

The States' Impact on Federal Education Policy Project: New Perspectives on Research and the Historical Record

Transcript of Session 4 Panel Session and Table Discussion: Future Directions: Implications for Federal Policy

Margaret Goertz: My name is Peg Goertz and I am with the Consortium for Policy Research in Education at the University of Pennsylvania, and one of the advisors on the project. And my job is to moderate this final session, which, if you go to page nine of your agenda, is “future directions.” It says “Implications for Federal Legislation,” but it’s also implications for future research.

We’ve had very, very rich presentations and a very rich conversation both at our tables and during the break. And we’ve heard a lot today, and the conversation has been very interesting for me as both a policy analyst and a professor, that it’s ranged from the fundamental purposes of schooling, to the purposes of the federal role, to ideas for NCLB reauthorization. The purpose of the panel we have for our final session is to reflect on this conversation, and basically bring us back to the three purposes of the project that Gordon started us with this morning. If I can bring your attention to the guiding questions at the bottom of page nine: What themes from the discussion should inform the design of education federalism in future legislation? Certainly NCLB is what’s on everybody’s mind, but I think Tom’s presentation really gets us thinking about, well, what can we learn from the reauthorization of other education programs? How might we encourage research on – and I want to say, and fund the design and implementation of – education federalism? And, of course, how do we work together to stimulate and encourage the collection and preservation of records to support this research?

Our panelists are Gordon Ambach, Chris Cross who you’ve already met, and Patty Sullivan who is currently with the American Federation of Teachers. They bring to this panel on federalism in education extensive involvement in both the design and implementation of education policy and at multiple levels of the system. The order is going to be Patty, and then Chris, and Gordon. They are going to speak for about half an hour. Then we’re going to open it up to questions and comments from individuals in the audience for about fifteen minutes. And then I am going to turn it back over to Gordon for concluding comments.

Patricia Sullivan: Thank you, Peg. And thanks to the Archives for their work on this project. It’s been fascinating to have the opportunity to think about these issues. I have been working in this field for a long time. It makes me feel sort of old now that I think about it. I am here to do a couple of things today. One is to talk about what’s going on a little bit here in Washington, and give you a sense of context. Then I am going to talk a little bit about what we learned today. Over the various breaks and lunch we’ve had a chance to review the questions that were asked and the sheets that were filled out. There’s a lot of ground to cover so bear with me. I only have a few minutes.

First of all, what's going on with the ESEA reauthorization? I don't call it No Child Left Behind reauthorization because that's not what we are talking about anymore. Basically we had a situation where we ended up with a bill in the House that effectively imploded over a number of issues. I confess that I have to credit a number of people, some of whom are in the room, for helping to bring that bill to a halt because it was going to make a bad situation worse. So to the extent that the Senate then said that they were going to proceed with the bill, they watched what had happened in the House and thought better of it. So the conversations continue. And while there hasn't been an official announcement, it's pretty clear we're not going to see a reauthorization bill this year.

So in the absence of a reauthorization, Secretary Spellings decided that she would take matters into her own hands. And like any good bureaucrat at the end of an administration when the Congress isn't able to stop you, you go ahead and do things that you'd like to do that you know you couldn't get from the Hill. Now I know Mike Smith and Tom, you never did any of these things at the end. You never signed any letters. No guide. Nothing. Secretary Spellings decided to put out some regulations, and they are now proceeding with a series of hearings around the country to get feedback on them. The regulations that are proposed deal with a number of different issues adding graduation rates to AYP so you have one more disaggregated way to fail. They modify the SES provisions. There are a number of things in it, that again, at least my organization and many others, don't think are such a good idea, and are very troubled by the process. When you have a piece of legislation, you have hearings, you have a lot of input, you have markups, you have amendments, you have floor debate. There's lots of time for discussion. When you put out a regulatory package you put out an NPRM, Notice of Proposed Rule Making. You slap sixty days on it and then at the end of sixty days you read through the letters and if you want to listen to what's in the letters you do, but if you don't, you don't have to, and they become, in effect, law. It's a troubling process on top of some troubling provisions.

I guess the good news in all of this is that because we don't have a piece of legislation, and because we don't have a Democratic presidential candidate, and because we have what is going to be a new Congress pending, we have time. Time means that organizations, many of whom are represented in this room, are taking the time to really think about what should be in ESEA reauthorization. That debate to me has been fascinating because it has led to big ideas, bigger thinking, different thinking.

We had a very rich discussion in a meeting that I was at, I guess it was last week, around reauthorization issues where the debate shifted less about ESEA and more about what the federal role should be; sort of a shift in the discussion in the room about what the role of states should be and really who should be doing what. That was the first time that I've had that kind of a conversation, probably in years. I'm thrilled by the opportunity to think differently about this piece of legislation. The conversation today has been really helpful because I've learned a lot.

So let me tell you a little bit about what I've heard from you all today, and we can add more in the Q & A. First of all I think we can learn a lot from the good parts of No Child Left Behind. Tom, you talked about some of it. To the extent that we've got people looking at data in a way that they didn't before is very powerful, and that we have kids who were ignored by the system

before, they're not being ignored. So there are lots of good things. It would be nice if there were some money to fund some of the other things but that's not going to happen.

Certainly, we need to learn from the experiences of IDEA, not only in its creation, and Tom you and I might have a debate about how that bill was reauthorized, and how many people were in the room when it was actually written, which was not very many. That was kind of a problem, but certainly how it was structured, how it played out. We need to learn from that experience and I don't think we're thinking about that. We certainly need to learn from the history. It's a rich history. This piece of legislation has been around. We have the history. We have all of the brain power sitting in this room. So to the extent that we need to look back and see what we did right, this law has been around for a while so certainly the historical approach is important.

We need to look at the research and frankly we need more of it, because to the extent that we tend at the federal level not to look at research to inform legislation, it's a political activity and sometimes the research doesn't agree with the politics. And guess where we err. We also need to talk to the people who are going to implement the law. I had the chance today to sit at a table with a teacher who's on sabbatical. She has a totally different perspective than I do. So it is very important to talk to the folks that have to live with this law.

We also (we talked about this in the last panel) really need to think about the teachers in this. That is my bias – I work for AFT – but they play a critical role. They need to have more input into all of this. We also talked a lot today about creating capacity, state capacity. That's my bias, obviously. Ted, when you were a chief, when you started, how many staff did you have and how many did you have when you ended? [Inaudible response.] You can't implement a law if you don't have people and you have to have the right people. Psychometricians don't grow on trees and they're expensive. And if you've got to have twelve secretaries just to get your federal paperwork done, it means that you don't get to have a psychometrician, and you have to sort of guess on your assessments. That's not a good implementation strategy.

We've got to create capacity at the districts to recognize what districts can and can't do. When I talk about states and districts I can't name any that are the same. Every state is different. They operate differently. Their governance structures are different. Same thing at the district level. So you've got to appreciate those distinctions. We need to create capacity at the federal government. Present company excluded, some of the federal bureaucrats, staff that I work with, they've never been to a state education agency. They don't understand how state accountability systems work. It's very difficult to write regulations and implement them if you don't have a clue. It's not easy just to jump in and learn. They're big, complex systems and to the extent that we need to create a capacity to implement at the federal level, that's important too.

Obviously, we talked a lot about technical assistance, again, the need to create a research base and funding; all which will lead hopefully to the good innovation that we'd all like to see. I think mostly what we talked a lot about today was really the need to define what we want beyond the federal role, just as helping with equity issues, which is sort of the initial role, and trying to level the playing field. I feel funny having a meeting like this without Jack Jennings, so I'm going to quote him. Jack always says the law was created, Title I, with a whole lot of money and

no accountability. And now we have a whole lot of accountability and no money. So we need to figure out what we want and I hope at some place in between erring on the money side.

Truly, we need to articulate what we want the federal government to do, and we have an opportunity to do that, and I'm hoping that conversation will go on. But in the process, as we talk about the state impact and the relationship to the federal government, I want to be very careful to maintain a balance between what is federal and what is national. I was talking with a lobbyist yesterday who wanted to put a particular definition in federal law and I said to him – he used to work at the Department of Ed and now he is down on K Street like everybody else does – I said to him “Do you really want somebody over at the U.S. Department of Education to define job-embedded professional development for teachers? Because if you put that in the federal law, it gets regulated.” That, to me, steps over the line for the federal government. Now we can have a national conversation about what that should look like. But in my own personal experience, we need to watch that line. So I'm going to turn it over to you.

Christopher Cross: First of all, I want to say how pleased I am to hear that psychometricians don't grow on trees. It would be an ugly picture out there, I think. I want to also unabashedly plug, since you have mentioned the history of federal legislation, the book I did about three or four years ago on federal education policy and the evolution of it, called *Political Education*, published by Teachers College Press, because in it I tried to trace the influences, and the policies, and the people who shaped federal policies, really since '58 on. I went back to NDEA and I think it helps to give a perspective, and I won't say anything further on that.

I want to talk more about the implications here for the future. One of the things that has always troubled me a lot is the silos which exist within the federal government, from the legislation through the bureaucracy, that then gets mirrored at the state and the local level. By that I mean, for example, let's take the two laws we have been talking about here today, ESEA and IDEA. They are never considered at the same time. They are always considered in separate venues. In the House they are considered by separate sub-committees. There is no knowledge transfer here at all between them. And then you get into the bureaucracy, and I think there are, what, seven principle operating components in the Department of Education that deal with K-12 education. There's one that deals with higher education. When you think about that and the implications of it, it's no wonder that you have a mess in terms of trying to look at what is federal policy. You look at that with respect to an issue like teacher education. There's Title II of the Higher Education Act and there's Title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, both of which deal with teacher education. They are just in the process, hopefully, of finally after four or five years, reauthorizing the Higher Ed Act. Then we're going to come along in another year or two and do other things with respect to teacher ed in ESEA. I can guarantee you, as sure as we're all sitting here today, there will be almost no coordination or articulation between those things.

I also have seen over a period of these many years, going back to '65 and forward, a loss of focus for the federal government. When we started all of this, and you could even go back to NDEA and say that it was driven by some external factors to education, it was not an education bill. It was a national security bill, as the title says, that happened to carry education into it. And it was used as a convenient vehicle to get some things enacted. But then going back to '65 and ESEA

the focus was on special populations. And it was on special populations in IDEA. It was on special populations in the Bilingual Education Act, which was in between that time. And then, all of the sudden we lost focus. In part, many small, categorical programs have emerged over the years to be consolidated in the first term of the Reagan administration, and then to mushroom again, and that exists to the point now where it would be hard to say and define what is the federal role? I will submit at the end here what I think some things have to be done to address this.

I also think we've reached the end of the period of time in which we can look for, basically, mandates to solve all the problems. I believe we have to look at and try incentives, and look at seeing how we can incentivize behavior. If you said something to the effect of ok, your goal is to close the achievement gap and you have so many years to do it; and as you make progress you'll get a bonus on your federal money, and you can use that however you want to; I think you'd really see some people stepping up and doing some things differently. That's a very crude example, but it's an example of the kinds of thinking that I think we have to do in looking at some new models here for how we proceed.

Finally, I think that it's true that we aren't going to see any major changes unless we get presidential leadership, whoever it is, because, as I say in my book, except for actually 94-142 back in '75, nothing major has happened in federal education without presidential leadership. And 94-142 happened only because of the Nixon resignation, the weakness of Gerald Ford in being in office at that time, and the drive of John Brademas and Harrison Williams in wanting to get a piece of legislation through. They saw this as an opportunity. They got it through, and they got it enacted. That, I would submit, is the single case where you have had major change in K-12 education without presidential leadership.

So if you look ahead we have one presumptive nominee, I guess is what the media calls it, and two candidates. I'd be hard pressed to say that given the national and world situation that one of the first acts of this new president, whoever he or she may be, will be to jump on reauthorization of ESEA or NCLB. You have to give credit to George Bush for having, on his second day in office, actually convened a meeting to put something out there. There may be lots of problems with it but he was passionate and committed on education. I don't think there is going to be that window here and I don't know how long we're going to wait until we see that kind of leadership emerge. If you look around the candidates who are out there today, you would be hard pressed to say there is a record there that you can look to and say what they would do and how they would approach it.

Finally, I think one of the things that we have suffered from, and this goes back through these many years, is we've never had a real conversation about education. It's always been about other things. It's been about civil rights and that goes back to IDEA, which is really civil rights in terms of its enactment. NCLB has a lot of civil rights components. It's national defense that drove us in NDEA. It was an equity agenda that drove us in the original ESEA. Never have we really dealt with a thoughtful conversation just about what are our educational objectives. Who do we think is best suited to do that? Is this something that topic "A" belongs on a list for the feds, topic "B" for the states, topic "C" for the locals? And have a thoughtful conversation about

it. Until we have the leadership and can do that, I think we're just going to stumble along from law to law.

Gordon Ambach: Thank you, Chris. I thought you were going to say that we're going to stumble over to the other side of the stage. Patty has provided a great context for you of what the current picture is, and Chris has really drawn the large scale canvass, if you will, of the issues about proceeding and what the likelihood is of having major change.

I'm going to try to reflect on the conversations that I heard through the day on a more narrow focus, if you will. It seems to me that at this stage we have to be looking at legislative implications related to our topic and related to these broad issues of federalism in, perhaps, a couple of stages. One is more short-term and the other is more long-term.

If I would take you back to Lorraine's presentation of her paper, talking about policy effect cycles, research on that, the research on the issues of venues and the research on the issue of the political and institutional structure for changing what happened is not a short-term kind of research. That's a longer-term kind of research. It's extremely important to get at. And I think that it's in that context that we have to be considering these broader questions of, essentially, what do we expect of the different levels of government for purposes of setting what our directions are in this country? The talk about nationwide strategies of education has always been difficult and it's stitched into the issue of the responsibilities that are initially assigned to the states and the localities but have been shared by three levels of government since the beginning of the country.

Let me turn very quickly to the two kinds of issues that are on the more short-term agenda. One of them is the issue of what do you do about accountability in the next round of No Child Left Behind? The second one is what is the possibility of doing something on the issue of incentives within No Child Left Behind? That doesn't mean there aren't other things that would need to be dealt with, but in my book, if there is not a resolution on the issue of the structure and expectation for accountability, you are going to be very hard pressed ever to get anything out the end of the pipe.

In 2001 when No Child Left Behind was constructed, a review of what was in the accountability provision, Mike spoke to this earlier, but very quickly, you put in a one-hundred percent goal to proficiency by 2014. That was twelve years from the time of enactment, so it meant every kid coming into first grade by that time would be already up to proficiency.

You take two subjects, reading and mathematics. You put in an AYP with an annual progress rate to get to that 2014. You put in disaggregated data. You hard wire together with the results of that data, reporting on disaggregated basis, and connecting that with a set of sanctions if the schools don't get there, and that was the formula. There was not one single school in this country that used that formula at the time that it was put into effect, not one. This was created whole. And add to it additional testing that went in with it, it's no wonder that there has been a great focus of controversy and difficulty about what that accountability formula meant. The pieces had been there before, by and large, but they had not been hard wired together. What we're seeing now (and I'm up in Vermont, I see it on a local level, and you can see it all across

the country) is as this formula has clicked in year by year by year, it has increased the issue of antagonism, of differences about it, of its effect and so on.

There's lots of unintended consequences that have come through because of that formula. There are certain intended consequences that have come through. I cite that because if there's to be a change in that formula, and lots have been recommended, like instead of having just proficiency you use a basic proficient advance scale. You benchmark the NAEP. You benchmark to some international measure. You multiply the number of subjects that are included. There's lots of different proposals that have been advanced. The question, when you add each one of these elements to it, do you still hard wire it at the national level so that, in fact, that system of sanctions gets connected with more and more pieces which get into the formula? I submit that as a research area short-term, a lot of thinking goes into the question of how can you adjust this accountability formula so that it, in fact, identifies where you most want to put the resources, as program improvement did; [but] doesn't hard wire the whole system, as it is now hard wired with automatic kick outs of failure? Because you know as well as I, you get to 2014, every school in this country is going to fail. The psychometricians have been telling us that from day one because the closer you get to one-hundred percent, the tougher it is to get there. It can't persist, but the challenge to all of us is, if you don't keep that accountability formula, what goes in its place? How, specifically, do we set it at the national level or the federal level? How much do you trust that you have this handled at the state or the locality level?

Last point. Hinged to that, it strikes me, is a very interesting set of questions about incentives. Could you, in fact, design some way that you have a pool of money which, in part, is used on the sanctions side of it, the very lowest performers, and in part is used for rewarding performance in schools? Low performers moving up specifically high, middle performers moving up and so on and so forth. I am not trying to prescribe what it should be. All I'm trying to suggest is, near term, there are some very, very specific issues that have got to be tracked or, in my judgment, you won't see much progress very soon. You will have continuing resolutions in this area for quite a while. Let me leave it at that. It's what I've been hearing in several places on the discussion. It brings it down, if you will, to short-term. I hope that helps to sort of fill out the picture of context, the bigger picture, and then some of the short-term.

Question and answer period following table discussions

Margaret Goertz: Thank you. Is this working? We have fifteen minutes for questions for the panelists or comments. There are going to be individuals with microphones, I believe, one in the back and one right in the front, so if you raise your hand the microphones will gravitate towards you. Because this is being recorded please cite your name and if you want to, your affiliation. Ok. Lynn Olson?

Lynn Olson: This is actually a question I'm asking on behalf of Bill Taylor, who had to duck out, who asked in this morning's discussion, and I think it gets back to this issue of sort of both what we record in terms of our archival information, [and] who's at the table. His question after the morning's discussion was: Where are the communities of color and the civil rights groups in the conversation about how we got to where we are in federal legislation and what's good and

bad about it? So it wasn't much discussed here today, but is sort of another part of, I think, this mix of how legislation gets made and implemented.

Gordon Ambach: Was that a question Lynn, or was that an observation? [Inaudible] It was an observation.

Margaret Goertz: Katie??

Kathryn McDermott: Katie McDermott from the University of Massachusetts. This may be kind of a dirty trick but I want to pull the conversation back to something that Lorraine said at the very beginning of the day about how when we've had policy discussions about the different roles of the different levels of government it's always been in the context of some particular policy area, that there is always kind of a, well, that we don't tend to just say what should the federal role be, what should the state role be, what should the local role be. So recognizing the value that there might be in having this conversation in a more general way, I am curious to hear what you think is likely to happen instead. How does this conversation continue?

Patricia Sullivan: When you say this conversation, do you mean the conversation here?

Kathryn McDermott: No, the policy debate.

Patricia Sullivan: Oh, the policy debate. I guess from certainly a Washington insider's perspective – I mean I pay a lot of attention to states but I live here, and so I'm biased in that way – I think that as Chris said, in the absence of strong leadership leading the policy discussion and leading the legislative activity we're going to end up right back where we are today. As I say that I think to myself, "Well how do I make that happen? How do we push the policy debate?" The answer is by sort of using the power of people like you all. Certainly my organization and others are involved in a lot of coalitions to try to have that conversation so we're ready when we have a new president and a new Congress to engage them in the conversation. I think in the absence of a really strong leader we truly are not going to get very far. Where that leader comes from or what organization steps in. . . I mean I worked at NGA for ten years; if that organization decides to do something a lot of things can happen. To date they haven't been very involved in these discussions but we're going to get a new group of governors and so who knows what can happen? But something has to change here.

Joel Packer: Joel Packer, National Education Association. One of the areas that really has been touched on very little is what should the federal role be in terms of teacher quality? We talked a little bit about special ed teacher preparation. As everyone knows No Child Left Behind just put in place federal definitions; highly qualified teachers. Any reaction from anyone on the panel about as we move to the next reauthorization or through the next IDEA reauthorization as well, what should the federal government do to help improve the quality of teaching?

Gordon Ambach: Patty?

Patricia Sullivan: AFT always does whatever NEA tells us to do.

[laughter]

Gordon Ambach: I thought it had to do with paying dues to either NEA or AFT.

Patricia Sullivan: No. I think that particular area is a good example of where we have to think hard about who does what. Obviously states are very much involved in the certification of teachers. We have a system of producing teachers that we heard a little bit about earlier; special ed and general ed teachers. You can question the quality of some of those programs. We have alternative certification teachers now. There are lots of different ways that teachers come to our classrooms. My personal view of this is that having the federal government step in and define what a high quality teacher is did absolutely nothing to identify teachers. It did like a lot of what No Child Left Behind did, and that was to encourage people to try and game the system. My view on this is that the feds have a very limited role and you and I can have a hearty conversation about pay for performance and all sorts of the nuances of those issues but I think the role should be limited and that the focus should be more so on improving the quality of our schools of education.

Christopher Cross: Can I just add that I agree with your last point entirely? I think the lack of communication between superintendents and schools of education and, frankly, mandates from the superintendents about who they will hire and with what kinds of qualifications and training has to happen. This has to be (I know the NEA hates the idea of market driven) but this has to be a market driven solution to that, because until that gets to be the case you don't have any leverage over the institutions of higher education to make change. They will only make change, and there are a lot of higher ed people in the audience today, and you may disagree with me on this but you're only going to get major change as an external force that's going to make those changes occur.

Beryl Radin: Beryl Radin from American University. I'd like to pick on a point that Lorraine included in her presentation but I don't think we developed it very much, and that's really the implications of governors getting involved in the educational policy debate. The only time we've really heard about governors is largely an NGA focus, and those of us who dealt with different states know that NGA is often the lowest common denominator, and that doesn't really reflect what's been going on in the state. I mean there are some really dramatic changes that have occurred in states. It's not only that governors are involved, but in many states and cities mayors are involved. That the debate has moved from a conversation between specialists to a conversation between political generalists. That education now has to deal with conflict between resources for education and a lot of other policy sectors. Things get even more complicated because of the "contracting out" phenomenon that's all over this society. I think what concerns me is that most of these conversations today have really been people in the education policy world talking to one another. There are many experiences that are found in other policy areas that reflect these same dynamics because governors have had to deal with the feds in multiple and often conflicting ways. I've been working particularly on performance measurement issues. There are a lot of things that are going on in the performance measurement area that I think are really appropriate to look at in terms of the testing obsession with No Child Left Behind. I guess the question is: How can we broaden the debate to think about education as one of a number of policy areas? How can these conversations be generated and developed? Thanks.

Patricia Sullivan: I feel like I have to defend my former employer. First of all, I think that in some areas, very politically charged areas, NGA does go to the least common denominator because that's all you can get. And believe me; I have a lot of gray hair trying to get to the least common denominator on some issues.

But at the same time, when you convene a group of governors, and the easiest way to get them going and all convened and focused is to point at the federal government and complain, they all agree that the federal government, unfunded mandates, they're there. What I would argue though is that you shouldn't look to the organization. You look at individual governors because individual governors, they're different. Obviously they're individuals to begin with. They sit in different governorships. The governorship, for example in Texas, is incredibly weak. The governorship in Michigan is very strong. It just depends on the state.

A number of governors, and I'll give you the example of Ted Strickland in Ohio, who has convened a large group of both policy people, the unions, the superintendent who he's trying to fire, a number of business people, folks from the health care community, with funding from the Knowledge Works Foundation, to basically do a whole transformational change process on education in Ohio. Anybody who's met Ted Strickland knows that it's easier to do what he tells you to do than to try to talk him out of it. He's just a very persistent guy. There are pockets of that going on in a number of states. The only way to sort of broaden that conversation is to get more governors involved and right now they're focused on other things.

Gordon Ambach: Just a quick point. You make a very important point about how do you broaden the political base, if you will, to try to get something done. It can't be done solely within the education community; however, if you can't get some kind of agreement across most of the education community you don't have an awful lot of a chance to be able to broaden out your base of political support. I think that you have to look at it apart as to what it takes to try to get some sense of agreement within the educational community about which direction to go and then definitely work with governors, work with legislatures and so on to build that out. I'm not saying that you wait until the end to do that, but I am saying that you have a kind of a states' arrangement. And just one other point. The whole business of trying to look for counterparts, to try to look for comparable experiences in other fields and see how they apply to education, is extremely important. Too little of that is done, much too little, and that is a very, very important point that you made.

Margaret Goertz: I think that we have time for two more questions.

Maris Vinovskis: Maris Vinovskis of the University of Michigan. This has been a great day and a great panel. It's ending on a sort of pessimistic note. Let me reinforce that. [laughter] I think basically that Chris Cross's analysis is a very accurate one, in terms of the role of presidential leadership. Also remember, maybe we've gotten lazy. It's twenty-five years since "A Nation at Risk." We thought that this would go on forever with the public being so concerned and interested. It's very clear in this election that that's not happening at the public level and I don't think it's happening at the presidential level. Whatever is going to happen is more likely to be continuations.

We'll come up with new slogans and many of us are good at that, and that will cover things for a while, but it won't solve the problem. So one of the things I think we need to ask ourselves is where we really have other problems besides education at the state level, at the federal level. Medicare is not going away. Social Security is going to be a real problem. We have all these things that are coming. Why do we expect that suddenly people are going to come back to education and say, "You did such a good job in the last twenty-five years that we gave you, that we are turning to you again." Is it Goals 2000, America 2000, No Child Left Behind? What is going to be there?

Our credibility is getting a little thin among people who actually follow these things. I would suggest that one, we look at some broad issues of saying to people, "Education is important for everybody." And what's particularly important that's coming? First of all, immigration. We forget that we have a higher rate of immigration now, in terms of our natural increases, since the early twentieth century. That has huge implications from an economic point of view, from a human rights point of view, and also from an assimilation point of view. We need to talk about that. We need to gather strength around something like that. The economic productivity issue is important but it can't be the naive one that we have been selling since the '70s.

The southern governors who thought all you have to do is invest in education and you have big outputs. Well, we invested in education. We didn't do so well but economic productivity actually zoomed. So we need to go back and say why it's a little more complicated, and what we need to do. The third thing. We need to look at new areas. One of the exciting areas now is the relationship between health and education. We are now seeing a series of studies, most of which are still unpublished, studies which show that educated people, for a variety of reasons, controlling for everything else, are doing much better in terms of health and also reducing health costs. We have to go back to asking why should the public, in light of all these other things, put us up at higher priority? And if we don't do that, no one's going to do it for us. It's certainly not going to be our presidential candidates.

The other thing is, whatever happened in the last twenty-five years to research and development? We kept talking about how we were going to find out what to do and we're up here, standing, and we really don't know, if you're honest about it. We're doing some things better; IES for example, is doing a better job in so-called scientific research in many ways. But what is missing is what we had in the early '70s, this planned variation idea that Mike Smith and other people pushed. We haven't invested there. Who's going to invest, and in which areas? What's going to be the partnership? And what's going to be the role of the state? I think, really, the problem is we are faced with a country that's besieged with problems, not unusual in our history. Education doesn't now seem to be one of them. We've used up some of our opportunities. We're going to have to rediscover ourselves and our leadership because we can't expect somebody else to come in, in the short run, to do something. And we better do it because education is important for all of us and people believe that, but it's going to have to come from us. It's not going to come from Washington.

Susan Sclafani: I'm Susan Sclafani, formerly of the U.S. Department of Education and now a consultant with Chartwell Education Group. I think that while I agree with many of the things

that were just said, we, being more practical, we are going to have a reauthorization in the next several years and my greatest fear, and the response that I would like to have is, how do we ensure that the regulations are not based on the current model of education and prohibit in many ways the opportunities for innovation and change? As our society is changing dramatically, our schools need to change as well, and yet I fear that unless we figure out some good strategy, that we are going to tie the hands of our educators as they try to innovate because of the rules and regulations based on the current model.

Margaret Goertz: I hate to cut off the questions at this point but I've been told we're on a very, very strict schedule so I want to, please, try and begin thanking the panelists. I have been asked to remind you to fill out your evaluations and I want to turn the rest of the program over to Gordon.