

From: Donna Garner <wgarner1@hot.rr.com>

Date: May 3, 2015 at 6:12:43 PM CDT

To: Robin Alice Linahan , Rebecca Forest , "HOGE, ANITA"

Subject: ROBIN, PLEASE LISTEN TO THE PODCAST MADE WITH ALICE
LINAHAN ON 2.13.14 -- 5.3.15

[If people want to share this e-mail or any parts of this e-mail with other people, it is fine with me. – Donna Garner]

Robin, it just occurred to me that you have probably not listened to the podcast that Alice, Rebecca, and I made on 2.13.14. I posted the podcast at the end of the WND article about Hillary. If you will listen to the podcast, you will have a much better understanding about why and how Goals 2000, NCEE, OBE, School-to-Work, standards-based/workforce development, etc. entered Texas.

[2.13.14 – PODCAST – Starting at marker 7:20 [technical difficulties before that marker], Donna Garner gives the historical background on Hillary Clinton, NCEE, Common Core, English Success Standards (curriculum standards written by teachers for teachers), inexpensive tools parents can use to teach their children to read/spell/write/compute — <https://soundcloud.com/alice-linahan/women-on-the-wall-radio-choice>]

As I recall, the Gov. of Texas [probably Gov. Bill Clements or else Gov. Mark White] appointed Skip Meno as the Tex. Comm. of Ed. Meno came from Rochester, New York. That was the “birthplace” of NCEE/Marc Tucker/Clinton/Magaziner/Cuomo. Once Meno got here, he fixed it where members of the Texas Education Agency staff (and some influential Texas Senators) were sent for NCEE training and were put on NCEE Boards.

All of this was done with taxpayers’ dollars without the knowledge of the Texas State Board of Education and the public. Because we did not have computers/Internet back then, it took years for us to uncover all of this. I wrote a research report for Texas Senator David Sibley on 3.24.96 and helped Richard Watson (SBOE member) write his report on 3.4.97. Before the Internet, it was amazingly slow to do research on current topics. [I have posted these two reports at the bottom of this page.]

Around Sept. 1992 or 1993 (?) I took a day off from my teaching duties (at my own expense) to go down to the SBOE meeting to speak against Goals 2000. What I discovered was that the “big cahuna” was not Goals 2000 that day but was the presentation by Skip Meno of a huge document that meant new standards were to be written for every single course in the Texas public schools. The few conservatives on the Board were completely caught off guard, but the chamber that day was filled with TEA staffers (and their buddies) who knew the rewrite of the standards (i.e., TEKS) would provide many lucrative positions for “consultants.” The TEA staffers knew that the end result would be jobs, all new curriculum, lots of new teacher training, etc. for Type #2 advocates. When the SBOE voted for Skip Meno’s plan that day, the Type #2 people were elated!

[4.15.15 -- When I wrote this report for Texas Senator David Sibley back in 1996, common people (such as myself) did not have computers that could format the way we do now; nor did we have the ability to include attachments. Therefore, I produced this report as a hard copy with hard copies of the attachments. Unfortunately, I do not know where the attachments are that accompanied this report; but perhaps the content without the attachments will give the public some research information on Hillary, NCEE, Marc Tucker, Goals 2000, etc. Also, the public using computerized research libraries may be able to locate some of the sources referenced as attachments.

As people read these two reports, they need to remember that Bill Clinton was President from 1993 to 2001. One of these reports was written in 1996 and the other in 1997. Bill Clinton served two terms but was impeached for perjury before a grand jury because he obstructed justice by lying about having an affair with White House employee Monica Lewinsky. He was acquitted by the U. S. Senate and served his complete term of office.

**So far as I know, Texas Senator David Sibley ignored my report and did absolutely nothing to stop the federal takeover of the public schools, and the same thing held true for Richard Watson’s report. It was not until Robert Scott became the new Texas Commissioner of Education and the voters elected 7 out of 15 conservative members to the SBOE that Texas once again mounted an effort to move our public schools back into the Type #1 philosophy of education.
-- Donna Garner]**

=====

March 24, 1996

**Senator David Sibley
411 Woodfall Drive
Waco, TX 76712**

Dear Senator Sibley:

Several weeks ago you asked me to research Goals 2000 and its impact on Texas education. I wish I had time to do a more thorough job, but here is what I have managed to document substantively. Please keep in mind that I am a classroom teacher with rather limited resources of time, money, and political knowledge; but perhaps there will be some information here that will help you.

Rather than bore you with all the quantities of information on the subject of Goals 2000, I am citing parts of specific documents, some of which will accompany this report.

As you know, Goals 2000's background is very suspect. President Bush and the nation's governors agreed on the six National Goals at a University of Virginia summit meeting in 1989. There were no federal dollars involved, no federal bureaucracy was created to administer it, and it was state-centered.

Shortly thereafter President Clinton was elected, and the "national program of statehouse leadership turned into a federal government initiative" (Izumi 3) which got tied to the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Along came Mrs. Clinton and her husband who had close associations with Marc Tucker and Ira Magaziner (of national health care fame). Editorial writer Robert Holland, who writes for the WASHINGTON TIMES, stated in his article on October 25, 1993, that Mrs. Hillary Clinton was a director of the pro-OBE (outcome-based-education) National Center on Education and the Economy (NCEE) which Marc Tucker spun off from a Carnegie study in the mid-1980's. NCEE sponsored a Commission on the Skills of the American Work Force with Ira Magaziner as the chairman. The final report

concluded that employers were more interested in their employees having good social attitudes than in their having basic literacy and math skills.

This NCEE report led the Labor Department to produce the Secretary's Commission on Achieving Necessary Skills (SCANS). It was this report along with Marc Tucker's influence which led Texas under Commissioner Meno to conduct the Real-World Forums.

By the way, Hillary Clinton is presently being investigated by New York State Attorney General Dennis Vacco because she was paid over \$101,630 by the NCEE without being listed among the five highest-paid people in this non-profit organization. NCEE never registered with the state lobbying authorities yet spent \$2 million in lobbying the state capitol. The organization was funded by a grant of \$5 million from New York; and Governor Cuomo, who was offered a seat on the Supreme Court by President Clinton, became NCEE's honorary chairman. According to a story in the NEW YORK POST dated January 11, 1996, Marc Tucker (whose salary went up 600% between 1988 and 1993) became an "instant authority" on education. He had no previous education training or experience yet proclaimed in 1988 that NCEE would restructure education in Rochester, New York. In an article in the ROCHESTER DEMOCRAT AND CHRONICLE, May 7, 1995, it is stated that Tucker's restructuring school-to-work strategy produced terrible results with miserable test scores and a high dropout rate ("Update" 1). As I will explain later in this paper, the school-to-work initiative forms a large part of Goals 2000.

Holland further stated in his 1993 article that Mrs. Clinton also served on the board of the New Standards Project (NSP) which was co-directed by Marc Tucker. Many states signed contracts and paid great sums of money to the NSP to write state standards with the promise that they would be benchmarked to the national standards. It is no wonder that the "state standards" all seem to look as if they were "cut out of the same cloth" (Holland). Remember the controversial U. S. History Standards which came out last year and cost \$2 million to produce?

It is this national standards movement which has impacted severely the Clarification of the Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS) in Texas. The national

standards movement has a clear agenda to drive schools away from explicit skill instruction and standardized testing toward such subjective measures as performance-based assessments, portfolio evaluations, and outcome-based-education. A few of us on the Clarification Teams have continued to kick and scream as the OBE wording was arbitrarily placed on each TEKS draft document.

At the top of our present Essential Elements, it reads, "The student shall be provided opportunities to." This type of wording indicates that the classroom is to be teacher directed; the EE's tell the teacher what to teach but puts the responsibility for learning on the student's shoulders.

This is what the November 1994 election was all about--a public outcry at the polls to return this country to a degree of personal responsibility; the voters want us educators to help make their children accountable for their actions. We teachers should do our very best to present our material in a way which motivates students to learn, but the students must be held ultimately responsible for their own learning.

Robert Holland says in his book NOT WITH MY CHILD YOU DON'T:

There is a distinctive jargon that usually accompanies OBE: 'what children should know and be able to do,' [emphasis added] and 'authentic assessment,' to cite just two examples. And where OBE goes, you normally will find advocates slamming memorization and structured drill, any form of ability-grouping, competition, and standardized testing. At the same time, you'll hear high praise for group or cooperative learning, portfolio assessment, thematic (or interdisciplinary) learning, whole language (as opposed to phonics) to teach reading, 'real life' or socially relevant projects, the overriding importance of self-esteem, mandatory community service...globalism, multiculturalism, and environmentalism (3-1).

Because of the "national standards" movement under Goals 2000, we on the Clarification Teams had the decision made for us by the Connections Team that each writing team must start its document with the outcome-based-education

wording "what students should know and be able to do." The funding for the Connections Team came directly from Goals 2000 ("Funding").

This new wording at the beginning of each TEKS will force Texas into OBE testing and grading in every classroom in our state which means an endless cycle of reteaching/retesting and subjective grading of projects. The science TEKS indicate that assessment of students will be done almost entirely through performance-based assessments for which there is no possible way to standardize grading across the state.

It is important to have a clear understanding of what OBE really is.

William Spady is one of the leading OBE theorists. One of his main premises is that "All students can learn and succeed." This sounds good on the surface, but consider what author Wayne Wolfe says in his article dated April 1993 in FREE WORLD RESEARCH SPECIAL REPORT:

Currently, not all students are succeeding. We can define success as passing courses, advancing in grade level, and graduating. At each level, the concept of failure applies. If the students don't exhibit the required knowledge, they fail. They are then remediated by either retaking the course, being held back a grade and taught the material over again, or not graduating which can be remediated by programs such as GED.

If ALL students will succeed, how will that be attained, especially for students that have physical learning disabilities? ...The bell curve is a graph produced when we plot grade level along the horizontal axis and number of students who achieve that level along the vertical axis.

Relatively few students attain the grades of F and A, relatively more students attain D and B, and the largest number attain the average of C.

In the field of statistics, that is referred to as 'normal distribution' and is common throughout nature...whatever characteristic is measured, the majority lies in the middle...

Spady and other OBE educators...denigrate the bell curve...[They ignore the fact that] if people were perfect, we would be off the scale, with every student exhibiting perfect knowledge of everything. But we aren't perfect. So there will always be students who do relatively better or worse than average. Theoretically, it would be possible to institute a system of total equality. where there were no deviations from the norm.

But practically, where would that level lie? It would necessarily have to be at the end of MINIMUM ACHIEVEMENT...How else can you eliminate variations? The student who has the lowest intellectual capability CANNOT attain the level of the student with the highest capability, so who will have to change? The student with the highest ability can certainly be brought down in results easier than the student with the lowest ability can be brought up...The public education system is obligated to provide an environment where every student has the same opportunity to succeed academically. But to attempt to guarantee equality of results is ludicrous (Wolfe 2).

Robert Holland also devotes a whole chapter in his book to the fallacies of OBE. He states:

One word summarizes OBE's fatal contradiction--deadlines. The advocates of pure OBE want to do away with them. Children are to be allowed to take a test over and over again--as many times as they need or want--until all have reached a common standard of mastery. Failure is abolished from the vocabulary. No one fails; all will succeed. Competition is out; cooperation is in.

At the same time, OBE's proponents claim to favor education that is geared to the 'real-life' context of work and relevant social issues. They contend that their approach...will prepare children to succeed as workers in the 21st-Century global marketplace.

Sorry, but that doesn't add up. It's nonsense.

Deadlines are a part of daily existence...A farmer must meet deadlines to get his crop to the market. A junior executive must prepare a

report in time for its presentation at a board meeting. A lawyer must prepare a brief in time for it to be filed in court on behalf of his client. A physician's deadlines for expeditious treatment may make the difference between life and death (Not 7-1).

(For my personal experience with OBE, please refer to the attached letters dated September 8, 1994, and March 4, 1995.)

What is wrong with Goals 2000 besides the fact that it is built on the unrealistic principles of outcome-based-education? There is simply no doubt but that Goals 2000 transfers power from the state and local education authorities to the federal bureaucracy in Washington, D. C.

Although the Clinton administration emphasizes the "voluntary" nature of the goals, the Goals 2000 Act uses the command "will" over forty times in describing what the federal government expects states and local districts to do to meet the demands of the eight National Goals. The word 'will' is not permissive; it is a direct mandate which requires the states and locals to do a specific thing (particularly if they have accepted federal funding attached to the Act); and federal courts will probably interpret it that way. "One expert on legal drafting observes that the word 'will' not only expresses a future contingency, but also 'when the relationship is a delicate one, expresses both parties' obligations.' Under such a definition...the states could find themselves forced to implement the goals" (Izumi 6).

The Act sets up Resource and Technical Planning Groups on School Readiness whose duty it will be to create guidelines for early childhood assessments.

Will the federal government decide on the validity of assessments in areas such as bilingualism?

The National Education Standards and Improvement Council (NESIC) will oversee the "voluntary" national content and student performance standards.

(I will address later in this document just how "voluntary" these content standards have been in Texas.)

A number of federal research institutes are also created under the Goals 2000 Act. One group is charged with identifying approaches which promote gender equity in elementary and secondary education.

Another layer of bureaucracy is set up in Section 941(h) which divides the U. S. into regions where regional education laboratories will be set up.

They will be governed by unelected, appointed boards of special interest representatives and will basically become advocacy groups to push local schools into restructuring -- possibly to include OBE.

One of the most pernicious parts of Goals 2000 is the federal funding which accompanies the Act and which states can only get if they meet the "voluntary" requirements. Since Texas accepted the Goals 2000 money, we now have to adhere to the goals, objectives, and standards laid out by the Act. One of the mandates says Texas has to have a "process for aligning State or local curricula, instructional materials, and State assessments with the State content standards and State student performance standards" (Izumi 9).

The Act explicitly recommends that state strategies include instructional materials which are gender equitable and multicultural; in education language, this usually means that the materials are anti-male and anti-Western.

The Act also tells states how they must divide the federal funding. Section 306(f), p. 164, states that the way to achieve parental and community involvement is to increase "the access of all students to social services, health care, nutrition, related services, and child care services, and locating such services in schools, cooperating service agencies, community-based centers, or other convenient sites" (Izumi 11).

Do the health care services mean "reproductive services" as advocated by ex-Surgeon General Jocelyn Elders?

There is no getting around the fact that Section 307 of the Goals 2000 Act mandates that the Secretary of Education is authorized to give the approval of a state's application for funding; and after the first year of funding, the Secretary

will approve more funding only if a state's improvement plan is satisfactory. This provision explains why Texas, after accepting the first year's funding, is under irresistible pressure to implement the "thirty-five objectives listed under the eight national goals" (Izumi 11) so that they can get more funding. (Texas has received about \$33 million over two years). According to the Family Research Council, less than half the funding for Goals 2000 was to reach local schools in the first year of existence (FY 94) with 60% of the money being used to fund bureaucratic layers to create new frameworks for education (Marshall 1-10).

(Please see attached letter from Indiana Congressman Dan Burton dated March 28, 1995, to the members of the Indiana State Board of Education. This letter outlines in a very explicit manner the offensive sections of Goals 2000.)

A companion piece to the Goals 2000 Act is the School-To-Work Opportunities Act of 1994 (STW) which ties the school and the workplace together through the creation of a "skills certificate." A state will have to prove that its plan is following the national goals and standards contained in the Goals 2000 Act before it can receive its School-To-Work grant.

The skills certificate certifies that a student "has mastered skills at levels that are at least as challenging as skill standards endorsed by the National Skills Standards Board" (Izumi 15). The problem with this is that if the government is handing out the skills certificates to select students, those students will have a definite advantage in getting a job or getting into college. What will happen to those states who have resisted participation in Goals 2000 and who do not give out "skills certificates"?

What will happen to children who have been educated in private schools or home schools and have opposed participation in Goals 2000 and STW because of fear of government control? Since the skills certificates issued under any state plan must meet the skills levels and standards set by the National Skills Standards Board, it will be this federal Board who will set the criteria for getting a skills certificate, not the states or local schools. The curricula in the public schools will end up being shaped to improve the chances of students obtaining these certificates, and that means that the federal government will be directly

intruding into the local classrooms through setting curricula methodology (Izumi 16-17). It is easy to see that the "voluntary" standards can easily turn into "mandatory" requirements.

Now let me explain just how Goals 2000 and School-To-Work have impacted the Clarification Process for the Essential Knowledge and Skills in Texas.

In the fall of 1993, the Real-World Forums were conducted in Texas. These were set up as a result of the influence of the SCANS report and Marc Tucker, who spoke before the SBOE. According to Mary McGarr, Secretary of the Katy ISD School Board, Commissioner Meno was frustrated over his effort to implement OBE in Texas and devised a plan to make the public think that they were coming up with the reform movement. The TEA proclaimed massive participation by the public in the Real-World Forums, but Mary states:

Twenty-five people per meeting from not all the school districts in Texas are telling the rest of us what we want...It is also notable that the AUSTIN AMERICAN reported on November 18, 1993, [quoting Cynthia Levinson, TEA Project Manager of Real-World Forums] that only 375 forums with about 9,000 participants had been held. Leaving only November 19, (a Friday), Nov. 22 and 23 (the two days before Thanksgiving vacation) and November 29 and 30 before the end of the designated November time period, one has to wonder when and where 675 forums with 16,500 participants were held in just five days, two of which are not usually used for public meetings (1-2).

A member of the State Panel on Student Skills and Knowledge told me that Meno wanted to bring Spady (OBE guru) into the state to facilitate the process but had to settle for Meno's New York OBE friend Daggett instead. One of the members on the panel who was not very savvy accidentally blurted out, "When are we going to get down to business and implement OBE?" When he said that, Commissioner Meno became very agitated because he did not want the agenda to be so openly revealed. The source also said that she finally understood what the Real-World Forums were all about when Cynthia Leavinson said that the Real-World Forums were simply meant "to create a mood for change in Texas."

My source said she tried to push for the report to be organized by subject areas, but the TEA decided on the actual "settings" format. She said she demanded to see the 300 pages of public input and saw the public's desire for good spelling skills mentioned over and over, but the TEA selected the examples they wanted to highlight. The examples were not chosen by frequency of vote either, and the TEA decided which ones to put in bold print.

At this point, we Texas educators began to be told at every in-service training session that no longer should basic skills be the focus of our classrooms. "After all," the TEA spokespersons said, "the business world wants students with good social skills who feel good about themselves. You do not need to focus on academic skills because it is more important how students feel about themselves."

We were subjected to "educational experts" who told us that numerical grading was very damaging to a child's self-esteem and that we should evaluate children through "authentic assessments."

It was after the Real-World Forums that the wording in Texas began to surface on a regular basis as stated on page 2 of RAISING EXPECTATIONS TO MEET REAL-WORLD NEEDS, "What should high school students know and be able to do by the time they graduate?" (Texas 2). Thus, OBE finally got its ugly foot in the door in Texas.

It was about this time that I began my efforts to defeat Goals 2000.

Please refer to the letter dated March 4, 1995, directed to SBOE Member Donna Ballard in which I explained what happened from September 1994 through March of 1995.

I was appointed to the Clarification Writing Team for English Language Arts/Reading in the summer of 1995 and attended my first meeting in August of 1995. I am attaching various documents from both myself and from another writing team member named Donna Korman. We repeatedly tried to move the process in the direction of explicit skills, grade level specificity, traditional

subject area strands, etc. Three different times we came together as a team and went through the consensus-building writing process only to receive a regurgitated version later from the TEA which had not been composed by the writing team members.

Our process was continually obstructed by a representative from the Counsel of Chief State School Officers. According to the "Abstract" dated March 1995 for the QuEST Project (Quality English Standards for Texas), "The utility and quality of the standards and the related instructional and policy efforts will be validated both by the Council of Chief State School Officers and through other formative and summative expert review" (1).

Barbara Kapinus, CSSO, constantly kept us from writing any explicit skills requirements and continually directed us back to the "national standards" documents being written by the International Reading Association and the National Council of Teachers of English.

Our team was forced to follow a format which was created by the Connections Team; we were required to accept the K-3, 4-8, and 9-12 grade bands even though none of us was involved in making those designations. Some of us even put together a document which contained explicit skills and which would have given classroom teachers, parents, and students a clear understanding of the curriculum requirements for each grade level.

[***Later on in the process when we realized that we could not redirect the ELAR writing team to adopt Type #1 elements, we current classroom teachers on the writing team produced our own alternative document called the Texas Alternative Document -- TAD. It was not adopted in July 1997 because of political pressure put on by Karl Rove and others who did not want Gov. George W. Bush to have any controversy in Texas since he was in the run-up for the Presidency. Later around 2007, we resurrected and updated the TAD and submitted it to the SBOE and to the TEA for consideration. We renamed the updated TAD the English Success Standards --

<http://truthinamericaneducation.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/02/English.Success.Standards.doc> . Once again the ESS was not adopted by the SBOE because of political pressures of eight of the members, but they did implement the Type #1 parameters and much of the content from our ESS. The new ELAR/TEKS document with the Type #1 philosophy of education was adopted in May 2008. – Donna Garner]

After reading about the standards recommended by the International Reading Association and the National Council of Teachers of English which just came out on March 13, 1996, I can see why we few explicit-skills writing team members in Texas have had a hard time changing the process. The wording which kept popping up on our documents and which we had not composed is almost identical to the wording on the "national standards" document!

According to an article in the WACO TRIBUNE HERALD dated March 13, 1996, even Mike Cohen, senior adviser to Education Secretary Richard Riley, thinks the "national standards" are too vague (Riechmann).

Any explicit skills which have managed to get into our Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS) draft document were put there by sheer political pressure from the few of us who have felt strongly enough to take a risk. Out of forty-eight members of the writing team, there are probably ten of us who believe in explicit skills. However, not all of those members have been willing to risk the group's wrath and that has left about five of us to "to fight the good fight." Donna Korman has done an admirable job in painstakingly tracking each TEA document change, and her letters as well as mine will give you a clear picture of the process.

I did check with two members of the Social Studies Writing Team who reported that on at least two different occasions, the TEA put wording on documents which the team members had not written. Their team was clearly intimidated and forced into politically correct and multicultural wording, and the Texas Social Studies Council has pushed the team toward the "national standards" movement by insisting that the study of history in high school should start with 1890. They want to leave the study of the Founding Fathers to be taught only in fifth grade when the Colonial Period is covered.

The Foreign Language Writing Team was saturated from the very beginning with "national standards" documents. The Southwest Educational Development Laboratory in Austin was project director for their team, and SEDL is funded as a regional educational laboratory sponsored by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement under the U. S. Department of Education. Each year SEDL participates in planning and producing a national policy symposium in

cooperation with the USDE and the U. S. Dept. of Health and Human Services. The foreign languages draft document almost parallels exactly the national standards developed through grants from the USDE and the National Endowment for the Humanities. Their document also has very few, if any, explicit skill guidelines even though some of their writing team members who are anchored in the reality of the classroom tried to get them to understand that students cannot integrate higher level thinking skills without having basic foundational knowledge ("Southwest").

I am attaching a page which shows the funding sources for each of the Clarification Teams. Notice that almost all the teams were funded through Academics 2000 (Goals 2000) and/or Department of Education monies ("Funding").

I am also attaching a copy of the "Proposed 1996 National Education Summit Recommendations" which the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) presented to their members at their March 19, 1996, meeting. They are trying to get the National Governors' Association at their Summit this week to set up a way to conduct an "independent review of state's standards to judge quality and help improve them" (1).

CCSSO believes that states do not have "an independent process through which their standards can be reviewed for quality, usefulness, rigor, and international competitiveness" (1) , and they want to set up such a review agency to review the states' standards--more bureaucracy.

We surely do not need more evidence to prove that Goals 2000 and all its many tentacles have indeed taken away our local control of education in Texas:

Never before have states had to submit their 'lesson plans' to get federal money. American tradition and law have held that education is a matter of state and local concern. As the federal government began to usurp the control of education, curriculum was still set apart as an issue reserved for state and local decisionmakers. The U. S. Education Department was

specifically prohibited from dealing with curricular issues when it was created in 1980. Yet Goals 2000 ignores the prohibition. It calls for federal involvement in the funding, development and approval of standards and assessments. These are curricular issues in which the federal government should not be involved. Thus, the Goals 2000 application requires a state to submit to an inappropriate role for the federal government (Marshall).

I just watched the March 21, 1996, presentation on C-Span of Gov. Tommy Thompson as he discussed the upcoming National Education Summit to be held this coming Tuesday and Wednesday, March 26-27. Gov. Thompson said that according to the latest polls, education is the number one issue among the American public. He said that the National Summit is an attempt by the National Governors' Association to sponsor a discussion of standards, assessments, and technology. He said this Summit would focus on the opposite method of educational reform--opposite from Goals 2000. He said reform must come from the "bottom up" rather than from the Goals 2000 way of "top down."

It seems quite clear to Gov. Thompson that Goals 2000 has failed in its attempt to bring about education reform, but my concern is that the Clinton administration has not yet given up on Goals 2000. It is my belief that since this is an election year and President Clinton is trying to appear more moderate that there seems to be a relaxation of Goals 2000 regulations. For right now, Sect. of Education Riley seems all-too-willing to let states set their own agendas. What would happen if the Republicans lost their political clout in November and could no longer bring conservative pressure to bear?

The fact is that the intrusive regulations are still written into Goals 2000, and Texas is still tied to the federal government's shoestrings because of accepting Academics 2000 funding. A source in Washington, D. C. who has kept up with the legislation told me that many amendments have been offered to the Act but as of right now, the Act basically stands in its original form.

We are right in the middle of the field review of the Essential Knowledge and Skills, and we have not yet seen a breakthrough of explicit skills with grade level

accountability. Is Commissioner Moses and/or the State Board of Education going to stand up to the "national standards" movement and tell the federal government that we believe Texans should write curriculum requirements for Texans? It is my sincere hope that this will be the case; and I hope that you, too, will be a strong supporter of state and local control.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Donna Garner

=====

[5.3.15 -- The following report was written by Texas State Board of Education member Richard Watson. This was transmitted by Mr. Watson back in 1997, and the formatting is now quite antiquated. I have tried to insert paragraphing, but it was rather hard to tell where paragraphs belonged. -- Donna Garner]

Subject: RICHARD WATSON'S REPORT TO THE SBOE -- 3.4.97

Richard Watson was on the Texas SBOE for years and tried courageously to uncover the inner-workings which led up to 1997. He delivered this impassioned report on March 4, 1997. So far as I know, nothing he said was ever denied or proved to be inaccurate. He and his report were simply ignored by the education establishment. What a travesty of justice!

Donna Garner
wgarner1@hot.rr.com

=====
=====

Presentation to State Board of Education
by Richard Watson - March 4, 1997

I will state at the outset that it is the right -- but more than the right -- it is the responsibility of those in elective office to bring forward

legitimate concerns and ask whatever questions are necessary in the interest of their constituents.

When all parties involved have the goal of what is best for children in our schools, it would seem to me that the adversarial nature of the discussion should be greatly diminished. Let me go on the record that I believe that what is best for children in our schools IS the goal of every member of this Board, and I have stated that publicly many times.

There will always be, in a free society, differing ideologies and philosophies brought to the table. That is as it should be. We don't need to fear that.

I have read in print numerous times a statement that was made in our meeting last month, something to the effect of, "Sometime we have to talk about what children will learn." This is precisely what this whole discussion is about. What will children learn? What will children be taught? Who decides?

Last month I gave you a short presentation of things I had learned in my study of the Report of the Committee on Student Learning. I won't go back over that entire presentation, but because it is pertinent to where we are today in the TEKS process, I will recap just a portion of it.

The Committee on Student Learning heard and discussed Dr. William Spady's overview of Outcome-Based Education (OBE), the goal of which is to redefine the paradigm of American education. IF education is to be outcome based, there must be a process to derive outcomes. The minutes [of the report] state that that process would be facilitated by leaders in OBE, and that the committee might want to coin a new term as they moved forward such as "real world outcomes."

Thus was born the process of outcome derivation which was dubbed the "Real

World Forums" (RWF). The Report states (p.38) that part of the process of the RWF would be to train the facilitators to work with the Forum groups to develop a vision of the future.

Dr. Spady noted that the development of this vision of the future would be very important and it could be guided by how the questions were framed. Each group would be asked what the world of the future would look like and then develop knowledge and skills to fit into that world.

It was determined that the groups needed to see a "global view of the future." And all of a sudden we started hearing how our students need to be prepared to operate in a "global economy." Folks, we've been operating in a global economy since we dumped the tea overboard in Boston Harbor.

Again, I am questioning the wisdom of allowing a FEW people to take THEIR vision of the future and promote THAT world view as the presuppositional base for our public education system.

That IS the Spady model of transformational OBE. Design the future you want and work back from there. That is what the RWF did as it derived outcomes for our education system.

The argument is presented that that was four years ago, and things are different. I accept that, and frankly, I am grateful for the difference. But here is the critical point. There were some OBE foundations laid and some OBE directions set in motion during that time that we ARE still following. The challenge has been given me to connect what happened then with what we are doing now.

The connection is quite clear. It is made in our State Application for a School to Work Implementation Grant submitted to the U.S. Department of

Education in 1996. On page nine of that grant application, there is the heading and paragraph:

Real-World Expectations. The Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS is infusing "real world expectations" into academic subjects at grades K-12. In 1994, over 25,000 citizens participated in 1000 town meetings to identify the skills and knowledge necessary to succeed in a changing world."

So, the RWF results, which were guided by OBE trained facilitators, became the starting point for the TEKS. Granted, numerous changes have been made, some of them significant, in some of the subject areas. But the foundation upon which the TEKS are built remains. That foundation is the transformational OBE base of William Spady.

Last month, questions were raised about the National Center on Education and the Economy (NCEE), its director Marc Tucker and their influence on education in Texas. Additional questions were raised about one of the programs of NCEE, the New Standards Project, and what influence it has had in the development of the TEKS. If we were influenced by these outside forces, the fundamental issue becomes: "Texans do not want the federal government and national special interest groups developing curriculum for Texas children."

Again, the challenge to me is to prove that our process has been impacted. A very brief history is in order and will lead to a conclusive answer to this issue.

In 1991, the Legislature created the COSL. WE have talked about that Committee. Appearing before that committee on April 24, 1992 was Dr. Lauren Rescind [Dr. Lauren Resnick?] to present the New Standards Project (p.28)

A review of the NCEE's major publication *America's Choice: High Skills or*

***Low Wages!*, was given to the COSL This is the publication that the COSL was told was a "key" document for implementing OBE. It lays out the complete strategy for School to Work.**

- **1991: Governor Richard's mandated the Smart Jobs Plan. Smart Jobs recommended restructuring education with a Certificate of Initial Mastery (CIM). The CIMS is the cornerstone of the Marc Tucker/NCEE agenda as stated in America's Choice**

·

- **1992: TEA funds model STW programs. The Blueprint for Integration of Academic and Occupational Education states the importance of training all teachers in OBE.**

- **1992: Texas joins NCEE's New Standards Project.**

- **1992: It is during this time that Dr. Spady speaks to the COSL and does some staff training in OBE.**

- **1993: COSL decides on pursuing an outcomes derivation process which is named Real World Forums. RWF are conducted using OBE facilitators trained in Spady's advice on framing the questions to obtain the "correct" vision of the future.**

- **1993: Texas renews its partnership with NCEE/Marc Tucker's New Standards Project.**

- **1993: The SBOE approves the Master Plan for Career and Technical Education. The Master Plan called for a new curriculum based upon competency, a Certificate of Initial Mastery, an outcome-based assessment and total integration of health and human services into the schools.**

- **1993: SB 642 creates the Texas Council on Workforce and Economic Competitiveness (TCWEC) which ultimately is given authority over TEA to implement STW as described in NCEE's America's Choice.**
- **1993: HB 367 creates the Design Committee for the STW plan. Marc Tucker consults and assists the committee. (School to Work Transition, A Texas Perspective, p. 56)**
- **1993: SB 7 calls for the development of "Essential Knowledge and Skills." This is the first official legislative use of the term.**
- **1993: TEA produces School to Work Transition, A Texas Perspective, incorporating much of the Tucker/NCEE agenda.**
- **1994: Texas joins the NCEE Workforce Skills Program.**
- **1994: Texas renews partnership with NCEE's New Standards Project.**
- **1994: Federal School to Work Opportunities Act passes. NCEE assist Texas in apply for a planning grant. (.School to Work Transition, A Texas Perspective, p. 56)**
- **1994: SBOE approves "clarification" of the Essential Elements to align with TAAS [test]. (SBOE minutes, July 1994)**
- **1994: Texas applies for and later receives Goals 2000 federal money to help fund what is now the REWRITE of the Essential Elements.**

- **1994: TEKS contractors receive training from NCEE's New Standards Project.**
- **1995: SB 1 passes. It mandates that Texas' standards must be comparable to national standards. It mandates federal regulations for Career and Technology Programs.**
- **1995: Texas Develops STW professional development plan which calls for training in OBE (Professional Development plan for STW, 1995)**
- **1995: The Design Committee (Block 10) Plan is attached to Welfare Reform Bill and passed. It gives authority over STW to TCWEC, an appointed panel. It puts TCE+WEC in authority over TEA. Skills Panel and Local Workforce Boards are created -- all in accordance with NCEE/Tucker agenda laid out in America's Choice.**
- **1995: Goals 2000 plan with Schools to Work component is approved.**
- **1996: Texas continues partnership with NCEE's New Standards Project. NCEE chooses San Antonio, Texas as site for its First Annual Standards Based Reform Conference called, "Moving the Agenda Forward."**
- **1996: Texas submits application for STW grant. Application includes all the NCEE/Tucker components for implementing a STW system. Included as a supporting document to the application is the Master Plan for Career and Technical Education that calls for a CIM. The STW plan requires coordination with Goals 2000. (STW Grant application, p. 10)**
- **1997: SBOE votes on first reading for adoption of TEKS for an unprecedented 160 Career and Technology courses. And the NCEE/Tucker agenda is poised to change our education system into job training programs, which in fact, is stated**

in Goal 1 on page 1 of the STW Grant Applications and says that this is the purpose of the essential knowledge and skills. This makes employers "customers" of our system rather than parents. Those are radical, fundamental changes.

The influence of the NCEE/Tucker agenda on what we are doing in Texas, coupled with federal legislation, leads me to state again the fundamental issue. Texans do not want the federal government and national special interest groups overseeing the writing of curriculum for their children.

One of the strategies on page two of the STW Grant application is to have "instructional programs which lead to a transportable skill certificate, i.e., Tucker's CIM. And page 1 says that "Texas is committed to developing a comprehensive ... School to Work system that engages all youth. That means all students are to participate in a curriculum with a work component. That means fewer hours in the classroom because of hours in the workplace which means less emphasis on academic instruction, all in line with the NCEE/Tucker agenda.

This is one of the reasons why Texans do not want the federal government and national special interest groups overseeing the writing of curriculum for their children.

The National Education Goals Panel Report for 1996 was released about a month ago. It stated that NCEE's NSP is working with 17 states, of which Texas is one, to develop a National system of standards and assessments. This is a top-down system that is the antithesis of local control.

You see, these are the changes for which there has been a public outcry. The indication of this is the fact that the COSL talked at length about how to PROMOTE this change to OBE to the public.

The STW grant application talks about a market-driven system, yet it too addresses at length how to get the various parties to buy in! If something is driven by the demand of the market, you do not have to expend energies and resources convincing people to BUY IN!

Money was also put aside in the TEKS process and an RFP put out for an entity to promote the TEKS to the public. The reason that all that promotion is necessary is that Texans do not want the federal government and national special interest groups overseeing the writing of curriculum for their children.

A summary of all STW in all the states was reported in the National Governors Association Stateline on 12/9/96. That report noted that there are three major barriers to the implementation of STW:

- 1. Local control of school districts.**
- 2. Public belief in the importance of college.**
- 3. Traditional ACADEMIC structure.**

Our structure for teaching our children academics is a barrier. Listen to this quote from Marc Tucker: "What is essential is that we create a seamless web of opportunities to develop one's skill that literally extends from the cradle to the grave and is the same system for everyone."

Pressing everyone into the same mold is not what made this nation the envy of the world. Opportunity for everyone is something you protect, not something you impose. And the imposition of a nationalized curriculum written by the federal government and national organizations is not what Texas want for their children.

Donna Garner