

# Archived Information

## GOALS 2000 STATE AND LOCAL EDUCATION SYSTEMIC IMPROVEMENT

**Goal: To support comprehensive state and local education reform tied to high standards for all students.**

**Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives:** Goals 2000 funds the development of standards (Objective 1.1), teacher quality (Objective 1.4), and family and community involvement (Objective 1.5). It also authorizes the establishment of Ed-Flex, which provides states with waiver authority (Objective 4.2).

FY 2000—\$491,000,000

FY 2001—\$0 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: HELP IMPROVE STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT IN CORE SUBJECTS THROUGH GOALS 2000 OPERATING IN CONCERT WITH OTHER FEDERAL PROGRAMS AND STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES.

**Indicator 1.1 Meeting or exceeding state performance standards: States and districts that have implemented systemic, standards-based reform will show increases in the percentage of students meeting or exceeding proficient levels in reading and math on their state assessment systems.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	<p><b>Status:</b> Unable to judge.</p> <p><b>Explanation:</b> Goals 2000 began the Federal effort to promote systemic, standards-based reform and is aligned closely with ESEA Title I requirements for standards. With implementation beginning in 1995, state standards were expected to be in place in 1998 and aligned assessments in 2000. It is following such implementation that we expect to be able to measure progress of students against the standards.</p>	<p><b>Source:</b> Goals 2000 Evaluation Design study. <i>Frequency:</i> Planned. <i>Next Update:</i> Planned.</p> <p><b>Validation Procedure:</b> No formal verification procedure.</p> <p><b>Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:</b> Data will be collected and reported in accordance with ED <u>Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data</u>.</p>
<b>1999:</b>	<b>No data available</b>	<b>No target set</b>		
2000:		Baseline to be established		
2001:		Increase over baseline		

OBJECTIVE 2: STIMULATE AND ACCELERATE STATE AND LOCAL REFORM EFFORTS.

**Indicator 2.1 Standards for core subjects: All states will have content and performance standards in place in reading and mathematics.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>States with content standards</i>			<p><b>Status:</b> Positive movement toward target.</p> <p><b>Explanation:</b> Goals 2000 is aligned closely with ESEA Title I, which requires states to have content and performance standards in place by 1998. The challenges to states in developing and implementing content and performance standards were more difficult than those anticipated in the timeline established in IASA for implementation.</p>	<p><b>Source:</b> Title I peer review records. <i>Frequency:</i> Annually. <i>Next Update:</i> 2000.</p> <p><b>Validation Procedure:</b> Data supplied by Title I Program Office. No formal verification procedure applied.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
<b>1999:</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>All</b>		
2000:		All		
2001:		All		

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>States with performance standards</i>			As a result, several states requested and received waivers allowing extensions of the deadlines for having performance standards in place.	<b>Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:</b> Title I peer review guidance directs determination of status of content and performance standards. By design and by the legislation, Title I peer review records are the authoritative data source for this indicator.
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>		
<b>1999:</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>All</b>		
2000:		All		
2001:		All		

**Indicator 2.2 Aligned assessments: By 2000-01, all states will have assessments aligned to content and performance standards for mathematics and reading or language arts.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>States are required to have aligned assessments in place by 2000-01; in 1999, no states submitted evidence to ED that they have final assessments in place.</i>			<b>Status:</b> No 1999 data, but progress toward target is likely.  <b>Explanation:</b> Goals 2000 is aligned closely with ESEA Title I requirements, which require states to have aligned assessments by 2000-01. Goals 2000 is using the Title I process for evaluating progress in developing aligned assessments. In 2000, it is expected that states will begin to submit evidence that they have developed and are implementing aligned assessments. ED distributed peer review guidance for aligned assessments in fall 1999 and conducted technical workshops for states.	<b>Source:</b> Title I peer review records. <i>Frequency:</i> Annually. <i>Next Update:</i> 2000.  <b>Validation Procedure:</b> Verified by Department of Education attestation process and ED <u><a href="#">Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data</a></u> .  <b>Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:</b> Title I peer review guidance directs determination of assessment alignment. By design and by the legislation, Title I peer review records are the authoritative data source for this indicator.
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>		
<b>1999:</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>		
2000:		40		
2001:		All		

**Indicator 2.3 School's alignment of key processes: Principals in states or districts with standards will indicate that increasing percentages of schools have curriculum, instruction, professional development, and assessments aligned to standards.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage reporting curriculum and instruction aligned</i>			<b>Status:</b> Positive trend toward targets.  <b>Explanation:</b> In the 1998-99 school year, for reading and mathematics, 69 percent of principals reported that their schools have curriculum and instruction aligned with standards to a great extent, 70 percent reported that changes in professional development have occurred as a result of the implementation of standards, 38 percent reported assessments aligned to standards to a great extent, and 26 percent reported alignment in all three of these areas.  Questions yielding data for the 1997-98 school year are similar to, but not exactly the same as, questions yielding the data for the 1998-99 school year.	<b>Source:</b> National Longitudinal Survey of Schools, unpublished tabulations. <i>Frequency:</i> Annually. <i>Next Update:</i> 2001 for 1999-2000. School-Level Implementation of Standards-based Reform, 1999.  <b>Validation Procedure:</b> Data supplied by Westat. No formal verification procedure applied.  <b>Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:</b> Data is self-reported from principals.
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>		
1998:	51			
<b>1999:</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>Continuous increase</b>		
2000:		75		
2001:		N/A		
<i>Percentage reporting professional development aligned</i>				
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>		
1998:	41			
<b>1999:</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>Continuous increase</b>		
2000:		75		
2001:		N/A		
<i>Percentage reporting assessments aligned</i>				
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>		
1998:	35			
<b>1999:</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>Continuous increase</b>		
2000:		75		
2001:		N/A		

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage reporting curriculum and instruction, professional development, and assessments aligned</i>				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1998:	No data available			
<b>1999:</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>Continuous increase</b>		
2000:		50		
2001:		N/A		

OBJECTIVE 3: PROMOTE EXCELLENT TEACHING THAT WILL ENABLE ALL STUDENTS TO REACH CHALLENGING STATE AND/OR LOCAL STANDARDS.

**Indicator 3.1 Teachers' knowledge of standards: Increasing percentages of teachers will report that they feel very well prepared to implement state or district content and performance standards.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	<b>Status:</b> No 1999 data reported, but progress toward target is likely.  <b>Explanation:</b> Data is collected from a biennial survey. As increasing numbers of states have content and performance standards in place for longer periods of time, it is expected that teacher preparedness to teach to these standards will increase.	<b>Source:</b> Teacher Quality: A Report on the Preparation & Qualifications of Public School Teachers, 1999. <i>Frequency:</i> Biennially. <i>Next Update:</i> 2001 for 2000.  <b>Validation Procedure:</b> Data validated by NCES review procedures and NCES statistical standards.  <b>Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:</b> Data is self-reported data.
1998:	38%			
<b>1999:</b>	<b>No data available</b>	<b>Continuous increase</b>		
2000:		50%		
2001:		Continuous increase		

OBJECTIVE 4: PROMOTE PARENTAL AND COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT IN STUDENT LEARNING THROUGH THE PARENT INFORMATION AND RESOURCE ASSISTANCE CENTERS (PIRCs).

**Indicator 4.1 Parent Information Resource Centers beneficiaries: Parents will report that they are more knowledgeable about education issues after receiving information and services from the PIRCS.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Parents reporting increased knowledge about education issues</i>			<b>Status:</b> Unable to judge.  <b>Explanation:</b> The program is expected to be reauthorized with the ESEA. The Department has proposed evaluation activities and requested funds for national activities that could be used for evaluation. Data for this indicator would be collected through the planned evaluation.	<b>Source:</b> Planned national evaluation. <i>Frequency:</i> Planned. <i>Next Update:</i> Planned.  <b>Validation Procedure:</b> N/A.  <b>Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:</b> N/A.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
<b>1999:</b>	<b>No data available</b>	<b>N/A</b>		
2000:	Baseline to be established	N/A		
2001:		Baseline to be established		

**KEY STRATEGIES**

Strategies Continued from 1999

- ❖ Provide assistance at the state and school levels for improved school performance and increased family and community engagement in learning, through Department service teams, technical assistance centers, and state school support teams.
- ❖ Support interstate working groups to discuss how to improve and measure student achievement and to identify the types of Goal 2000 activities that support gains in student achievement.
- ❖ Encourage states and districts to share their model standards as they relate to the reading, math, and college preparation initiatives.

## **KEY STRATEGIES (CONTINUED)**

### Strategies Continued from 1999

- ❖ Expand public understanding of the need for challenging academic standards by disseminating information on standards-based reform through states, national associations, and other stakeholders.
- ❖ Help states and districts develop and implement aligned assessments designed to improve student learning by providing financial support under Goals 2000 and Title I and by encouraging the sharing of effective methodologies.

### New or Strengthened Strategies

- ❖ Convene state cluster meetings to evaluate program effectiveness, systemic cross-program planning, and opportunities to sustain reform initiatives.
- ❖ Conduct evaluations of systemic, standards-based reform efforts within states, local districts, and schools and its impact on student achievement.

## **HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES**

- ❖ Goals 2000 grants and subgrants require states and LEAs to develop a comprehensive school reform plan that aligns all local, state, and federal programs with state learning goals. In most states this comprehensive plan serves as a foundation for the consolidated plans required under the 1994 reauthorization of ESEA. Consequently, Goals 2000 is intimately connected with the alignment of all ESEA programs with each other. Goals 2000 activities have been most closely aligned with ESEA Title I reform efforts (standards, assessments, accountability, schoolwides, CSR, etc.), Parent Information and Resource Centers, Comprehensive Assistance Centers, and the Technology Literacy Challenge Fund (TLCF). Initial Goals 2000 grants to states included funds for technology planning; those plans became the foundation for TLCF activities.

## **CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL**

- ❖ States have varying levels of commitment to systemic standards-based reform. Thus, their definition and approach to systemic reform varies considerably.
- ❖ States are at varying stages in their development of standards and aligned assessment systems.

## **INDICATOR CHANGES**

### **From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)**

#### Adjusted

- ❖ FY 1999 Indicator 1.1 was changed in FY 2000 to focus exclusively on NAEP and targets were refined to be more specific.
- ❖ FY 1999 Indicator 1.2 was changed in FY 2000 to be more specific.
- ❖ FY 1999 Indicator 2.2 was changed to better align with ESEA Title 1 and became Indicator 2.1 in FY 2000.
- ❖ FY 1999 Indicator 2.3 was changed to better align with ESEA Title 1 and became Indicator 2.2 in FY 2000.
- ❖ FY 1999 Indicator 3.4 was made more specific and became Indicator 3.1.
- ❖ FY 1999 Indicator 4.1 was changed in FY 2000 to better align with an ongoing data source.
- ❖ FY 1999 Indicator 4.2 became Indicator 2.3 in FY in 2000.
- ❖ FY 1999 Indicator 4.3 referred to the numbers of teachers; in FY 2000 the reference was changed to the percentage of teachers.
- ❖ FY 1999 Indicator 5.1 was made more specific in FY 2000.

#### Dropped

- ❖ FY 1999 Indicators 2.1 and 2.4 were dropped in FY 2000.
- ❖ FY 1999 Indicators 3.1, 3.2, and 3.3 were dropped in FY 2000.
- ❖ FY 1999 Indicator 5.2 was dropped in FY 2000.

### **From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)**

#### Adjusted

- ❖ The order of Indicators 3 and Indicators 4 was switched.
- ❖ Indicator 1.1 (formerly Indicator 1.2—meeting or exceeding state performance standards: by 2002, 32 states with 2 years of assessment data and aligned standards and assessments will report an increase in the percentage of students meeting or exceeding proficient and advanced levels in reading and math on their state assessment systems) was changed as follows: (a) the 2002 date was dropped from the indicator because the program will not be funded beyond FY 2000; (b) the unit of analysis was changed to states and districts that have implemented systemic, standards-based reform, which is a better measure of the fidelity of implementation of Goals 2000 than 2 years of assessment data with aligned assessments; (c) the word “report” was changed to “show” (d) the measure was simplified to the percentage meeting or exceeding proficient levels rather than proficient and advanced levels, and (e) state assessment systems was simplified to state assessments.

## **INDICATOR CHANGES (CONTINUED)**

### **From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)**

#### Adjusted

- ❖ Indicator 2.1 (standards for core subjects: increasing numbers of states will have content and performance standards in place in reading and math. By 2000, all states will have content and performance standards in place) was changed so that it no longer addresses time periods before 2000.
- ❖ Indicator 2.2 (aligned assessments: increasing numbers of states will have assessments aligned to content and performance standards for two core subjects. By 2000, 40 states will have aligned assessments; by 2001, all will) was changed to better align with the Title I legislation.
- ❖ Indicator 4.1 (formerly Indicator 3.1—PAT/HIPPY participation the number of families who participate in Parents as Teachers (PAT) or Home Instruction for Preschool Youngsters (HIPPY), will increase annually. By 2000, approximately 14,000 families will participate in PAT or HIPPY was changed to better measure impact.
- ❖ Indicator 3.1 (formerly Indicator 4.1—teachers' knowledge of standards) was modified so that the wording is better aligned with the survey question used to gather performance data.

#### Dropped

- ❖ Former Indicator 1.1 (shared indicator on student performance on national assessments: Between 1992 and 2002, the percentages of students who meet basic, proficient, and advanced levels in reading and math on the National Assessment of Educational Progress will increase) was dropped. This indicator was dropped because it is too broad to measure the impact of Goals 2000; the impact of Goals 2000 depends to some extent on the degree of implementation at the state level and on the support for implementing systemic, standards-based reform given to districts, both of which has been uneven nationally.
- ❖ Indicator 4.2 (professional development: the percentage of teachers who indicate that they are engaged in professional development that is enabling them to teach to challenging standards will increase annually. By 2000, 50 percent of teachers will report such participation) was deleted as Indicator 4.1 sufficiently captures the construct measured by this indicator.
- ❖ Indicator 5.1 (satisfaction with Goals 2000 administration: Increasing percentages of Goals 2000 customers (e.g., SEA and LEA staff) report that the technical assistance provided by federal Goals 2000 staff is of high quality, useful, and meets their needs) will be retained for internal management purposes but was removed from this performance plan.

New—None.