor and in preparation for debate on the floor will make the measure more acceptable to all concerned. It should be very clear, thanks to Representative Goodling's efforts, that there is no mandate involved. The measure that the Administration sent to Congress included the six goals, all of which were approved by the nation's Governors. The Congress has added two more goals, which concern parental involvement in the schools and professional development for teachers. These are two of the most important and strongly supported elements of comprehensive education reform, so he does not expect any opposition to them.

There were some amendments in the House version that affect the relationship between the Goals Panel and NESIC. The Senate version gives the Panel power to review and approve standards, while the House version gives it the power to review and disapprove standards. Both versions affirm the basic philosophy that the Goals Panel will retain authority over the standards that ultimately are developed.

Governor Roy Romer:

Governor Romer interjected that the Panel should try harder to get the American public to understand exactly what standards mean. Specifically, the Panel must distinguish standards from education (OBE). In the last elections, the issue of "back-to-basics" reform versus outcome-based standards was debated. The point of developing standards as *the way* to get back to basics was lost. The Panel must help the American public understand what it means when it talks about standards, and not let the emotional content of OBE take over. The voters clearly want better education. The Panel should use a more clearly understood vocabulary. The term "outcome-based education" is too difficult to understand.

Governor Romer cautioned the Panel against allowing the addition of goals such as parental involvement and professional development to propel it back into "soft and fuzzy" categories. He added that the Panel should not be in the business of measuring parental involvement in education.

Secretary Riley:

Secretary Riley responded that the intent of the Panel concerning academic standards is clear. The Goals 2000 bill clearly deals with academic standards, not values.

Governor McKernan:

Governor McKernan noted that people who advocate "back-to-basics" reform would not oppose the Panel's efforts if they truly understood the goals. He emphasized the use of accurate language as critically important to clarify the confusion.

He commended the Administration for its leadership in education reform.

Governor McKernan said that the Technical Planning Group's report (TPG) is now available. It will help the Panel frame its thinking and direct the debate on national standards and the criteria for those standards.

He emphasized that the Panel wants full public input into discussions of the standards, discussions which probably will last more than a year. The more public discussions there are, the more the Panel's and the public's concerns will be laid to rest. He thanked Dr. Shirley Malcom and Ms. Emily Wurtz (NEGP staff) for their work in creating this report.

Governor McKernan called on Dr. Malcom, the TPG Chairperson, to present the report. He introduced her as the Head of the Directorate for Education and Human Resources at the American Association for the Advancement of Science, a board member at the National Center

on Education and the Economy, and Co-Chair of the Task Force on Women in Biomedical Research at the National Institutes of Health.

Dr. Shirley Malcom:

Dr. Malcom thanked the TPG members for their hard work in producing the report, particularly Ann Heald, Chester Finn, and Claire Pelton, as well as the NEGP staff, particularly Emily Wurtz.

She emphasized that the TPG report is the result of an open process in which many experts, including those involved in standards-setting efforts throughout the country, were invited to participate. In producing the report's recommendations, participants were always mindful of the need for consensus building and for dialogue with the public, as well as of the role of instructional practices and issues of assessment.

The report urges the Panel to become more concrete in its discussion of standards: it must directly demonstrate the specific activities teachers should perform in order to meet the standards, and which specific methods will be used to judge whether a standard has been met.

Dr. Malcom stressed that the Panel needs to recognize the reality that efforts to develop standards are already underway throughout the country—they are not waiting for the legislation, for NESIC, for the Department of Education, or for any other organization to take the first step. Curriculum frameworks are being developed in the states even now, either with or without the Panel's participation. Therefore, even though the TPG was charged with making recommendations specifically to the Panel, TPG members also recognized their responsibility to the many people across the country who are already working on standards. Dr. Malcom urged that the Panel make sure its efforts converge with the efforts of these people, and that it use the same language and the same definitions already being used.

She noted that the TPG tried to take a reasonable and common-sense approach so that its report could be understood by ordinary people.

Dr. Malcom stated that through the TPG's numerous discussions with groups developing standards, it became clear that these groups are seeking direction and guidance. The various groups readily agreed with the TPG on several issues, including the basic criteria for subject-specific standards and the need for a single set of NESIC-certified standards. The TPG came to believe in the power of the review process and now urges that NESIC provide a review function to any professional society that wants feedback on the standards it has developed.

She said that in writing its report, the TPG had difficulty reaching an agreement with these standards groups on the criteria for voluntary review of state standards. NEGP will have to walk a fine line between the states' recognized sovereignty in developing education standards and the need to create standards that are worthy of adoption. Similarly, a balance must be struck

between the urge to develop standards that can serve as a banner for systemic reform and the need to make standards that are reasonable and feasible for all students. And the desire for a set of standards that are interdisciplinary and reflect a real-world approach to education reform must be balanced against the desire for subject-specific standards.

Dr. Malcom noted that there were similar conflicts between politically acceptable choices and choices that are more intellectually defensible but are a harder political sell; between the need for speed in developing standards and the need for caution in doing so; and between people's high aspirations for education reform and the technical limitations that hinder reform efforts.

In conclusion, Dr. Malcom said she hoped the TPG's report will serve as a basis for further discussion as the Panel and NESIC continue the process of sifting through these difficult issues. She said that education reform will be a hard job, and figuring out how to do it will require a lot of time intelligence, wisdom, and faith that it can be accomplished.

Governor McKernan:

Governor McKernan called for panelists to comment on the TPG report.

Senator Bingaman:

Senator Bingaman complimented the TPG on its report. He noted that Appendix B lists a schedule for completing the standards. The math standards were completed in 1989; five others are scheduled for completion by 1994, one by 1995, and the final one by 1996. He asked that if the Panel approves these standards, the Goals 2000 legislation passes, and NESIC approves the standards, what happens next? Essentially, there will be six sets of standards ready to be launched or submitted to American parents, teachers, and students as of next year; how will the Panel persuade people to adopt these standards?

Dr. Malcom:

Dr. Malcom responded that in one public hearing that took place in Minnesota, many people attended and were very engaged in the discussion and already had opinions. The Panel must start selling the notion of standards-based reform now, without waiting for the legislation to pass. The Panel may want to consider taking it upon itself to engage the public in a dialogue about standards right now.

Senator Bingaman:

Senator Bingaman countered that the concept of standards is still too ephemeral to allow active engagement of the public. In the spring of 1994, according to the report's schedule, the standards for the subject of history will be completed. Presumably there will be a document that will state specifically what students need to learn at different grade levels. After people have this document in hand, they can begin to discuss whether it holds a reasonable set of requirements or needs fine-tuning. Perhaps the Panel should center the national dialogue on the specific standards that are developed rather than on the ephemeral concept of standards, especially since the standards are scheduled to be in place before a meaningful national dialogue can get underway.

Dr. Malcom:

Dr. Malcom answered that the Panel should use any means possible to engage the public in this discussion, whether it is a list of the specific standards or the general idea of standards-based reform.

She pointed out that the math standards have been around since 1989, yet not even all math teachers are aware of or support them.

Dr. Malcom added that having a specific document that lists standards is useful, but there also must be a strategy already in place for engaging the public in a discussion of specific examples from the standards.

Governor McKernan:

Governor McKernan said that one reason people aren't more aware of the completed math standards is the lack of an imprimatur on those standards by any group other than math teachers. He asked whether there is a role for NESIC or the Panel to bring the existence of these standards to the attention of those who set education policy in the states and communities.

Dr. Malcom:

Dr. Malcom answered that there is a need for people other than math teachers to advocate for math standards because the public may get the impression that math teachers are simply being self-serving in their promotion of math standards. The Panel must make the public aware that the math standards exist and that we all have a role in getting students to become productive and responsible citizens and to continue learning in our technological society.

Governor Leavitt:

Governor Leavitt stated that the core of the problem is that no one is in charge of managing education. In the real world, no state has a system of managing public education; every state may have hundreds of separate systems, one for each school district. People mistakenly believe that the governor is in charge of education in each state, but governors have a very limited capacity to affect education. The governor can appropriate a budget but cannot decide how the money is spent. The governor's strongest hand is to forward the cause of education reform in the public agenda. Governors are uniquely positioned to advance education reform.

Governor Romer:

Governor Romer noted that the Panel should be more protective of Secretary Riley so that the public doesn't get the impression that he is the sole federal officer in charge of managing all of American education. He noted the American tradition of resistance against having education managed by a federal agency.

He recommended that NESIC go forward with certifying math standards first and delay work on history standards because the subject area will likely promote a lot of controversy. There isn't as much ideological controversy in the subject areas of math and science.

He also emphasized that these standards are not yet set in stone. The Panel could refer to these standards as temporary or preliminary, so the public will have the understanding that they can be refined. Then, the Panel can assess how the process of adopting the standards at the state level progresses, and if necessary recertify the reworked standards. Once the Panel has gained some experience in certifying standards in a relatively easy subject area, it can try the more difficult subject areas.

Dr. Malcom:

Dr. Malcom noted that the TPG report recommends the term "provisional certification."

Governor Romer:

Governor Romer stated that the Panel should charge Rotarians throughout the country to take on a 1-year project of making people aware of the math standards. Just as members of the Lions Club are identified with advocating for the blind, Rotarians would be identified with advocating for education reform. It would be a mechanism for making standards-based reform, and the math standards in particular, understandable to the average person.

Senator Bingaman:

Senator Bingaman added that the standards will never be adopted unless teachers approve them. At the community level, parents and administrators will defer to teachers on the acceptance of standards.

Dr. Malcom:

Dr. Malcom observed that in all fairness to math teachers and their professional organizations, the reason that some teachers and members of the public are unaware of or unsupportive of the math standards is that it is an extremely difficult task just to get the word out. Math teachers' professional organizations are generally regarded as the best at informing their constituents on important issues, but despite their best efforts, it is a very hard job. At the elementary school level, there aren't many math teachers per se, but rather instructors who teach many subjects, including math; therefore, all elementary teachers, not just math teachers, must be targeted. She stressed that given the length of time the math standards have existed, and given the fact that they [the standards] still haven't fully penetrated the community of math teachers, even though this is the best organized group of teachers, the Panel can get an idea of the tremendous scale of their task.

Governor Leavitt:

Governor Leavitt asked how broadly accepted the concept of standards is among the American public.

Governor Romer:

Governor Romer noted that even if a specific law were passed stating that specific standards would be adopted on specific dates, school boards that change with every election can interfere with adoption of those standards. In his state's recent elections, many school board changes were attributed to the emotionally charged and somewhat spurious issue of opposition to outcome-based education. Many people assumed that these changes would stop the standards movement in its tracks.

Governor Romer urged the Panel to address its inability to communicate with the American public on the issue of standards. He suggested the Panel devise a simple pamphlet to illustrate standards to parents: perhaps a document that contrasts what the parents learned in fourth grade, and the new expectations for fourth graders today. He reiterated that the Panel is failing in its communication on this subject, and cannot focus solely on the teachers. Teachers may only feel the impetus to get involved in the reform process when parents put some pressure on them by coming to them with questions.

Governor McKernan:

Governor McKernan noted that it is important to include in any such effort a discussion of why standards are important.

He then welcomed the arrival of Representative Goodling and invited him to speak.

Representative Goodling:

Representative Goodling stated that if the Panel could not adopt the two-page Statement of Principles today, and if it then could not ensure that every parent in the country and every member of Congress has it, the Panel's work would die in its tracks. He said that one of the most important lines in the Statement of Principles reads, "the voluntary national content standards [will] not address nonacademic areas such as student values, beliefs, attitudes, and behavior." He stressed that the Panel must get across to the public this point concerning ethics, must get the Statement of Principles adopted and circulated quickly, so that every member of Congress and every state legislator can explain it when they are "hammered" with questions by concerned parents.

Secretary Riley:

Secretary Riley noted that he has said the same thing in a yellow fact sheet that spells out what Goals 2000 does and does not do. All of the Panel participants need to get the message across (i.e., to make clear what Goals 2000 is not), but the Goals 2000 bill does refer specifically to high standards and to academic standards.

Representative Goodling:

Representative Goodling said that many members of Congress are afraid of the potential parental reaction to the legislation, and that the public must be educated.

Governor McKernan:

Governor McKernan said the Panel must convey to people why the whole issue of standards is important, because too many people don't understand it and are therefore afraid of it.

Senator Cochran:

Senator Cochran congratulated Representative Goodling on his success in the House of Representatives and moved to formally adopt the carefully and thoughtfully drafted Statement of Principles. He underscored that the Statement of Principles allows local educators the flexibility to design their own curriculum within broad outlines, which should reassure those who worry that the standards will contain Federal edicts or mandates.

Senator Bingaman:

Senator Bingaman seconded the motion.

[There follows some confusion over whether the Panel is adopting the Statement of Principles or the entire TPG report.]

Governor Romer:

Governor Romer called the Panel's attention to a sentence in the Statement of Principles that reads, ". . . the Panel would oppose any Federal effort that would require states and local schools to use such national standards." He wanted to add that the Panel "encourages states to use the standards as models"; use of the term "opposes" sounds too negative and even defensive.

Governor Leavitt:

Governor Leavitt stated that the Panel cannot be put in the position of encouraging states or school districts or even academic disciplines to develop these standards.

Ms. Emily Wurtz:

Ms. Wurtz asked whether the Panel would agree to the rewording: "While encouraging states to use these standards as models, the Panel would oppose any Federal effort to require states and local districts to use these national standards."

Governor Romer:

Governor Romer agreed with this wording.

Governor Leavitt:

Governor Leavitt proposed to further amend it to read, "While encouraging states to establish high academic standards," as opposed to "these standards."

Governor Romer:

Governor Romer said that these standards are the best the Panel could produce, so it should be honest and uphold these standards as the best possible models.

Secretary Riley:

Secretary Riley asked to include the terms "high" and "academic" in reference to the standards, so it would be clear that they are content-related.

Governor McKernan:

Governor McKernan asked Dr. Malcom and Ms. Wurtz for their impression of what the public's reaction would be to such wording, given the great deal of misinformation circulating among Americans.

Dr. Malcom:

Dr. Malcom responded that most people don't grasp the point that the standards are voluntary. In the TPG recommendations, they were careful to make a distinction between state content standards and subject-specific content standards. The state has the authority to say that they can build from the national standards but not adopt them; if they do come up with their own standards, these must be as rigorous as those listed in the recommendations for subject-specific standards.

Governor Leavitt:

Governor Leavitt said that the ideal is not to compel people to do something or to make them feel as if they have been compelled. They should be allowed to use the model and make small modifications as they wish, as long as they don't feel compelled to accept any federal or national model.

Ms. Anne Heald:

Ms. Heald, Executive Director of Center for Learning and Competitiveness, and a member of the TPG, stated that the international experience supports Governor Leavitt's point: worldwide, a nation's standards do not stand on their own but become resources that are used differently in different localities.

She added that most American parents are not aware that their own children are far off world standards, and there aren't many resources that tell them how well or how poorly their children are being prepared.

Governor McKernan:

Governor McKernan asked whether to add the point that the Panel encourages states to use these national standards as they develop their own state and local content standards.

Ms. Wurtz:

Ms. Wurtz said the report was developed in the hope that it would be a positive statement of what the Panel is endorsing and a clarification of what it is not endorsing, and that the report addresses national rather than state standards.

Secretary Riley:

Secretary Riley, returning to discussion of the Statement of Principles, wanted to add more modifiers to the term "standards," to call them voluntary, world-class, academic standards.

Senator Cochran:

Senator Cochran noted that that terminology is included later in the Statement, so the Panel should just add the modifier "academic" to the term "standards."

Secretary Riley:

Secretary Riley agreed.

Governor McKernan:

Governor McKernan called for a vote. The Statement of Principles was unanimously approved, without any changes to the original language.

Governor Romer:

After the vote, Governor Romer added that the wording is important because the Panel is trying to persuade the public that the government is not interested in teaching children values. However, he questioned the claim that history or science can be taught without some framework of values. He asked how one would describe an ecosystem without a sense of value about what is good about ecological interrelationships?

Governor Leavitt:

Governor Leavitt said that the Panel's work is all about allowing communities to develop their standards based on the community's values.

Governor McKernan:

Governor McKernan said that the Panel has now achieved the tone it needs in this Statement to give local communities the assistance they need to adopt these standards. He thanked Dr. Malcom and Ms. Wurtz for their hard work, and called for the start of the open-microphone session.

Q: Audience member Barbara Jones, assistant director of the Department of Education in West Virginia, asked Governor Romer whether he wanted to go on the record as saying that he does not support the teaching of values, democratic principles, and all the precepts that schools were founded to promote?

A: Governor Romer responded that the public has a genuine fear that children will be taught a set of values that are counter to their parents' own. The Panel is seeking a demarcation between those skills and knowledge that are appropriate to public school from those beliefs and knowledge that are appropriate for individual communication within a family or within a church. Outcome-based education (OBE) has polarized the public on this issue.

His statement was an attempt to let the Panel get on with its work on standards without the polarizing emotional effect of this argument. The simplicity of the Statement of Principles is effective, although he personally still struggles with the issue of values.

- A:** Governor McKernan added that the document does not say values ought *not* to be taught. It says that national voluntary content standards should not be a part of *imposing* any belief on local states or schools. The Panel has no position on whether values should be taught in schools. It is simply addressing academic standards.
- Q:** Ms. Jones asked that the Panel not allow a small minority to define what those values are, and suggested that schools teach many values: the value of hard work, of being on time, and of respecting others and their opinions. She urged the Panel not to abandon these values.
- A:** Senator Bingaman responded that teaching citizenship, civics, and democracy as a preferred form of government must entail values.
- Q:** Phyllis Darling, director of the Nevada Center for Education, said that standards will be meaningless unless teachers give them a knowledgeable and enthusiastic reception. The key to that is inservicing and staff development. She asked how much money will be set aside for that essential task, once the national standards have been developed.
- A:** Secretary Riley responded that professional development is a priority. One of the legislation's major thrusts is that part of overall education reform requires a substantial change in professional development.
- A:** Governor Romer added that although more money is needed for professional development, people shouldn't get the idea that reform cannot be accomplished without extra money specifically for that purpose. All professions are changing rapidly, and all professionals are obligated to upgrade their skills whether or not there is extra money set aside to do it.
- Q:** An unidentified member of the audience from Washington state said that in Washington, there are 296 different school districts that set their own curricula, not one state curriculum. She was concerned that her state and others like it will not participate in standards certification because these local districts don't have the legal "room" to do so; it appears that only states have such "room."
- A:** Secretary Riley responded that it must be made clear to all localities that it is in their best interest to comply with their own state standards.
- Q:** Irene Spiro, of the College Board, asked the Panel to describe how it will obtain public input into the standards process.
- A:** Governor McKernan answered that the Panel's work is meaningless without public input and that a national dialogue is essential to the Panel's recommending anything that demands public support. The Panel is planning a number of public hearings and meetings around the country to get that input over the next year. The Panel will distribute a list of these meetings and the types of input they are seeking.

Q: A reporter for Education Daily asked Secretary Riley how ESEA funding will be used as leverage for getting disadvantaged students to meet the same standards as all other students if the standards are voluntary. What are the mechanisms for getting these students to meet the standards, if there is no tie to ESEA funding?

A: Secretary Riley answered that ESEA is tied to state standards. The national standards are purely voluntary and are a resource for the state, but the state can qualify for ESEA funds without complying with the national standards.

Q: An unidentified questioner asked whether there is any specific requirement in the Goals 2000 legislation or in ESEA legislation to use experts in higher education to develop standards. In his experience, teachers and administrators typically are involved, but not professional historians, geographers, scientists, and the like. He saw this oversight—neglecting to include experts in higher education—as a flaw in the legislation that easily could be remedied by adding a phrase to the effect that highly educated professionals from many fields be included in standards development.

A: Secretary Riley noted that professionals in higher education are included in the membership categories for NESIC and the state planning panels.

A: Dr. Malcom added that one of the standards criteria in the TPG report is that standards must reflect accurate and sound scholarship, and documentation must be provided as to whether, for example, scholarly associations have been included in the standards development process. Also, the report recommends that standards developed by the states meet these national criteria. These mechanisms should be in place in order to guide people in the direction of including scholars.

Q: Governor Romer asked what resources will help school districts determine whether those providing their teaching materials are in compliance with the standards. Where will school districts get the information to verify claims by book sellers and others that their materials are in accord with the standards?

A: Dr. Malcom answered that professional societies within each discipline will be very protective and will make sure that the materials are in accord with the standards. But she stressed that his concern is very well-placed, because some people already are claiming to follow the standards when they very clearly are not doing so. She said that the Panel must pay close attention to this issue and must ensure that groups are convened to render these professional judgments.

Governor McKernan:

Governor McKernan concluded the meeting by noting that the Panel accepted with great gratitude the TPG's report but did not adopt it. The Panel did adopt the Statement of Principles on voluntary adoption of standards. He then declared the meeting adjourned.

NATIONAL EDUCATION GOALS PANEL
Statement on Voluntary National Education Content Standards
adopted November 15, 1993

In 1990, the President and Governors agreed on six national education goals and committed themselves to a decade of sustained action to meet them. The National Education Goals Panel was created to measure and support the nation's progress toward meeting these goals.

A consensus has emerged that to meet Goals 3 and 4 we Americans must agree on the results we expect from students in core academic areas, which is what "content" standards define.

The National Education Goals Panel strongly supports the development of clear, rigorous content standards by States and local communities, and it believes that voluntary national standards are essential to this effort. The following principles will serve as the foundation for continuing Goals Panel involvement in establishment of these standards:

Voluntary

The Panel will participate only in the establishment of voluntary national content standards that may serve as models and resources for State and local school reform efforts.

The Panel would oppose any federal effort to require States and local schools to use such national standards.

Academic

The Panel believes that voluntary national content standards should address only core academic areas, such as those stated in the National Education Goals.

Voluntary national content standards should not address non-academic areas such as student values, beliefs, attitudes and behaviors.

World Class

The Panel will endorse only those national content standards which, though uniquely American, are at least as challenging and rigorous as the academic expectations for students in other countries of the world.

Voluntary national content standards must not be compromised or watered down for any reason. The Panel believes that our focus should be on helping each student reach higher levels of academic achievement.

Bottom-Up Development

National and State content standards must be developed through a consensus building process that involves educators, parents and community leaders from schools and neighborhoods across the country.

For these voluntary national education standards to be useful, they must be relevant to each community using them. The Panel has no intention of developing content standards on its own and would oppose any standards that were not developed through a broad based, participatory process.

Useful and Adaptable

National voluntary content standards must allow local educators the flexibility to design their own curriculum plans within the broad outlines of the standards. Standards should focus upon a limited set of the most important and lasting knowledge and skills, so they are useful for teachers, parents and students, and represent the most important knowledge, skills and understandings we expect students to learn.

Voluntary national content standards will not be a "national curriculum" but, rather, provide a broad outline of the kind of knowledge and skills necessary "for responsible citizenship, further learning, and productive employment in our modern economy." (Goal 3)

The establishment of national voluntary standards is an effort that has received strong support from the business community, Republican and Democrat Presidents, Governors, members of Congress, local educators and citizens from across the country.

We believe that, if treated with care and wisdom, these expectations of what students should know and be able to do, will empower parents in every community in the nation to demand more of themselves, their children, their schools, and their government.

A federal grab for control of schools

By Judd Gregg

Imagine a Czar of Curriculum in Washington. Crazy? How about a National Bureau of Standards for Schools. Far-fetched? This may sound like a bad dream at first, but it could become reality if the Senate passes President Clinton's plan for education reform called Goals 2000.

It is important to understand that although the title is innocuous, the administration's initiative is far-reaching. It is aimed at restructuring the way education is managed in America. No one suggests that our educational system is all it can be. But the answer is not putting education in the hands of the new federal bureaucracy created by this Clinton initiative.

The Clinton plan will specifically shift a significant amount of the control of curriculum and management of elementary and secondary schools from local communities and states to the federal government. It is, therefore, important to highlight some of the problems with this legislation.

■ A series of new federal bureaucracies. The concept of this legislation is to lay the management of education in the arms of two small, but extremely powerful, federal entities. The first is known as the National Education Standards and Improvement Council (NESIC) and is charged with certifying national content and performance standards. These standards will basically address all areas affecting the way elementary and secondary schools are operated.

The second is called the National Education Goals Panel. NESIC refers its work to this Goals Panel, which passes judgment on its acceptability. The operation of these two entities will basically set out a national agenda that will cover all functions of elementary and secondary school education, including curriculum.

For the first time in the history of this country, the federal bureaucracy will be defining how education should be delivered on Main Street anywhere in America. The traditional role of limiting federal direction in education to narrow areas, such as special education, will have been abandoned, as the federal role moves to defining how elementary and secondary school education should be delivered across the country.

■ Voluntary standards. Throughout the legislation the term "voluntary" is used aggressively. The standards are, for example, "voluntary." The state's participation is "voluntary." The National Opportunity to Learn standards are "voluntary." The assessment system is "voluntary."

Methinks the plan doth protest too much. There is very little that is voluntary about this initiative. In fact, the only thing voluntary in this bill is the word itself. In order to qualify for access to a \$400 million pot of funds, states must produce plans that conform to the content and performance standards set out by the national panels cited above. The argument, of course, is that if the states do not want the money, they do not have to participate in setting up such standards; therefore, everything is "voluntary." However, the structure is such that it is unlikely that the political leadership of the states will be able to resist the financial and legal pressure to participate in this program. Also, as we have seen in the past, this is the "camel's-nose-under-the-tent" approach. One can expect that when this initiative is up and running, obtaining so much as a nickel in federal funds for current programs, such as for special education, will likely require compliance with the performance and content standards that have been certified by NESIC under this act.

■ Lawsuits. It is obvious that one of the purposes of the act is to create a litigious atmosphere — along much the same lines as has occurred in environmental policy. The standards to be developed in compliance with this law — relative to teachers' workload, special treatment of students with special needs and a myriad of local education functions — will quickly become the hammer for activist lawsuits. This will be true whether a state adopts a plan that meets the directives of the national standards for content and performance or not. The long-cherished principle of community control of education will be lost to the courts.

■ A straitjacket at the local level. Control over education at the state and local level has been maintained in part by flexibility in complying with federal regulations. Goals 2000 moves in the opposite direction. It limits flex-

ibility and expands and centralizes control at the federal level. It defines content and thus controls input rather than focusing on results.

Of course, this unwillingness to push for results standards is a reflection of the influence of the National Education Association and other labor unions. The unions do not wish to be held to such standards, preferring instead an approach regulating input. That approach, of course, avoids accountability and precludes effective comparisons.

As the Vermont commissioner of education recently stated: "The bill defines a radically different federal role in education: The Goals Panel will set the goals, the Standards and Improvement Council will certify the standards to measure progress toward the goals, and the Secretary will oversee a state and local planning process to reach the goals. While the federal government requires plans now, they govern only a part of education. . . . This bill will assert federal oversight over the whole educational program in a state or community."

This bill is another in what is becoming a long list of initiatives by the Clinton administration that fall into the category of "we know what is best for you" legislation. It is an attempt by a group of recycled 1960s utopian academics to enforce their view of the world and in this case, their views on education, on all the misguided folks out there in America who really do not know what is appropriate for their children. In case you didn't know, that's you.

*xx: Galston*

State of South Carolina

Office of the Governor

CARROLL A. CAMPBELL, JR.
GOVERNOR

POST OFFICE BOX 11369
COLUMBIA 29211

March 1, 1994

The President
The White House
Washington, D.C. 20500

Dear Mr. President:

I am writing to express my deep concern and disappointment about what is happening with the education goals/standards initiative which we began in 1989. As co-chairs of the governors' group which wrote the National Education Goals, you and I talked a good deal then about the dangers of the "slippery slope" we were embarking on by inviting a set of national academic standards by which parents and students could measure academic achievement. Yet we believed the risk was warranted because of the enormous potential benefits to students and parents, and we believed that by careful vigilance, the rights and responsibilities of states, localities and parents to design education systems that fit their needs would be preserved.

Unfortunately, the reality of model national academic content standards is hardly closer than it was five years ago; very little real progress has been made. Through a combination of partisan bickering and real philosophical differences on issues like school choice, Congress has been stymied – even from endorsing the broad education goals we established.

But the states have continued to move ahead. Nearly all of us have embarked on standards-based education and we are working toward better assessment tools that will allow us to hold our systems accountable based on what kids actually learn. Some states have made mistakes and have had to pull back because of legitimate concern about the appropriate role of government at any level in our children's education. But mostly we are making progress.

Now comes Goals 2000 and the reauthorization of the major federal education program, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). When you introduced Goals 2000, we had to practically go to war to convince your Department of Education to stand up to House Democrats on behalf of local control of schools. At that time, I wrote that I believed that bill, by tying federal programs to

The President
Page 2
March 1, 1994

"opportunity to learn" or school delivery standards, threatened to turn the clock back on four years' worth of bipartisan teamwork and focus once again on system inputs instead of student performance. While the House bill was improved and the Senate accepted amendments requested by the Governors' Association, the outcome of the conference is still problematic.

But the House-passed version of the ESEA reauthorization, a multi-billion dollar federal aid program and the behemoth of federal education aid, is not problematic. It is unacceptable. Though the compromise wording is fuzzy, the fact is it again directly ties inputs -- "opportunity to learn" standards -- to eligibility for participation in Chapter 1, the most important elementary and secondary education federal program there is and one in which states have little choice but to participate.

So the House of Representatives and the Administration have now gone from agreeing to the development of national model standards to requiring that states must have standards -- both content and input -- to participate in Chapter 1. What is next?

Although I have become increasingly uncomfortable with the process, I have worked in good faith with the Congress and two Administrations to advance the vision you and I articulated. Through the Governors' Association, we have helped garner bipartisan support and, indeed, the House ESEA bill passed with overwhelming bipartisan support. But, Mr. President, I am saying "enough": let the federal government stay out of the goals/standards movement because the federal government cannot seem to contribute without wanting to control.

The fact is that national standards, and especially opportunity to learn or input standards, should not be a part of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act reauthorization at all. These voluntary standards, to the extent they are federally codified, should be defined in the clearly voluntary Goals 2000 legislation. Governors and parents should not have to fight for their rights in a very complicated subject area every time Congress passes an education bill. It's not right, and it's dangerous to our system.

The issue here is community control over education versus Washington control over education. I know that you understand this, and I am asking you to stand up for parents and communities.

Sincerely,



Carroll A. Campbell, Jr.
Governor of South Carolina