



GOALS 2000 A Progress Report



FALL 1996

THE NATIONAL EDUCATION GOALS

By the year 2000—

- ★ All children in America will start school ready to learn.
- ★ The high school graduation rate will increase to at least 90 percent.
- ★ All students will leave grades 4, 8, and 12 having demonstrated competency over challenging subject matter including English, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, the arts, history, and geography, and every school in America will ensure that all students learn to use their minds well, so they may be prepared for responsible citizenship, further learning, and productive employment in our nation's modern economy.
- ★ U.S. students will be first in the world in mathematics and science achievement.
- ★ Every adult American will be literate and will possess the knowledge and skills necessary to compete in a global economy and exercise the rights and responsibilities of citizenship.
- ★ Every school in the United States will be free of drugs, violence, and the unauthorized presence of firearms and alcohol, and will offer a disciplined environment conducive to learning.
- ★ The nation's teaching force will have access to programs for the continued improvement of their professional skills and the opportunity to acquire the knowledge and skills needed to instruct and prepare all American students for the next century.
- ★ Every school will promote partnerships that will increase parental involvement and participation in promoting the social, emotional, and academic growth of children.

Year Three: States Lead School Improvement With GOALS 2000

Activity under GOALS 2000 is in its third year, helping schools in more than 4,500 communities across the nation mobilize to improve the future of their children by designing common sense approaches to improve teaching and learning.

States are defining clear academic standards that challenge every student, developing assessments to measure student learning, and strengthening school accountability. Some key facts regarding state participation are:

- ★ Forty-five states have received second-year funds, and local districts in New Hampshire,

Oklahoma, and Montana will receive their state's share.

- ★ Nineteen states have comprehensive improvement plans and all of them received third-year funding in July.
- ★ At least 90 percent of second- and third-year GOALS 2000 grants, up from 60 percent for first-year funds, will go to local school districts and schools. This means about \$630 million dollars for schools to support their own approaches to improving student achievement.

The GOALS 2000 Partnership

I can say directly that the current partnership between federal, state and local educational institutions gives me hope for major progress. A new balance is being forged with the focus on local communities and the other levels in support roles. It is the right balance. It recognizes that no single level can succeed alone in providing the services needed for America's students. Partnerships are the model for a successful future.

—Bill Randall, Commissioner of Education in Colorado

Congress and President Clinton made a bi-partisan commitment to education on March 31, 1994, when the GOALS 2000: Educate America Act was signed into law. Educators, business and parent organizations, as well as Republican and Democratic elected leaders, agreed that this national response was needed because, despite more than a decade of education reforms since *A Nation at Risk* was published, students and schools were not measuring up to the high standards required to maintain a competitive economy and a strong democracy.

With GOALS 2000, the federal government pledged to form a new and supportive partnership with states and communities in an effort to improve student academic achievement across the nation, where education remains a local function and a state responsibility. The following sets forth these state and federal roles in GOALS 2000 reform:

State Leadership

1. States set challenging academic standards in core subjects for all students.
2. States develop a comprehensive approach to improving education, including developing standards and assessments; providing professional development opportunities for teachers; improving accountability for meeting the standards; and promoting parental and community involvement.
3. States accomplish these two reforms with broad-based, grassroots involvement.

Federal Support

1. The federal government provides seed money to help states launch and sustain their ongoing education reform efforts.
2. The federal government provides states with unprecedented flexibility for using GOALS 2000 funding. States and local school districts may use GOALS 2000 funds for a wide range of activities that fit within their own approaches to helping students reach higher standards. (See the article on page 7 about waivers, Ed-Flex, and other "new flexibility" advantages.)

INSIDE:

Building on a Decade of Reform	2
GOALS 2000 Funding Allocations	2
How a GOALS 2000 Approach Works	3
GOALS 2000 Activity Across the Nation	4
Flexibility: Results, Not Rules	7
What's New in the GOALS 2000 Act	8

SPECIAL PULLOUT:

**State Contacts for
GOALS 2000
& Misconceptions
about GOALS 2000**

GOALS 2000: Building on a Decade of Reform

GOALS 2000 is a direct outgrowth of the state-led education reform agenda of the 1980s, which included increasing high school graduation requirements, particularly in math and science, instituting statewide testing programs, offering more Advanced Placement courses, promoting the use of technology in the classroom, and instituting new teacher evaluation programs.

State Reform Results

These education reforms yielded important results: academic performance increased and the performance gap between white and minority students decreased, according to important indicators. For example:

Course-taking patterns

- From 1982 to 1994, the percentage of high school students taking the challenging academic courses recommended in the 1983 *A Nation at Risk* report increased from 14 to 52 percent.
- Enrollments in Advanced Placement (AP) courses also increased significantly, and the number of students passing AP exams nearly tripled between 1982 and 1995.

National Assessment of Educational Progress scores

- The average performance in mathematics improved substantially on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) between 1978 and 1992. Among 9- and 13-year-olds, the improvement was the equivalent of at least one grade level.

- Performance in science was also higher in 1992 than in 1978 among all age groups, especially in general science knowledge and skills.
- The gap in performance between white and minority students has been narrowing, especially in mathematics.

Insufficient Gains

These gains in academic performance, while significant, are not sufficient. The NAEP results in reading performance remain relatively unchanged. And the narrowed gap in performance between white and minority students remains unacceptably large.

Because of international economic competition, states are competing with other countries, rather than with other states, to attract and retain high-paying jobs. But, by the mid-1980s, a series of studies demonstrated that the academic performance of U.S. students, and therefore their potential competitiveness in the workforce, lagged significantly behind that of students in other countries. By this standard, the United States was losing its ability to compete economically, and the need for education reform was as urgent at the end of the 1980s as it was at the beginning.

The 1989 Charlottesville Education Summit

The 1989 Education Summit convened by President Bush and the nation's governors, led by then-Governor Bill Clinton, further underscored the need for a national response to address education issues. The Charlottesville Summit, as it was called, led to a number of important commitments for sustaining the momentum of education reform. These include:

- The creation of the National Education Goals.
- The recognition that states must focus on raising the achievement levels of all students rather than on simply creating models of success.
- A broad consensus among state and business leaders, parents and the education community that education reform must raise academic standards; measure student and school performance against those standards; provide schools and educators with the tools, skills, and resources needed to prepare students to reach the standards; and hold schools accountable for the results.
- A clear statement of an important and carefully defined federal role in improving education, including financial, research, and dissemination support and greater flexibility in administering programs.

The GOALS 2000 Act

The 1994 GOALS 2000 Act reflects these commitments. The act endorses the national education goals. It provides a broad framework for education reform, easily adaptable to the unique circumstances each state and community faces in educating its children and sustaining its reform efforts. GOALS 2000 provides support to state and local education reforms with exactly the kind of flexibility called for at the Charlottesville Education Summit.

GOALS 2000 FUNDING ALLOCATIONS

STATE	FY 1994 FUNDING	FY 1995 FUNDING	FY 1996 FUNDING	1997 ESTIMATES
TOTAL (52 STATES)	\$92,400,000	\$361,870,000	\$339,700,000	\$476,000,000
ALABAMA	1,604,625	5,941,766*	5,675,986	7,895,690
ALASKA	460,574	1,547,345	1,437,296	2,015,509
ARIZONA	1,364,600	5,450,582	5,038,557	7,220,860
ARKANSAS	993,175	3,650,495	3,434,819	4,800,139
CALIFORNIA	10,514,198	42,111,705	39,211,219	54,798,617
COLORADO	1,086,789	4,288,514	3,922,624	5,585,002
CONNECTICUT	962,265	3,460,756	3,149,595	4,453,445
DELAWARE	406,278	1,291,544	1,242,928	1,742,164
FLORIDA	4,022,211	15,861,034	14,713,635	20,880,761
GEORGIA	2,358,215	8,959,402	8,515,014	12,097,369
HAWAII	417,745	1,381,641	1,307,668	1,830,605
IDAHO	458,232	1,568,397	1,478,175	2,072,739
ILLINOIS	4,138,448	15,992,571	15,050,826	20,965,086
INDIANA	1,737,392	6,557,145	6,280,894	8,734,445
IOWA	888,162	3,219,618	3,077,877	4,261,417
KANSAS	865,991	3,193,916	3,099,621	4,350,864
KENTUCKY	1,479,642	5,775,274	5,549,490	7,709,898
LOUISIANA	2,064,025	7,968,128	7,642,099	10,577,254
MAINE	506,617	1,647,540	1,535,403	2,147,204
MARYLAND	1,450,703	5,379,938	5,016,113	7,070,017
MASSACHUSETTS	1,884,961	6,990,859	6,242,461	8,845,858
MICHIGAN	3,622,852	14,371,488	13,653,547	19,081,265
MINNESOTA	1,389,913	5,377,078	5,062,092	7,103,635
MISSISSIPPI	1,361,751	5,094,972	4,864,881	6,746,306
MISSOURI	1,694,086	6,525,935	6,132,073	8,574,360
MONTANA	449,712	1,560,150**	1,459,914	2,044,513
NEBRASKA	568,280	1,986,104	1,834,350	2,661,199
NEVADA	410,679	1,419,052	1,303,042	1,868,241
NEW HAMPSHIRE	0	1,290,294**	1,232,612	1,728,084
NEW JERSEY	2,445,502	8,792,536	7,904,169	11,130,562
NEW MEXICO	742,764	2,782,261	2,610,240	3,691,669
NEW YORK	7,166,140	27,112,295	25,358,328	35,384,032
NORTH CAROLINA	2,060,116	7,745,087	7,280,313	10,327,046
NORTH DAKOTA	406,852	1,340,576	1,259,984	1,765,253
OHIO	3,711,499	14,833,684	14,226,873	19,844,608
OKLAHOMA	1,155,879	4,396,613**	4,176,732	5,822,424
OREGON	1,048,333	4,012,392	3,799,963	5,312,803
PENNSYLVANIA	4,070,640	15,529,194	14,464,447	20,258,933
RHODE ISLAND	442,901	1,480,004	1,359,668	1,902,901
SOUTH CAROLINA	1,276,721	4,710,359	4,511,625	6,263,574
SOUTH DAKOTA	427,589	1,412,549	1,309,917	1,836,220
TENNESSEE	1,680,252	6,387,802	5,999,453	8,432,635
TEXAS	7,286,644	29,228,278	27,187,479	38,181,903
UTAH	710,199	2,587,039	2,452,958	3,429,258
VERMONT	407,301	1,272,847	1,225,743	1,717,476
VIRGINIA	0	6,658,924*	6,200,305	8,704,627
WASHINGTON	1,583,754	6,328,974	6,056,946	8,492,110
WEST VIRGINIA	779,620	2,799,259	2,788,423	3,829,992
WISCONSIN	1,685,573	6,582,097	6,320,177	8,806,412
WYOMING	370,640	1,262,907	1,224,150	1,715,593
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	477,300	1,523,409	1,353,218	1,895,093
PUERTO RICO	2,381,661	9,608,968	9,064,078	12,632,327
AMERICAN SAMOA	44,917	184,247	173,864	247,560
GUAM	47,455	194,658	183,688	137,787
NORTHERN MARIANAS	25,000	102,549	96,770	261,548
PALAU	25,000	102,549	79,187	510,788
VIRGIN ISLANDS	92,677	380,157	358,733	52,791
MARSHALL ISLANDS	25,000	102,549	96,770	137,787
MICRONESIA	73,729	302,433	285,389	406,357
BIA, AFN	586,222	2,249,558	2,125,600	3,005,382

* Did not apply for second-year funding.

** Local districts in these states will receive directly from the Department of Education their state's share of 1995 GOALS 2000 funds.

(continued on page 3)

(continued from page 2)

The 1996 National Education Summit

In 1996, governors, President Clinton, and American business leaders attended a National Education Summit which resulted in a renewed commitment to the need for academic standards, assessments, and new tools, such as educational technology, to help ensure that students achieve at higher levels. Acknowledging that some headway had been made in education reform, these leaders urged greater progress and increased effort to ensure that America continues to be competitive in an international economy. ■

What Is a Standard?

Academic standards describe what every student should know and be able to do in core academic content areas. They also define how students demonstrate their skills and knowledge.

In Charlotte-Mecklenburg, North Carolina, the 5th-grade social studies content standard sets a goal for students to be able to identify basic tenets of citizenship and government. They will, for example, be able to: identify three branches of U.S. government and describe their legislative, executive and judicial function; describe the three levels of U.S. government (local, state, and federal) and list examples of authority of each of them; compare how governments in the United States, Canada, and Latin America select leaders, establish laws, and receive their authority; explain specific changes that have taken place in government over time; and identify and state the significance of symbols, people, and events to the development of the United States, Canada, and Latin America.

In the state of Delaware one of the goals the mathematics content standard sets forth for students is to develop an understanding of estimation, measurement, and computation by solving problems in which there is a need to measure to a required degree of accuracy by selecting appropriate tools and units.

To meet this standard, students in grades K–3 will investigate meaningful problems, individually or in cooperative groups, using appropriate technology, and demonstrate that they are able to estimate and then measure length, perimeter, time, temperature, and weight/mass to the nearest unit using standard and non-standard units; determine the value of a given set of coins; measure and compute the perimeter of rectangles; and use multiple computational procedures with whole numbers.

How a GOALS 2000 Approach Works

To fully appreciate the GOALS 2000 approach to education, it helps to examine two states that launched similar efforts prior to the 1994 act. In both Maryland and Kentucky—after six years of sustained effort and commitment to high standards—students are showing achievement gains.

Kentucky's Comprehensive Education Reform Act

In 1990, the Kentucky State Legislature passed the comprehensive Kentucky Education Reform Act. A central feature of the act is high academic standards for all students.

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

Financial Equity. A new financing system brought greater equity across districts. Teachers now get more training to teach to high standards, and schools have better access to educational technology in their classrooms. Also, more students enter school ready to learn due to expanded preschool programs, family resource centers, and extended school services for those who need additional support to achieve high standards.

GOALS 2000 Helps. Kentucky has targeted its GOALS 2000 funds toward accelerating local reforms, with a particular emphasis on strengthening parent involvement in schools through, for example, homework hotlines, alternatives to on-site school visits such as “video visits,” and training for teachers in utilizing parents as instructional volunteers in the classroom.

Results. Comprehensive reform is beginning to pay off in Kentucky, with students showing gains in academic achievement.

- The state's 4th-, 8th-, and 12th-graders made substantial improvement on the 1993–94 state assessment and continued improvement on the 1994–95 assessment, with the most dramatic gains experienced by 4th-graders.
- In all grades, the percentage of students performing at the proficient/distinguished level in mathematics, reading, science, and social studies increased over time.
- In grade 4 the average of the scores across all subjects tested rose 58 percent from 1993 to 1995.
- In reading, the percentage of 4th-graders scoring at the proficient/distinguished level increased from 8 percent in 1993 to 30 percent in 1995.

Maryland's Schools for Success

Maryland also launched a comprehensive reform effort—Schools for Success—after the Charlottesville Education Summit in 1989. The cornerstone of Maryland's reform effort is its accountability system, which establishes high standards for student achievement and related statewide assessments of student progress toward meeting the high standards.

Accountability. More than 3,000 teachers have been involved in designing and scoring test items for grades 3, 5, and 8 as part of the Maryland School Performance Assessment Program (MSPAP). Every year the state reports school progress along such indicators as student achievement in relation to the state's standards and school attendance and dropout rates. Low-performing schools receive interventions such as training, consultations and grants, and, if performance does not improve, they can ultimately face reconstitution which may involve changing a school's administration, staff, organization, and/or instructional program.

Curriculum Frameworks. The state has also developed curriculum frameworks designed to assist administrators and teachers in planning, developing, and implementing local curricula and assessments that help in achieving state standards. Schools are forming school improvement teams—comprising the principal, school staff, parents, and business and community members—that develop and implement school improvement plans.

GOALS 2000 Helps. Maryland chose to use GOALS 2000 money to comprehensively review and refine its Schools for Success initiative. A 54-member statewide planning panel—co-chaired by a local educator and a business partner—reviewed current school reform activities and developed strategies to fill in gaps. In particular, GOALS 2000 funds are being used for local improvement initiatives, to increase public involvement in education, accelerate the development of a high school performance assessment, and develop strategies to improve educational technology throughout the schools.

Results. Maryland reforms are also showing positive results:

- In comparison with 1994 state assessment results, in 1995, 52 percent more schools met or approached the standards for satisfactory performance at the 3rd-grade level.
- The number of schools similarly improving has increased by 13 percent at the 5th-grade level and by 32 percent at the 8th grade.
- Students have also made gains: 40 percent of all students statewide met the state standards—a 25 percent gain over 1993. ■

GOALS 2000 Activity Across the Nation

Successful education reform requires a sustained, long-term commitment. With GOALS 2000, we are out of the block and rounding the first turn, and we cannot afford to sacrifice the momentum achieved by nearly all the states and hundreds of communities.

—Richard W. Riley, U.S. Secretary of Education

Teachers, parents, business leaders, and community members across the country have made their expectations clear: every child needs to reach higher standards. The future of our children, our democracy, and our economy depends on it. Throughout the nation, states and communities are leading the way to make higher academic standards a reality for every child. And GOALS 2000 funds are providing significant support for these efforts, such as those in the states and localities highlighted below.

1. Building State Partnerships

At the state level, GOALS 2000 planning activities have created and strengthened partnerships and support for learning. Over the past two years, governors and chief state school officers have together assembled broad-based planning panels representing viewpoints from across their states to assess the current state of education and design a plan for raising student achievement.

As intended, states have built their plans on their own goals and strategies. Thus, you will not see the title “GOALS 2000” in every state. Instead you will see such state-driven initiatives as “New Directions for Education” in Delaware, “Academics 2000” in Texas, and the “Green Mountain Challenge” in Vermont.

Vermont's Green Mountain Challenge calls for developing world-class academic standards, comprehensive assessments, and an education system that provides all students an opportunity to meet the standards. In 1993, after more than 4,000 Vermonters provided input, Vermont adopted a *Common Core of Learning* that describes 20 “vital results” or learning goals. Local districts determine how best to reach the state standards, and the communities are invited to discuss student performance at an annual statewide school report night.

GOALS 2000 has afforded Vermont an opportunity to review, assess, and improve its reform activity, and to target three areas of weakness in its education system: dropout prevention, accountability, and local reform activity.

In **New Mexico** the GOALS 2000 planning process was a catalyst for bringing together many participants in the education system. The state panel learned about local projects sponsored by organizations such as the Panasonic Foundation, the Education Commission of the States, the Carnegie Foundation, and the National Science Foundation. They brought these project leaders together for the first time, enabling them to begin to collaborate, reduce duplicative efforts, and leverage small grants to have a larger impact.

2. Building Local Partnerships

Bringing together the many partners that contribute to children's learning is an essential component of improving education. GOALS 2000 encourages schools to reach out to the broader community to involve parents, families, businesses, and community members in school improvement activities. As school planning committees are using GOALS 2000 funds to design and implement strategies to improve teaching and learning, early indications show broader community involvement in schools.

Kansas has established content standards that all its children are expected to reach. To attain this goal in Wichita, the schools, higher education institutions, and community members are working together to improve staff development. The Horace Mann, Irving, and Park Foreign Languages Magnet school in Wichita is the site of a professional development school that is being run collaboratively by several members of the community. A \$20,000 GOALS 2000 grant supports efforts to recruit staff and design staff development programs so that teachers acquire the skills they need to help all students reach the state's standards.

A consortium of districts in northern **Iowa** is using a \$65,628 GOALS 2000 grant to collaboratively improve student achievement, engage and prepare all school personnel in school improvement, and increase family involvement in learning. The districts are pooling their knowledge by sharing successful strategies and lessons they have learned. Each district is also going to its community to develop a comprehensive school improvement plan. Community needs now drive resource decisions so that local, state, federal, and private resources can more effectively support student learning.

North Dakota awarded a \$15,340 grant to Walsh and Pembina Counties for comprehensive school improvement activities. School staff contacted religious leaders, business people, civic leaders, families, and

community members who traditionally had not been involved in education. They formed a local planning panel made up of 70 citizens, who met intensively for a year and designed a four-year plan to improve student learning. The plan included strategies, action steps, time lines, and clear responsibilities for working towards the National Education Goals.

3. Developing Challenging Academic Standards

“Our youth will continue to pay the price if we fail to articulate clear expectations for knowledge and competence. The stark reality is that youth who cannot perform against high workplace expectations are not going to be employed.”

—Business Coalition for Education Reform,
May 10, 1995 letter to Congressman
Goodling in support of the GOALS 2000 Act

Students and schools respond to the expectations set for them. Developing challenging academic standards is the linchpin of local and state improvement activities under GOALS 2000. Once developed, academic standards become a goal for students, teachers and parents, and provide a focal point for rigorous assessments, better curriculum and instruction, improved teacher training, and accountability.

The momentum set by states and localities for implementing high academic standards and related assessments continues to mount. A 1995 *Phi Delta Kappan* poll indicated that 87 percent of the public supports higher standards in core academic subjects. At the 1996 National Education Summit the nation's governors and business leaders called for raising expectations by setting tough academic standards for all students.

GOALS 2000 honors a variety of approaches to developing and implementing challenging standards that satisfy different state and community needs, as evidenced on the next page.

(continued on page 5)

THE COMMUNITY IS KEY AT SLIDELL HIGH SCHOOL IN LOUISIANA

Joe Buccaran, principal of Slidell High School and currently Louisiana's state principal of the year, describes how GOALS 2000 helped energize his school:

“I've been in education for 33 years. For the first time, we all wound up on the same page. GOALS 2000 provided the stimulus for us to roll up our sleeves and look deep into our school to find what we needed to do. We asked for a lot of community input for school improvement. ... It's remarkable how GOALS 2000 opened the door to so many things. It's about examining your school and its students and determining what needs to be done.”

The GOALS 2000 committee set priorities for teaching and learning and proposed ways to reach them. Their initiatives include a partnership with local employers that ensures community involvement and helps students identify career goals early on; ongoing, teacher-initiated professional development to keep teachers' skills and knowledge up-to-date; “Tiger Families” that foster a sense of community by pairing students with teachers throughout students' high school years; and highlighting the school's successes.

(continued from page 4)

Delaware is implementing high standards statewide as the centerpiece of New Directions for Education, an improvement initiative launched in 1992. Curriculum framework commissions spent three years developing internationally competitive standards in English/language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies with four benchmark points—grades K–3, 4–5, 6–8, and 9–10. The state has targeted more than \$940,000 of its GOALS 2000 funds to enable schools to design and pilot-test their own curriculum geared to meeting the new state academic standards.

Colorado, having a strong history of local control over education decisions, passed legislation in 1993 that called for developing model state standards while giving districts flexibility to develop their own standards that “meet or exceed” the state model. The state established a Standards and Assessment Development and Implementation Council that took the input of 14,000 citizens throughout Colorado over two years to develop a model set of state content standards. Schools and districts are now in the process of developing or revising their own standards—often with the assistance of GOALS 2000 funds—to ensure that they meet or exceed the state’s standards.

A local example: Colorado awarded a \$21,238 GOALS 2000 grant to Windsor to develop standards and assessments. All of the district’s staff and 100 community members participated in developing final academic standards in language arts, math, science, and social studies. More than half of the staff helped create assessments of writing tied to standards. A standards development committee of parents and community representatives worked independently from educators to develop a set of priorities for academic standards. Teachers were then able to draw upon their work.

Texas has long had a set of “essential knowledge and skills” that includes broad state goals for student learning. The state is currently using about \$2.1 million in GOALS 2000 funds to evaluate and revise its standards, making them more relevant to the knowledge and skills students will need to be successful in the 21st century. Essential Knowledge and Skills Clarification Teams, comprising 325 individuals from across Texas, have been established in each academic subject area to ensure that the standards are rigorous and focus on the knowledge and skills that students should demonstrate.

Nevada’s comprehensive improvement plan, Nevada 2000, outlines key strategies, benchmarks, and time lines for developing challenging standards in each of the state’s core academic subjects. As a result of its GOALS 2000 planning process, the state has established a Teaching and Learning, Standards, and Assessments Advisory Team—comprising educators, parents, legislators, business and industry representatives, and community members—to evaluate and revise Nevada’s Course of Study to include challenging standards for student performance in each subject area by 1999.

4. Developing Assessments

Measuring student achievement against challenging standards is a critical part of continuously improving instruction and holding schools accountable. While 43 states used

some sort of statewide assessment in 1994–95, most have not developed or adopted assessments that are connected to their tougher standards. One of the reasons most often cited by states is that the cost of developing these better forms of assessments is high.

States have used the GOALS 2000 planning process to further their assessment development activity, but most of the GOALS 2000 grant money goes directly from states to school districts for local activities. To support the development of state assessments, the Department of Education ran a discretionary grant program funded with first-year GOALS 2000 monies. Although the impact of such awards cannot yet be assessed, many of the projects, like the two below, focus on an area of particular difficulty for districts and states.

Delaware is using its GOALS 2000 assessment development grant to help the state design, develop, and evaluate assessments to best meet the needs of students with disabilities and limited English proficiency, in mathematics at grades 3 and 8, and in science in grades 5 and 10.

Minnesota, currently developing a rigorous set of graduation standards for high school students, is using its assessment development grant to modify new assessments. The goal is for all students, including those with disabilities and limited English proficiency, to participate in the state’s assessments and graduation standards.

5. Strengthening School Accountability

States, school districts, and schools can develop more accurate and useful information for the public regarding school performance. They can also more effectively develop rewards for high-performing schools and intervene in those that are low performing. And when states have a system for holding schools accountable for student achievement, they can provide additional flexibility to schools to innovate and remove barriers to student learning.

Already some states are promoting greater school accountability as part of their GOALS 2000 efforts. For example:

Ohio has identified 127 districts for targeted assistance based on student performance on 4th- and 9th-grade proficiency tests. These districts are receiving GOALS 2000 grants to help improve student achievement. Each district has made a public commitment to adopt challenging performance standards, including 75 percent of their students passing all sections of the Ninth Grade Proficiency Test by the end of the 9th grade. An Ohio Department of Education liaison works closely with each district as a broker of services and a “critical friend” to help think through improvement strategies and link communities with other districts and service providers.

New Mexico has built its GOALS 2000 plan around its new accountability system. The state requires every community and school to develop its own education improvement plan, with widespread community input, that is tied to challenging academic standards. Every year schools and districts report student achievement in relation to community goals, and state accreditation will reflect accountability for community-defined learning results rather than compliance.

ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT GRANTS

Delaware	201,785
Maryland	224,707
Michigan	257,228
Minnesota	253,257
North Carolina	80,267
North Dakota	223,039
Oregon	322,019
Pennsylvania	181,014
State Consortium*	242,684
TOTAL	\$1,986,000

* This consortium of 22 states is managed by the Council of Chief State School Officers

6. Upgrading Learning Environments

Explaining how GOALS 2000 money, by supporting the development of state and locally determined high standards, improves the learning environment, Barbara Wicks, a teacher from Maine, said:


“Literally thousands of state residents of all demographic descriptions have had input in the development of the statement of standards. A group of 300+ teachers gathered twice in the last half-year to translate the statements into action. Some teachers have remarked that the resulting effects on their classroom environments and activities are among the most productive and professionally worthwhile of their careers. This work has provided a forum for all students, teachers, and parents to begin sharing goals and standards while maintaining determination on how to reach them.”


As standards are raised, it is essential that schools focus on learning and foster effective practices for reaching all students. The following states and others are developing assessments that accurately measure student performance against the tougher standards; upgrading curricular materials to reflect higher expectations; and providing teachers with training to update their knowledge base and teaching skills.

In Connecticut, the Region 15 Public Schools formed a consortium which received \$23,000 to improve student performance through inter-school visits and the exchange of instructional materials and assessment strategies. Teachers and administrators from nine urban, suburban, and rural districts in partnership with several colleges, universities, and professional organizations, addressed questions about standards, assessments, and follow-up actions. Samples of students’ work were a subject of discussion. Two districts in the consortium now use electronic mail to share information. A teacher described the value of the collaboration for improving learning: “...it has contributed to our standards setting...when we have the opportunity to see what other students are producing, we see that our students’ work we once considered ‘best’ can be improved.”

(continued on page 6)

(continued from page 5)

 In **Massachusetts**, the Fitchburg Public Schools—in collaboration with the Leominster and Lunenburg Public Schools, and Fitchburg State College—are using \$150,000 (over three years) to help teachers and administrators implement the Massachusetts Educational Reform Act of 1993 through professional development activities. Teachers and administrators are getting hands-on training in problem solving, interdisciplinary teaching, and assessment strategies. They are using this training to develop a curriculum that supports the state's new curriculum frameworks for math, science, and technology. Technology workshops are also being offered to parents and community members.

 In **Arkansas** the preservice teacher education and licensure program at the University of Arkansas at Monticello is being completely restructured to help all students reach the state's academic standards. A collaboration of nine partner school districts in southeast Arkansas and the University received a \$50,000 grant to establish "laboratories" in the partner schools through which prospective teachers learn about effective teaching from master teachers, students, and parents.


7. Getting Educational Technology into Schools


Educational technology provides an ever-expanding horizon of learning opportunities for children and adults alike. In the first year of GOALS 2000 each participating state received a supplementary grant of at least \$75,000 to develop, as part of its overall education improvement plan, strategies for the use


of educational technology in schools. The 1996 amendments to the GOALS 2000 Act clarify that funds may be used to acquire technology and implement technology-enhanced curricula and instruction. In effect, many local GOALS 2000 grants already include a technology component to help students reach challenging standards.


HOW STATES ARE USING EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY

- as a tool for teaching academic content and demonstrating concepts
- as a mechanism for developing skills
- to engage students and raise mastery levels
- to make accommodations and adaptations in instruction to meet the needs of students with disabilities
- to broadcast courses, thus bringing lessons from other places into local classrooms
- to develop communication networks—using electronic mail and the Internet—for teachers and administrators to share information, successful strategies, and lessons learned from local and state programs
- as a tool for tracking school progress and holding schools accountable for student achievement

 In **Oregon** the Gresham-Barlow School District is helping students reach the high academic standards reflected in the state's Certificate of Initial Mastery (CIM) requirements by focusing its \$50,000 grant on helping teachers use technology. Two teachers from each of the district's 17 schools attended a series of workshops on integrating technology with instruction. Now they are designing at least one unit tied to a CIM proficiency that uses technology extensively. The teachers will monitor how well their students meet CIM requirements and modify their teaching strategies accordingly.

 Schools in Springfield, **Illinois** see technology as one tool for helping students reach high standards. The Springfield School District 186 is using \$158,471 in GOALS 2000 funds to provide teams from 15 schools with six weeks of intensive training in using technology throughout the curriculum.

 **Michigan's** West Iron County Public Schools are using GOALS 2000 funds to integrate the use of technology into their lessons. The Computers as Tools (CATS) professional development program trains teachers to cooperate in team teaching and thematic instruction and to utilize interactive multimedia and computer-assisted instruction.

 In **Utah**, where the state's GOALS 2000 technology award was used to further implement the state's Educational Technology Initiative (ETI), a recent evaluation of the ETI indicates that it has had a positive impact on education at all levels as it has become entwined with the state's efforts to raise student achievement levels. ■

Although GOALS 2000 has only been in effect a short time, the program has changed the face of education as we know it. I applaud your efforts to help children everywhere reach the high academic standard we have set for them.

—Tommy G. Thompson, Governor of Wisconsin, in his October 18, 1995 letter to the Department of Education

Urban and Rural Local Reform Initiative Grants

Many urban and rural communities that have high concentrations of poor and/or limited English proficient students have high dropout rates and low levels of student achievement. These severe problems can be overcome through higher expectations, better instructional opportunities, and greater community and parent involvement and collaboration that address students' diverse needs. To develop model educational approaches for these contexts, five urban and five rural districts received competitive grants directly from the U.S. Department of Education using \$2.1 million in 1995 of GOALS 2000 national leadership funds.

- The Chicago Public Schools received \$605,903 to help all students reach **Illinois'** academic standards in the Illinois State School Quality Initiative. Through this project, Chicago has 100 schools developing and implementing school improvement plans—with the involvement of teachers, parents, and community members—that are responsive to the educational needs of limited English proficient and economically disadvantaged students. Over the course of four years, Chicago intends to: increase the high school graduation rate to 80 percent; raise the student daily attendance rate; increase the percentage of students meeting or exceeding state standards in core subjects; and increase to 90 percent the percentage of graduates employed or engaged in advanced training or higher education a year after graduation.
- The Box Elder Public Schools and the Heart Butte District #1 in **Montana** each received grants—totalling \$84,308 and \$69,369 respectively—to raise student achievement. Both districts mainly serve Native American students, more than half of whom are limited English proficient and/or economically disadvantaged. Communitywide panels are developing strategies for schoolwide reform and measures to track progress of their reform initiatives. They are also refocusing their curriculum and developing various model assessments tied to challenging standards in ten subject areas to meet Montana's goals for student learning.

Flexibility: Results, Not Rules

The Congress and the United States Department of Education have made tremendous progress in transforming the federal relationship with the states on education. It has changed from one based on regulatory compliance to one based on accountability and performance.

—Robert V. Antonucci, Massachusetts Commissioner of Education

Over the past three years, the Department of Education has worked to provide funding and assistance to states and local districts in ways that maximize flexibility with regard to federal requirements, and minimize paperwork. It is operating in new ways that rely on a commitment to a shared goal—improving teaching and learning—by focusing on results, fostering collaboration, and promoting flexibility.

Applications and Plans

- *No regulations* have been issued for the implementation of GOALS 2000.
- The application form for GOALS 2000 funding was *only 4 pages long in the first year and 2 pages in the second year.*
- The application review and approval and the obligation of funds generally take *less than three weeks* from the receipt of the application.
- The *format and content* of comprehensive state improvement plans submitted under GOALS 2000 are *left to states.* Every state improvement plan submitted has been approved.
- Guidance for the *review of state education improvement plans* was developed with the input of state and local leaders across the country, and stipulates *only three criteria* a plan must meet: 1) reasonable promise of helping all students reach high standards; 2) widespread commitment to the plan throughout the state; and 3) local flexibility for innovation.
- A peer review team of educators, state officials, and business people, not federal officials, may review the state plans, make recommendations to the secretary, and provide observations about the plan to the state for its use. (See “Peer Review” article on this page.)

For the latest developments in flexibility plans, see “What’s New” on the last page.

Peer Review Adds Value

The process for reviewing state plans has provided a constructive opportunity for states to learn from the experience of other states and communities and receive help. Review of plans is conducted by a panel of five peer reviewers from outside the federal government, with a wide range of experience and expertise.

The peer reviewers analyze each plan and then visit the state to engage in extensive discussions and share ideas before making a recommendation regarding approval. More important, these reviewers provide states with expert advice on how to overcome challenges and point out areas that need additional attention.

States frequently note the value added by the fresh perspectives of outside peers, who generally stimulate dialogue among their state and local contacts that continues well beyond the peer review.

Waivers

The Department also supports state efforts by offering waivers from federal requirements that may impede school improvement. The GOALS 2000 Act, the reauthorized Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and the School-to-Work Opportunities Act for the first time authorize the secretary to waive the majority of statutory and regulatory requirements for the Department’s elementary and secondary education and vocational education programs, if necessary, to clear the way for better teaching and learning.

Ed-Flex

Perhaps the most dramatic example of the Department’s new flexibility is the Education Flexibility Partnership Demonstration initiative (Ed-Flex) established by the GOALS 2000 Act. Ed-Flex is intended to provide maximum support to participating states and local school districts for effective school reform. Ed-Flex allows the secretary of education to delegate, to up to 12 states, the authority to waive certain federal statutory or regulatory requirements affecting states’ and localities’ efforts to improve academic achievement for all students.

A state with a comprehensive school improvement plan approved by the secretary may apply for Ed-Flex. In addition, the state must waive its own statutory or regulatory requirements, while holding districts and schools affected by the waivers accountable for the academic performance of their students. And, before granting a waiver, a state must first determine that the underlying purposes of the affected program will continue to be met. Ed-Flex does not apply to the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), or to requirements pertaining to health, safety, civil rights, and parental participation in education.

On February 17, 1995, Oregon was the first state designated to participate in the demonstration. Seven others were designated subsequently.

ED-Flex Demonstration States

Kansas	Oregon
Maryland	Massachusetts
Ohio	Texas
Vermont	Colorado



Supporting Local Reform: Fishermen and University Presidents

The 1995 National Teacher of the Year, Elaine Griffin of Alaska, describes the value of GOALS 2000 for local reform:

GOALS 2000 funding was used to get our grassroots folk involved in the education process. Fishermen and university presidents sat down at the same table and talked about what needs to happen for our students to be successful.

Often, the toughest money for districts to find is for local reform. That’s why supporting improvements in schools and classrooms is the ultimate focus of GOALS 2000. Through competitive subgrants from the state to districts that promote **locally developed** improvement strategies and innovations, schools receive support to help students reach high standards.

The bulk of GOALS 2000 funds—90 percent after the first year—goes directly from the state to local schools and districts. By awarding funds on a competitive basis, states can place priorities on the awards and target funds to start up or accelerate local improvement initiatives.

GOALS 2000 has provided critical resources for a wide range of local school improvement efforts, including:

- building new local partnerships among schools, parents, businesses, colleges, and communities to improve education;
- upgrading teacher skills, student assessments, curriculum, and instruction to help prepare all students to meet challenging standards; and
- acquiring and implementing educational technology as a tool to improve learning.

Local interest in GOALS 2000 funding has been overwhelming: local requests to states exceeded first-year funds by as much as 200 to 600 percent depending on the state.

What's New in the GOALS 2000 Act

The GOALS 2000: Educate America Act was amended in 1996. Here's what's new:

- **Six additional ED-Flex states** were authorized by Congress. This program allows the secretary of education to delegate to state education agencies the authority to waive statutory and regulatory requirements in most federal education programs.
- The provisions in GOALS 2000 to establish the National Education Standards and Improvement Council (**NESIC**) were **repealed**.
- The authority to establish **opportunity-to-learn** standards and the requirement that states describe the "standards or strategies" for providing all students an opportunity to learn the content in state academic standards have been **repealed**.
- The specific requirements governing the

composition of the state planning panels and local planning panels have been eliminated. State plans must be developed by a **broad-based state panel** in cooperation with the state education agency and the governor.

- As an **alternative to submitting a plan** for education improvement to the secretary of education, in order to be eligible for continued funding after two years of participation in GOALS 2000 a state may instead: 1) submit an assurance from the governor and the chief state school officer that it has a completed plan that meets the requirements of the GOALS 2000 Act; 2) submit benchmarks and timelines for implementation of the plan and improvement of student performance; 3) make its education improvement plan, and the indicators it will use to judge progress in implementing the plan, widely available to the public within the state; and 4) report annually to the public on progress the state is mak-

ing in meeting its indicators of progress.

- **Local education agencies** in any state that was not participating in GOALS 2000 as of October 20, 1995 (Alabama, Montana, New Hampshire, Oklahoma, and Virginia) may, with the approval of the state education agency, **apply directly** to the U.S. Department of Education for a portion of their state's GOALS 2000 allotment. (Montana, New Hampshire, and Oklahoma are taking advantage of this option.)
- GOALS 2000 may not be construed to require a state, local education agency, or a school, as a condition of receiving GOALS 2000 assistance, to provide outcomes-based education, school-based health clinics, or social services.
- GOALS 2000 funds may be used to **acquire technology** and implement technology-enhanced curricula and instruction.

"I was really pleased that this legislation finally became the law of the land. . . . GOALS 2000 is the first federal program to focus on improving the quality of education in this country. . . . This law encourages states and localities to set high academic standards for America's children, and it makes it clear that we have high expectations for our future generations."

—Congressman Bill Goodling, Chairman of the Economic and Educational Opportunities Committee, 1994

For more information about GOALS 2000 call 202-401-0039.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Washington, DC 20202-0498

OFFICIAL BUSINESS
Penalty for Private Use, \$300

Postage & Fees Paid U.S. Department of Education Permit No. G-17

FIRST CLASS MAIL

GOALS 2000 Progress Report



State Contacts for GOALS 2000



FALL 1996

ALASKA

Helen Mehrkins
Ph: 907-465-8730 Fax: 907-465-2713

ALASKA FEDERATION

Dorothy M. Larson
Ph: 907-274-3611 Fax: 907-276-7989

AMERICAN SAMOA

Lui Tuitele
Ph: 684-633-1246 Fax: 684-633-5184

ARIZONA

Mike Hughes
Ph: 602-542-7461 Fax: 602-542-3590

ARKANSAS

Barbara Bankhead
Ph: 501-682-1189 Fax: 501-682-5010

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

Sandra Fox
Ph: 202-273-2339 Fax: 202-208-3312
Gaye Leia King
Ph: 202-219-3817 Fax: 202-208-3312

CALIFORNIA

Terry Emmett
Ph: 916-657-5140 Fax: 916-657-5457

COLORADO

Jan Silverstein
Ph: 303-866-6635 Fax: 303-830-0793

CONNECTICUT

Benjamin Dixon
Ph: 860-566-4185 Fax: 860-566-8964

DELAWARE

Carol O'Neill Mayhew
Ph: 302-739-4647 Fax: 302-739-4483

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Bettye Topps
Ph: 202-724-4222 Fax: 202-727-1516

FLORIDA

Wayne Largent
Ph: 904-488-6547 Fax: 904-921-9059

GEORGIA

Holly Robinson
Ph: 404-656-2598 Fax: 404-651-8737

GUAM

Nerissa Bretania-Shafer
Ph: 671-472-2241 Fax: 671-477-3407

HAWAII

Margery Gaza
Ph: 808-735-9023 Fax: 808-737-2708

IDAHO

Robert Watson
Ph: 208-334-3300 Fax: 208-334-2228
Internet: rpwatson@sde.state.id.us

ILLINOIS

Thomas Kerins/Warren Linburger
Ph: 217-782-6602 Fax: 217-782-6097

INDIANA

Linda Cornwell
Ph: 317-232-9177 Fax: 317-232-9121

IOWA

Marcus J. Haack
Ph: 515-281-8141 Fax: 515-242-6025

KANSAS

Phyllis Kelly
Ph: 913-296-3069 Fax: 913-296-7933

KENTUCKY

Rhonda Bailey
Ph: 502-564-3791 Fax: 502-564-6721
Internet: rbailey@plaza.kde.state.ky.us

LOUISIANA

William Miller
Ph: 504-342-3603 Fax: 504-342-7316

MAINE

Heidi McGinley
Ph: 207-287-5986 Fax: 207-287-5927

MARSHALL ISLANDS

Paulie Keliikoa
Ph: 692-625-7398 Fax: 692-625-3861

MARYLAND

Phyllis Bailey
Ph: 410-767-0520 Fax: 410-333-0714

MASSACHUSETTS

David Driscoll
Ph: 617-388-3300 ext. 323 Fax: 617-388-3392

MICHIGAN

Theresa Staten
Ph: 517-373-3354 Fax: 517-335-4565

MICRONESIA

Catalino I. Cantero
Ph: 691-320-2609 Fax: 691-320-5500

MINNESOTA

Stephanie Parsons
Ph: 612-296-1429 Fax: 612-297-2845

MISSISSIPPI

Suzanne Ulmer
Ph: 601-359-2561 Fax: 601-359-2040

MISSOURI

Craig Rector
Ph: 314-526-3232 Fax: 314-751-9434

NEBRASKA

Donlyn Rice
Ph: 402-471-5025 Fax: 402-471-4433
Internet: polly_f@nde4.nde.state.ne.us

NEVADA

Bill Arensdorf
Ph: 702-687-3187 Fax: 702-687-4499

NEW JERSEY

Anne O'Dea
Ph: 609-984-7992 Fax: 609-292-1645

NEW MEXICO

Denise Johnston
Ph: 505-827-1230 Fax: 505-827-6696

NEW YORK

Zelda Holcombe
Ph: 518-474-2238/518-473-7155 Fax: 518-486-7336

NORTH CAROLINA

Judy White
Ph: 919-715-1309 Fax: 919-715-5721

NORTH DAKOTA

Ron Stastney
Ph: 701-328-2276 Fax: 701-328-4770

NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS (CNMI)

William P. Matson
Ph: 9-011-670-322-6405 Fax: 9-011-670-322-6402

OHIO

Gene T. Harris
Ph: 614-728-5865 Fax: 614-644-5960
Internet: sdea_harris@ode.ohio.gov

OREGON

Joanne Flint
Ph: 503-378-8004 Fax: 503-373-7968

PALAU

Masa-Aki N. Emesiochl
Ph: 9-011-680-488-1003 Fax: 9-011-680-488-2830

PENNSYLVANIA

Jane Carroll
Ph: 717-783-1330 Fax: 717-783-6900

PUERTO RICO

Janet T. Santana
Ph: 809-281-6496 Fax: 809-751-6192

RHODE ISLAND

Loreto Gandara
Ph: 401-277-3124 x3 Fax: 401-277-6178

SOUTH CAROLINA

Pamela P. Pritchett
Ph: 803-734-8277 Fax: 803-734-6142

SOUTH DAKOTA

Margo Heinert
Ph: 605-773-4699 Fax: 605-773-6139

TENNESSEE

Amy Bearman
Ph: 615-741-2731 Fax: 615-741-6236
Internet: abearman@mail.state.tn.us

TEXAS

Criss Cloudt
Ph: 512-463-9701 Fax: 512-475-3499
Internet: ARRIGONA@TENET.EDU

UTAH

Bruce Griffin/Larry Horyna
Ph: 801-538-7762 Fax: 801-538-7521

VERMONT

Robert McNamara
Ph: 802-828-2752 Fax: 802-828-3140
Internet: BOBMNAS@AOL.COM

VIRGIN ISLANDS

Mario Golden
Ph: 809-773-6240 Fax: 809-773-5466

WASHINGTON

Hugh Walkup
Ph: 360-753-3223 Fax: 360-664-3314
Internet: H.WALKUP@INSPIRE.OSPI.WEDNET.EDU

WEST VIRGINIA

Teddi Cox
Ph: 304-558-2691 Fax: 304-558-0048

WISCONSIN

Pauline Nikolay
Ph: 608-266-3361 Fax: 608-267-1052

WYOMING

Linda Carter
Ph: 307-777-6252 Fax: 307-777-6234



Misconceptions About the GOALS 2000: Educate America Act

The passage of the GOALS 2000: Educate America Act in March of 1994 heralded a new role for the federal government in its support for education. No longer would the federal role focus only on narrow categorical programs. Now, it would also promote a comprehensive approach to help all students succeed academically. This new focus on achievement grew out of a bipartisan recognition that too many U.S. students were not achieving at the levels necessary for them to succeed in the modern economy.

As the federal government carries out this new role of flexible support for state and local school improvement efforts, some misconceptions have arisen about GOALS 2000. The 1996 Appropriations Act amended GOALS 2000 to clarify some of the misinformation about it. The following outlines some of the misconceptions, and addresses the concerns that have been raised.

Concern: GOALS 2000 will lead to a federal government takeover of local education.

Reality: Section 318 of the GOALS 2000: Educate America Act makes it absolutely clear that there are no mandates, and there will be no federal takeover: “Nothing in this Act shall be construed to authorize an officer or employee of the Federal Government to mandate, direct, or control a State, local educational agency, or school’s curriculum, program of instruction, or allocation of State or local resources or mandate a State or any subdivision thereof to spend any funds or incur any costs not paid for under this Act.” Section 319 of the Act again clarifies that Congress “reaffirms that the responsibility for control of education is reserved to the States and local school systems.”

The goal of the GOALS 2000: Educate America Act is to encourage local community-based actions that meet pressing educational needs, help more students achieve to higher standards, increase parental participation, and improve teaching. GOALS 2000 provides federal support for local and state reforms. The Act provides great flexibility in how states and communities develop and implement their reform plans.

There are specific statements throughout the GOALS 2000 Act that nothing in the Act will reduce, modify, or undercut state and local responsibility for control of education. In addition, participation in GOALS 2000 is completely voluntary.

Concern: Our schools will henceforth be pushed toward a philosophy known as Outcome-Based Education (OBE).

Reality: The legislation does not promote any particular education philosophy or approach; that is a local decision. GOALS 2000 focuses on upgrading **academic** achievement and preparing students for the world of work. Each state, school district, and school determines what content it wants students to learn, and whether or not that content should focus strictly on core academic and basic skills. The federal government will not be involved in those kinds of local decisions.

In addition, an amendment to GOALS 2000 in the 1996 Appropriations Act mandates that the federal government cannot, as a con-

dition of receiving GOALS 2000 assistance, require a state, local education agency, or a school, to provide Outcome-Based education.

Concern: GOALS 2000 creates the National Education Standards and Improvement Council (NESIC), which will act as a “national school board” and control what is taught in the classroom.

Reality: NESIC was eliminated upon passage of the 1996 Appropriations Act.

NESIC was initially recommended in 1992 by a bipartisan group, authorized by Congress and appointed by Secretary Lamar Alexander, and co-chaired by Governor Carroll Campbell (R-SC) and Governor Roy Romer (D-CO). The council included, among others, Representative Goodling, Senator Hatch, Lynne Cheney, and Chester Finn.

The purpose of the council was to provide an independent review of the quality of model national and state academic standards being developed by states and professional organizations in each discipline. These standards would have been submitted voluntarily. There was no requirement that a state receive certification as a condition of participating in any federal education program, such as Chapter 1, Drug-Free Schools, vocational education, or GOALS 2000.

Concern: GOALS 2000 requires the use of national standards, such as the recently released national history standards.

Reality: Under GOALS 2000, states and school districts determine *their own* academic standards that outline what they want their children to learn. If they choose, states and communities can use voluntary national standards developed by professional organizations as models to design their own challenging standards. Several states are adopting parts of the model national standards while others are developing their own standards. The use of national standards is voluntary. No funds are tied to the use of these standards, or of any subset of these standards. No law or regulation requires their use in any way.

Although the initial release of the history standards evoked a great deal of controversy, the standards have since been revised, and efforts to develop voluntary national standards in other content area—coordinated by such groups as the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, the Center for Civic Education, and the National Geographic Society—have been well received. Drafts of these standards have been reviewed by hundreds of teachers and other concerned citizens. The standards represent what teachers and scholars believe students should know in subject areas such as math, geography, civics, and the arts at certain points in their education. The much acclaimed math standards, released in 1989, are being used in classrooms across the nation.

Concern: GOALS 2000 will encourage the proliferation of school-based health clinics, and move schools away from the fundamental duty of education and into the provision of reproductive services.

Reality: The focus of the GOALS 2000: Educate America Act is improving student achievement, and promoting greater parental

participation in education. GOALS 2000 does not change the fact that decisions regarding school-based health clinics and the distribution of contraceptives remain a state and local responsibility. In addition, section 1018 of the Act requires that states and local communities that choose to use federal funds for health programs must develop procedures to encourage family participation in such programs. The 1996 Appropriations Act also included an amendment that expressly states that GOALS 2000 may not be construed to require a state, local education agency, or a school, as a condition of receiving GOALS 2000 assistance, to provide school-based health clinics or social services.

Concern: GOALS 2000 is another burdensome federal program with a multitude of rules and regulations.

Reality: GOALS 2000 is a responsible block grant. It sets broad objectives and goals, but allows the states to determine the means to reach them. The Department of Education has not, and will not, issue any regulations for GOALS 2000. The Department of Education has designed a streamlined application procedure for states that cuts paperwork considerably. The initial application for states to request GOALS 2000 money was only 4 pages long, asks only for information required by law to award funds, and eliminates numerous forms.

Concern: GOALS 2000 promotes opportunity-to-learn standards that focus on inputs rather than on standards for student achievement.

Reality: GOALS 2000 reflects an unwavering commitment to results. Developing and implementing challenging standards for what students should know and be able to do in key subject areas, and effectively measuring student performance against these standards, are cornerstones of the bill. States and school districts—not the federal government—will define and monitor these standards. The federal government will not be involved in monitoring individual schools or teachers.

In addition, the 1996 Appropriations Act eliminated the authority to establish voluntary model national opportunity-to-learn standards as well as the requirement that states describe their “standards or strategies” for providing all students an opportunity to learn.

Concern: The GOALS 2000 Act is the result of the liberal education establishment’s wish list.

Reality: GOALS 2000 passed the Congress with strong bipartisan support, and has been endorsed by national business organizations, including the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Alliance of Business, the Business Roundtable, and the National Association of Manufacturers. The GOALS 2000 Act supports an education reform agenda that was spearheaded by governors of both parties. It is a balanced bill, one that provides national leadership and some federal funds to support grassroots, bottom-up reform.

For more information about GOALS 2000 call 202-401-0039.