DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 093 864 95 SP 008 233

TITLE	Better Schools through Better Partnerships: The Final Report and Recommendations of the Council of Chief State School Officers' National Field Task Force on the Improvement and Reform of American Education.
INSTITUTION	Council of Chief State School Officers, Washington, D.C.; Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	National Center for Improvement of Educational Systems (DHEW/OE), Washington, D. C.
REPORT NO	DHEW-OE-74-12003-FR
PUB DATE	May 74
NOTE	73p.; For related documents, see SP 008 231, 232, and 234
AVAILABLE FROM	U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402 (No price quoted)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$3.15 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	*Educational Change; Educational Development; Educational Finance; Educational Improvement; Federal State Relationship; Females; Program Development; State Agencies; *State Departments of Education; *State Federal Aid
IDENTIFIERS	*Council of Chief State School Officers Task Force

ABSTRACT

This report is one of six to be released by as many task forces on educational improvement and reform. The eight sections of this report include: (a) an introduction, which discusses the work of the task force; (b) an overview of the development and current operation of state education agencies (SEAs); (c) a view of the SEA as an effective change agent; (d) a discussion of accountability as a basis of reform; (e) a discussion of the utilization of competency-based teacher education/certification as a means of educational reform; (f) an overview of the status of women in education with regard to employment in the field and curriculum content; (g) a list of selected areas of program development; and (h) a program of fiscal reform in education. The areas designated for program improvement are career education, adult and continuing education, bilingual-bicultural education, early childhood education, Indian education, and educational television. The task force's fiscal concerns center around the issues of (a) continuity of support for program development; (b) adequate levels of federal funding; (c) flexibility in the use of federal funds; (d) timeliness of federal appropriations; (e) administrative impoundment of appropriated funds; and (f) the responsibility of individual states to support education and equalize educational opportunity. The report includes a 49-item bibliography. (HMD)

DHEW Publication No. (OE) 74-12003

BETTER SCHOOLS THROUGH BETTER PARTNERSHIPS:

The Final Report and Recommendations of the
COUNCIL OF CHIEF STATE SCHOOL OFFICERS'
NATIONAL FIELD TASK FORCE
on the
IMPROVEMENT AND REFORM OF AMERICAN EDUCATION

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
Caspar W. Weinberger, *Secretary*
Charles B. Saunders, Jr., *Acting Assistant Secretary for Education*

Office of Education
John Ottina, *Commissioner*

In 1972 the U.S. Office of Education funded six independent National Field Task Forces on the Improvement and Reform of American Education. The names of these task forces are:

Administration and Supervision
Basic Studies
Community
Council of Chief State School Officers
Higher Education
Teachers

This publication presents the final report and recommendations of the Council of Chief State School Officers task force. Reports and recommendations of the other task forces are published separately. These reports and recommendations do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U.S. Office of Education, and no official endorsement by the U.S. Office of Education should be inferred.

MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL OF CHIEF STATE SCHOOL

OFFICERS TASK FORCE

Nelson Ashline
Rhode Island

Gerald Barbaresi
Connecticut

Eugene Bottoms
Georgia

Nathaniel Cole
Alaska

Anthony Conte
New Jersey

Marshall Frinks
Florida

Don Gann
Missouri

Philip Kearney
Michigan

Henry Kosters
South Dakota

Charles Nix
Texas

Raymond Peterson
Minnesota

Jim Pierce
New Mexico

Herbert Steffens
Nevada

Don White
California

LEADERSHIP TRAINING
INSTITUTE ON TEACHER
PREPARATION REPRESENTATIVES

Kathy Adam
Donald Orlosky
B. Othanel Smith

OFFICE OF EDUCATION
REPRESENTATIVES

Michael Fleming
Allen Schmieder

FOREWORD

In its continuing effort to develop programs which are more responsive to local needs, the National Center for the Improvement of Educational Systems of the U. S. Office of Education (OE) established six field task forces in early 1972 to contribute directly to its intensified efforts to help improve the Nation's school systems and the preparation of the people who staff them. These new groups, appropriately called the Field Task Forces on Improvement and Reform of American Education, represented a major commitment by the OE to involve people, institutions, and organizations in a continuing appraisal of its existing national training programs and in the development of alternative program strategies.

The creation of the Field Task Forces was a significant step in OE's efforts to build more effective mechanisms for utilizing the best of the wisdom and experience of its funded training projects and persons on the educational firing line. This particular effort built strongly on the work of Task Force 72,[1] under the leadership of Dr. Allen Schmieder, which directly involved the contributions of over 10,000 educators in the development of its reports and recommendations.

The Field Task Forces brought together a national cross-section of pacesetters from the major constituencies of American education--teachers, State education departments, the community, school administration and supervision, higher education, and spokesmen for the basic subjects taught in the schools--for a 6-month analysis of the key concepts underlying current training program policies, and more importantly, to help develop more effective means for achieving systematic educational improvement and reform. It is hoped that this important intensive task force effort will provide some models for a more systematic and continuing dialogue between Washington, the Regions, and the American and international community regarding the formulation and implementation of national education training policy.

---

1 A task force organized in early 1971 by the former Bureau of Educational Personnel Development (later National Center for the Improvement of Educational Systems and now the Division of Educational Systems Development, Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education) to examine the implications of training complexes, protocol and training materials, the OE-commissioned Elementary Teacher Training Models, and competency-based teacher education for educational reform and for future programing affecting educational personnel.

The need for and desirability of such Windows to the Bureaucracy[2] is reflected in the enthusiastic response from the Nation to this call to action. The Task Forces, whose members were nominated by a wide range of education personnel and groups from OE-sponsored programs and projects, included representatives from organizations which collectively have several million members. All major geographic regions and almost all racial and ethnic groups were represented in a rich variety of personnel embracing such committed leaders as the White House Teacher of the Year, the President of the American Counseling and Guidance Association, the President of the National Council on Anthropology and Education, the Chairman of the National Conference on English Education, the head of the Black Caucus of the National Education Association, the Director of the Education Division of the National Conservation Foundation, the President of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, the Leadership Training Institute Directors, and the Director of the Schools Division of the National Science Foundation. In the Field Task Forces, too, were to be found classroom teachers, parents, community activists, administrators, and others without formal title who by their involvement in training projects displayed a heavy personal stake and a deep-seated commitment to change.

But all of the members, who formed vested interest group concerns were selected in the hope that their recommendations would reflect their personal wisdom as well as the best of the training program viewpoints and policies of their groups.

The Task Forces had three major purposes: (1) to make recommendations regarding how best to use discretionary training funds for the improvement of the quality of American education, (2) to help develop specific training strategies for the improvement of educational systems through more effective development of educational personnel, and (3) to show the way to a more effective communication system between the national Federal offices, regional offices, State offices and their constituencies.

The Field Task Forces completed their respective studies in the fall of 1973. Their reports and recommendations reflect their reactions to the state of improvement and reform in American education as it

---

2 The title of a publication of the National Advisory Council of Education Professions Development which calls for a much greater involvement of people in the field in the development of national education program policy.

existed at that time. Many changes have occurred since then--as a result of steps taken by the Administration, by the Congress, and by the educational community. Although some of this material is therefore necessarily dated, so much of it is still current and useful that I feel that these reports will prove valuable not only today but in the future. Although they do not necessarily reflect OE positions and policies, they contain the opinions of knowledgeable and dedicated men and women. With this in mind, I commend them to you most earnestly.

Washington, D.C.
May 1974

William L. Smith
Director, Teacher Corps
(formerly Associate Commissioner
of the National Center for the
Improvement of Educational Systems)

CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION

In its continuing effort to develop programs which are more responsive to local needs, the National Center for the Improvement of Educational Systems (NCIES) of the U.S. Office of Education requested that the Special Projects Office of the Council of Chief State School Officers organize and develop this report in conjunction with selected representatives of State educational agencies throughout the Nation. It was the intent of NCIES to utilize the information contained in this report and other similar reports[1] in the planning and development of programs administered by the Office of Education.

The contents of this report are not intended to include all of the problem areas currently facing State education agencies since such a report would be well beyond the scope of the resources available to the Council for this report. Instead, we have selected issues and areas for discussion that appear to be of current interest and concern to State education agency personnel. Although each of these selected issues has been discussed from the perspective of State education agency personnel, the inclusion of a given topic area or the particular treatment of any topic should not be interpreted as either reflecting the policy of any individual State education agency or implying agreement of all State education agencies regarding that issue.

II. THE DEVELOPMENT AND CURRENT OPERATION OF STATE EDUCATION AGENCIES

State education agencies exist within all of the States under a variety of official agency titles. The State educational agencies in 34 States are called "Departments of Education"; nine are called "Departments of Public Instruction"; one (New York) is known as the "State Education Department" and one (Texas) is referred to as the "State Education Agency." Most States also have a State Board of Education, but in two States the operating agencies do not have other names and are referred to as the "State Board of Education."

The chiefs of these State education agencies function under a variety of titles which do not always match their organizational names. For example, various chief State school officers are officially referred to as the Superintendent of Public Instruction, the Superintendent of Education, the Superintendent of Schools, the Commissioner of Education, and the Secretary of Education. These chiefs are chosen in a variety of ways: 24 are appointed by the State Board of Education, five by the Governor, and 21 are elected by popular ballot, usually in a nonpartisan election.

State educational agencies are also somewhat dissimilar in their functions. Some are fully responsible for all levels of public education in their State. In other States, responsibility for higher education is vested in a separate agency, and authority over vocational education is vested in still another agency.

Whatever they are called and whatever their function may be, it was to State education agencies that the U. S. Congress addressed itself when it passed Title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (Public Law 89-10) - Grants to Strengthen State Departments of Education. Additional indications that State education agencies are being called upon for more aggressive educational leadership include the following statement within a 1965 Presidential message on education:

> State leadership becomes increasingly important as we seek to improve the quality of elementary and secondary education. We should assist the states by strengthening the efforts of their State educational agencies to:
>
> . Provide consultative and technical assistance for local school districts and local school leadership;
>
> . Formulate long-range plans;
>
> . Expand educational research and development;

- Improve local and State information about education;
- Identify emerging educational problems;
- Provide for the training of State and local education personnel;
- Conduct periodic evaluation of educational programs;
- Promote teacher improvement courses.

In summarizing their attitudes toward State education agencies, the Congressional Conference Committee report preceding the enactment of Title V declared "emphatically" that "the alternative to strong State Departments of Education is an educational lag and a default of leadership which can only result in a loss to the entire Nation."

State Education Agency Mission

It has been well established in the courts that education is primarily a State function and responsibility. In preparing to meet emerging educational needs in any State, the citizens must recognize that an adequate program of education can best be developed through competent and dynamic leadership at the State level. The need for such leadership at the State level is becoming more and more apparent since relatively little has been accomplished at the local level as a result of direct programmatic intervention from Washington. There is a need for coordination of Federal efforts at the local level by an agency that is both closer to the scene of action and that has a greater interest in and understanding of local problems than are possible from a national vantage point. In each State, one agency with statewide responsibility should provide that competent and effective leadership needed for planning and effecting improvements in education throughout the State.

Competent State agency operation and bona fide assumption of State responsibility for education can and should help to make possible genuine local responsibility for education in many areas where only the appearance of local responsibility exists under present conditions. At the same time, the State-level structure for public education is often faced with a need for internal restructuring as a necessary prerequisite for that task. The choice is still open in many States as to whether State education agencies will, or can, be effectively and meaningfully restructured so as to avoid a decline in the significance of their roles.

It is also important that State education agencies avoid blaming their occasional educational shortcomings exclusively on the Federal Government or local school districts. The States have plenary and regulatory powers with respect to education so long as provisions of the United States Constitution are not violated and, in many instances, State education agencies have not fully utilized their existing powers.

It should be the mission of every State education agency to ensure that the citizens of the State are provided with opportunities for the highest possible quality of education; that these opportunities are made equally available to every individual wherever he may live in the State and without regard to creed, color, handicap, or economic circumstance; and that the resources of the State allocated to the attainment of these goals are used with the maximum efficiency and economy.

State education agencies should place more emphasis on the attraction and use of highly trained professionals since such an increase in available expertise will inevitably strengthen the agencies. Increased expertise at the State level will improve the quality of State service and leadership available and will also put State education agencies in a better negotiating position with their Federal and local counterparts.

In spite of a variety of independent governing structures over its various parts, it is clear that the total educational system is quite interrelated. Undoubtedly, more effective coordination among these parts should exist and must certainly be achieved in the future. However, all agencies or groups responsible for coordinating various educational units or programs need to be aware of the possibility that coordination can also occasionally be utilized as a procedure that stifles rather than enhances individual initiative. In carrying out their coordination responsibilities, State education agency personnel should avoid the development of rigid, monolithic systems; instead, they should stimulate the development of patterns and procedures through which a variety of unique, individual efforts contribute to meaningful progress toward carefully developed broad goals.

State Education Agency Operation

State education agencies are strategically situated to provide a statewide impact in promoting sound educational programs in local school districts. Makeup of the agency and lines of communication and cooperation are appropriate for leadership in activities to improve education. Since education is a local operational responsibility, a State function, and a regional concern, State education agencies should provide diversity in their operational activities. They should organize and coordinate an effective education system; establish a sound foundation program of financial support; provide effective coordination and distribution of funds; establish minimum standards for achievement and quality controls; lead in long-range planning; conduct, cooperate in and encourage research;

stimulate innovation; assist local school systems in evaluating results; develop good informational systems; and provide incentives to local school systems to go beyond a minimal level of performance.

State education agencies are the key to securing a proper balance among local, State and Federal agencies. The State that is strong in quality education and in giving proper direction to its educational system need not be fearful of being relegated to an inferior role, either in partnership with the Federal Government or with other States in regional ventures. State education agencies must be stimulators of change and maintain dispersed local initiatives for innovation as a means of overcoming the tendency toward homogenized conformity.

The current demand for expansion of State operational responsibility for education is of fairly recent origin and, in many respects, can be considered an outgrowth of the inability of the Federal Government to perform this function. Strategically, local governments have often assumed that education was exclusively a local prerogative. However, as programs have become more diffuse and complex, and as educational demands have grown beyond the scope of individual local agencies, increasing leadership demands and expectations have been placed upon State education agencies. At first, the State education agency was essentially regulatory, but today a wide variety of services to local districts are also provided. Having assumed such a service role, the State agency is now in a strategic position to shape immediate and long-term development of education within the State. But the State education agency cannot assume and carry out alone the task expected of it; the State legislature and the citizens of the State must support these new operational goals of the agency. State legislators should initiate new directional guidelines for the future of education in the State, or resign themselves to accepting less from the State education agency, and therefore less for the children of the State. Furthermore, the State's executive branch should more closely relate to the State education agency as a means of enhancing the potential growth of the major resource within the State--its people.

Court decisions have caused some changes in the States' educational programs and financing. Fulfillment of the United States constitutional responsibility has required that States provide a considerable part of the funds necessary for local school budgets. Three fundamental considerations have led to a justification of additional State support: (1) primary concern on the part of the courts that each individual shall have an equal educational opportunity; (2) the court's concern that without State support, educational opportunity will be extremely unequal or might even be denied to some since communities differ so widely in ability to finance education, and (3) court support of a fairer distribution of costs among the various tax sources.

One of the current major concerns of the public focuses upon the continually rising costs of education with no comparable improvement in the results obtained or even any general agreement on the part of educators as to how those results might be measured. For example, funds that have been earmarked to achieve basic educational benefits for the poor, the disadvantaged, and the noncollege bound children have not achieved the anticipated results. The public has begun to react to this lack of success by refusing to pass an increasing percentage of school bonds. Voters in scores of U. S. communities have rebelled--mounting devastating campaigns against school tax increases and casting aside bond issues in unprecedented numbers.

Attention at the State level is now being given to those aspects of education in which major operational changes seem to be essential if present and future needs are to be met satisfactorily. As a result of careful study, the following important conclusions have emerged: (1) an adequate program of education for every individual is becoming increasingly important with each passing year to help to assure the progress and prosperity of the Nation; (2) effective planning for improvements in education is essential in every State; (3) lay citizens as well as educators must be engaged in the planning process because both are involved in and concerned about education; (4) all planning should be based on a careful study of pertinent information concerning trends and probable developments, rather than on wishful thinking or speculation; (5) because conditions may change or new evidence becomes available, the planning process should be continuous and plans should always be considered tentative and subject to revision; (6) significant changes in instruction and learning are likely to be made only when the need and importance are recognized and understood by those involved; and (7) the needed changes will come all too slowly unless major improvements are made both in the preservice and inservice programs for teachers and other persons professionally involved in education.

State Education Agency Relations

It has become increasingly evident that education must become even more of a partnership operation among local, State, and Federal governments. The high rate of societal mobility illustrates the need for quality education for all the Nation's citizens, regardless of where they happen to reside at a given moment in time. A State can no longer claim exclusive rights to or responsibility for the education of individuals residing therein on what may be a temporary basis. Since all levels of society either benefit or suffer from the educational investment in any specific location, all levels should share responsibility. For the partnership to be most effective, grounds for compatible control of schools must be established. In achieving these effective partnership arrangements, the following elements should be considered:

1. State education agencies are in need of a Federal education program which will bring about improvement in policy information, administrative practices, and fiscal arrangements.

2. State education agencies are interested in participating more fully in the initial formulation of educational policy which involves them and local school districts within their States.

3. State education agencies believe that education must remain a legal function of the States.

4. State education agencies want policy formulation to be open, fully debated and arrived at by the most widespread discussion of the fundamental issues involved.

5. State education agencies desire consolidation of various special grants-in-aid and consolidation of administering agencies.

6. State education agencies believe that Federal funds to the school districts should flow through the State level.

7. State education agencies are opposed to Federal requirements of uniformity among the States through regulations or other techniques affecting eligibility of State or local education agencies to receive Federal funds.

8. State education agencies believe that there should be major expansion of Federal funding through general aid measures and/or by means of an equalization type program.

9. Revenue sharing as a means of providing financial support for State and local governments should specifically recognize the State education agencies.

10. State education agencies should disseminate important research and development findings and outputs to boards of education, community groups, parents, students, and citizens interested in public education. This information should be presented in layman's language utilizing an attractive format.

III. THE STATE EDUCATION AGENCY LEADERSHIP ROLE IN EFFECTING CHANGE

The Council of Chief State School Officers believes that preservation of the status quo is not defensible in an ever-changing society. Efforts to maintain the status quo are, in effect, efforts to prepare for a world that will no longer exist.

One major role of every State education agency must be the provision of leadership and services in planning for (and helping others to plan for) meeting educational needs during coming years. In this manner, it will be possible for the State education agency to help local education agencies to be more responsive to societal needs and to exert an influence on societal change.

Until a larger proportion of educators as well as lay citizens understand clearly the importance and implications of additional contributions to the improvement of both public and nonpublic education that could be made by State education agencies, progress in changing the traditional roles, functions, and relations of State education agencies is likely to be far too slow to meet emerging needs. Among the retarding factors in many States are the following:

1. Few educators and citizens in most States have a clear idea of the contributions to the improvement of education that could and should be made through the leadership and services to be provided by a dynamic and competently staffed State education agency. Most educators and citizens seem to be relatively complacent or unconcerned.

2. People (including school boards and officials in many local school systems) seem to prefer the continuation of a relatively weak State agency. Perhaps they assume that a stronger agency would tend to be concerned primarily with the development of additional regulations and controls. They do not seem to understand that a State education agency that is organized and staffed to provide leadership in planning and effecting improvements in education will also be able to help them assume more meaningful local responsibility for the improvement of education.

3. Few college or university people are seriously interested in or are concerned about the State education agency. Consequently, they have not done much to bring about needed changes in the role of State education agencies.

4. Many State education agencies are handicapped in their attempts to make significant changes in their traditional roles. These handicaps may result from legal provisions,

line-item budgets, or policies and regulations imposed by other agencies primarily concerned with the management of government operations. A good example of this kind of limitation is having professional employees conform to restrictive State personnel requirements.

5. Many of the personnel involved in the State education agency itself may tend to resist any significant change in the traditional role or functions of that agency, primarily because they are comfortable in continuing with what has been done previously, and would be much less comfortable (and perhaps not even qualified) if they were expected to assume a different role.

If the State education agencies are to assume a bona fide leadership role in education, they must broaden their historic organizational and operational concerns (e.g., checking on compliance and doling out both money and advice) to include new leadership and service activities that are less bureaucratic, less regulatory, less bound by traditions and structures, and more concerned with planning, development, and change.

The term "leadership," whether used as a descriptive word or as a broad concept, is often either misunderstood or misused, perhaps in part because this term seems to connote different things to different people. Within the context of this report, the fundamental purpose, or function, of leadership consists of providing assistance in and facilitating the identification and attainment of goals that have been established by and for the organization. It is in this context that leadership, as both a role and a function, is crucial to the State education agency. It is in this vein that the agency can and must provide leadership of the type suggested by Morphet, Johns and Reller who observed that constructive leadership is found when assistance is provided in the following areas:

1. Defining tasks, goals, and purposes of the organization;

2. Achieving or attaining the tasks, goals, and purposes of the organization; and

3. Maintaining the organization by accommodating emerging as well as present organizational and individual needs.

As leaders consider alternative procedures for bringing about needed change, constant consideration must be given to the kinds of change necessary in education. It has been pointed out that there are three kinds of change: (1) changes in people; (2) changes in the institutions or organizations; and (3) changes in program or process.[2] Personnel responsible for effecting needed change should proceed in the order given--that is, from people to organization to program. Unfortunately, educators often attempt to implement change in terms of the institution

or program with little or no attention given to people. The State education agency is in no position to mandate change; it can only help to effect changes by proposing them in such a way that other educational agencies are willing to consider and perhaps adopt them.

An emerging role of the State education agency is to provide the leadership and services needed to plan and effect improvements in all aspects of education and to evaluate progress. The State education agency should assume the initiative and provide the necessary guidance, coordination and services. Every State legislature should make clear, by appropriate legislation, that a major responsibility of the State education agency is to provide the leadership and services necessary for the attainment of this goal.

On the basis of a special study of recent developments in several States, Nix concluded:

> Most State education agencies now are vigorously concerned with long range planning. Several States are striving to connect the program planning process more directly with the budgeting process--in some cases using advanced program budgeting techniques.
>
> Obviously, long range planning for the development of the State education agency has value only as it ultimately serves to improve the quality of the programs in the schools of the State.
>
> The State agency can provide the needed leadership only if it can develop sound plans for the use of its own resources to perform well-selected, relevant roles in the total system.[3]

A major problem in every State education agency is the tendency to develop a bureaucracy that perpetuates a rigid system which, although it may be comforting to those involved, ignores emerging needs and resists change.

The basic criterion used in planning and evaluating the role and services of State education agencies should be whether every function and service contribute maximally to improving the learning environments, opportunities, and procedures for everyone in the State who should benefit from education. Thus, it seems crucial that State education agencies become involved in the following activities:

1. Expand comprehensive planning, research, and evaluation programs. Additionally, develop a dissemination process which permits all local education agencies to have access to the data and information produced.

2. Study organizational structures by supporting new and creative organizational patterns for both local education

agencies and individual schools. Such questions as optimum size, impersonalization, depersonalization, participatory arrangements, and communications should be examined. Moreover, legislatures and citizens must be convinced that actions taken are just and sound.

3. Relate education to other social and economic programs. In a recent survey, only 10 of 38 States responding had organized programs or departments of urban education to effectively link themselves with their urban school districts. Illinois, New Jersey, Ohio, and Texas, for example, have taken initiative in this direction. The decisions of the Ohio and New Jersey State Education Agencies to relate to model cities programs in their States is indicative of what State education agencies might do with social and economic programs in their respective States.

4. Promote curricular experimentation. The State education agency's role in curricular experimentation is one of leadership to effect needed changes. This involves mounting experimental programs, and disseminating the results of such efforts. Equally important is the development of a statewide climate that encourages experimentation and implementation of needed changes.

5. Revise training and certification requirements. The State education agency has responsibility for the development and implementation of teacher preparation and certification criteria. They have a leadership role in testing the viability of existing training and certification patterns and, if these prove to be ineffective, responsibility for developing new ones.

6. Improve inservice education. State education agencies should obtain the cooperation of local school systems and institutions of higher learning in order to improve the nature and quality of inservice education for local school personnel.

7. Develop comprehensive support programs. State education agencies play a vital role in determining and implementing equitable State funding programs.

IV. ACCOUNTABILITY AS A BASIS FOR EDUCATIONAL REFORM

State educational systems are being asked now more than ever before to describe the quality of their results in terms of their effectiveness in linking resources to learning. This movement has led educators, as well as the educational constituency, to investigate a wide variety of alternatives that have as their focus a new form of accountability.

Defining Accountability

The word "accountability" has become an accepted term in current educational nomenclature, a concept in educational rhetoric which has made its way across the campus, so to speak, from the business vernacular to the classroom. But, as often happens with new ideas, the interpretation of the concept of accountability as it applies to education can be as varied as the backgrounds and experiences of the interpreters who use the term. Some writers assert that accountability is satisfied merely through the provision of information on the performance of schools, while others see accountability as a matter of redesigning the structures by which education is governed. In some cases, accountability is defined as a specific approach to education such as performance contracting or educational vouchers. To the legislator it most probably means, "What did you do with that money we gave you during the last session?" The diversity is apparent.

One study of accountability at Stanford University revealed four relatively distinct concepts of accountability:

1. Accountability as a political process
2. Accountability as an operational process
3. Accountability as attainment of goals
4. Accountability as performance reporting

In order to get some feeling for the scope of the diversity of interpretation of this new movement, let us examine very briefly the basis for these dissimilarities which were detailed in a report to the National Academy of Education's Task Force on Accountability.[4]

Accountability as a Political Process

Basic to the whole idea of educational accountability is the ability or inability of schools to provide desirable outcomes for particular groups in society. It is not uncommon, therefore, to hear that schools are not accountable to the poor, or to the minorities, to urban students or to Spanish-speaking children. In essence, what is being said is that accountability requires that the schools and other educational institutions obtain the results that a particular constituency desires. The assumption

is, then, that schools are successfully accountable to some groups, but they are not to others, and that the answer lies in a political process which favors one group over another. Given a conflict among the goals of the various constituencies and limited resources to meet these needs, priorities must be set for the expenditure of these funds. In effect, greater accountability to poorer students may necessarily mean lesser accountability to rich ones. To those who view accountability as a political process, those who have more power under the existing system of governance will obtain greater responsiveness to their needs and goals, and to them the system will be more nearly accountable. Those who have less power will raise persistent questions about the accountability of the system.

Accountability as an Operational Process

Where the previous concept was concerned with the specific goals of particular constituencies and their attainment by the educational system, the concept of accountability as an operational process refers to the legitimacy of the whole process by which educational services are produced and delivered. The emphasis is less on goals than it is on perceptions of what an accountable educational system should be. Proponents of this theory suggest a "deschooling" of society where schooling would no longer be compulsory and other formal or informal learning alternatives would arise. According to this definition, a laissez-faire approach using educational vouchers might be considered an accountable process, for it would enable individuals to make their own educational decisions. In this view, the outcome is less important than the process.

Accountability as a Technical Process

If one assumes that there is reasonable unanimity on the goals of schooling, then accountability can be assumed to be a delivery system for those results, produced at a reasonable cost. Perhaps the most widely publicized approach to accountability in the technical sense is that of educational performance contracting. Under this mechanism, the school district arranges to purchase educational services from an external organization, and the contractor is paid according to the results that he obtains as measured by standardized achievement gains of students. Another evaluation tool, Program-Planning-Budgeting-Systems (PPBS), attempts to link the objectives of schools to measurable outcomes on the one hand, and to programs, resources, and costs on the other. Several States have developed statewide PPBS approaches which they expect local districts to adopt.

Accountability as Performance Reporting

A fourth concept of accountability that has been reflected in current literature is that of performance reporting, a periodic report of the

attainments of educational units. In this category are the development of statewide testing programs as well as the provision of other information that is useful in interpreting test results among school districts such as the racial and socio-economic distributions of pupils.

In some cases, it is suggested that the provision of such information alone satisfies the requirements for accountability, while others presume that citizen and government pressure will serve as a lever by which poor performance will change, once reported.

Laying these differences aside for the moment, however, the Council would suggest that a good working definition of accountability, which uses the focuses of resources and results, might be: "A system of measuring the results of a given program or effort in order to identify strengths and weaknesses so that future resources can be wisely allocated."[5] Put more simply: Educational accountability is a way to find out how we are doing so that we can do better. Beyond this basic definition, it has been found by those people responsible for its application that accountability must of necessity reflect the conditions of the system to which it is being applied.

Accepting accountability on these terms requires that the use of resources be explained; however, it also implies a distinction between accountability and responsibility. Accountability is simply an obligation to report on the utilization of resources in terms of their contribution to the attainment of the desired results. Responsibility constitutes an obligation to take certain action or to achieve certain results. Authority consists of a prerogative or right to take specified action.

One of the criticisms of the recent accountability movement has been that teachers may be held responsible for the fulfillment of predetermined objectives without the resources or flexibility of resource utilization to achieve these goals. Realistically speaking, however, one cannot assume responsibility for accomplishing a given purpose unless he has authority to take appropriate action. Making one accountable--requiring him to measure the results of a given program or effort in order to identify strengths and weaknesses so that future resources can be wisely allocated--should not subject him to criticism or penalties when desired results are not achieved unless he was also assigned the necessary responsibility and authority in deploying resources for achieving those results. Accountability does not justify after-the-fact criticism when certain results have not been achieved unless it was understood in advance by all parties that such results should be expected.

Shifting the Emphasis

In the past, school systems were merely administered, by bringing together the people and the tools. With the new accountability, the school system must be managed by:

1. Pin-pointing needs--Where do we want to go? (Needs Assessment)

2. Setting goals--What is it we want education to do?

3. Laying out a course of action--How do we plan to get there? (Planning)

4. Organizing materials--What kind of help is needed? (By the teacher? By the principal? By the district office? By the State? Books, material, time, money, moral support.)

5. Appropriately assigned personnel--How can we use our forces most wisely? (Flexible staffing. Year round school. Educational alternatives.)

6. Evaluating the results--How well are we doing? (Assessment)

7. Reviewing the program--Keeping the program up to date according to the changing demands and needs of the time.

Shifting the emphasis from what goes into education to what comes out of education demands that we answer the question: What is it that we want education to do? Here, the State education agency, the State board of education, the district school board, or the appropriate agency at whatever level, must take the first step. Answering this question is the most important single step in the entire process, because everything that takes place from this point on is built on the decisions made here--decisions made cooperatively by both professional and lay persons, representing the aspirations of both the education and the citizen communities.

In a larger sense, accountability as perceived by the Council diversifies the responsibility for education by encouraging the participation of a broader segment of the population in the setting up of the goals for their learning experiences.

Goal Setting and Objectives

The establishment of overall goals translated into specific objectives serves to keep the criteria for achievement in focus. However visionary, these objectives must establish without question the desired outcomes of the educational community involved in terms which are specific enough to determine whether or not these goals have been, or, in fact, can be attained in terms of the resources available. Goals should be broad enough to be direction-setting statements of ideal conditions of the educational system which may serve to define the arena in which the

educational enterprise of the State, for example, will operate. Within an individual school, however, goals should be specific enough to measure in terms of long- and short-range objectives and should serve as guidelines for planning and programming the time and resources of the smaller educational community. They must be broad and flexible enough to permit the development of objectives that are verifiable. Realistically, if you don't know what it is you are trying to do, there is little way to determine if, in fact, you have done it.

Legal Basis for Accountability

To date, more than half of the States have statutes that bear on the question of accountability. Within these States the highest legal entity dealing with the educational system, usually the State board of education, has the general power to determine, adopt, or prescribe such policies, rules, regulations, or standards it may find necessary for the improvement of the State system of public education through accountability measures. For the most part, the statutes do not spell out specific measures; however, they do specify what a State education agency is legally accountable for in the public education system.

Legal responsibilities can be identified at the Federal, State, and local levels. At the Federal level, the legal responsibilities of the administering agency are specified within the laws relating to education passed by Congress and then translated into policies and regulatory statements that provide for assurances, audit procedures, and criteria to fulfill the intent of the laws.

In the States, legal responsibilities relating to the question of accountability in education are expressed initially in the laws that reaffirm the responsibility for the State board of education to establish uniform statewide educational objectives. Within most of these mandates are provisions that require the State's chief school officers to administer statewide assessment programs and to make a public report on the results.

At the local level, the legal framework set forth from the State level usually required the local school boards to issue accountability reports on resources that they control as well as requiring the consolidation of State assessment objectives and accreditation criteria within their program standards.

Technical Requirements

The State and local requirements to fulfill the legal basis for accountability, as well as the growing incentives from the Federal level (e.g., comparability regulations), necessitate certain school management activities in the area of technical requirements. These required activities are the "nuts and bolts" of an accountability mandate. These school management activities can be summarized in several groupings:

1. The development and maintenance of an on-going systematic evaluation of educational needs in the local districts and a comprehensive annual and long-range plan for meeting these identified needs.

2. The collection and reporting of student assessment data.

3. The implementation of a system for analyzing resources utilized and providing feedback for measuring future resource assignments.

4. The maintaining of a system of on-going financial accounting procedures that are standardized and provide information on expenditures as related to the statewide instructional objectives.

5. The operation of an orderly information system based on facts and conditions of school districts including assessment information and information on resources allocated, scope of programs, pupils served, etc.

In responding to legal requirements adopted by the State board of education the State education agency should make available to local districts technical assistance and services they cannot provide from their own resources. The State must consider carefully the potential impact of its various activities, and those activities selected should reinforce the State priorities for available resources and desired results.

Humanizing Accountability

The danger of this new accountability in education can come from those interpreters who would depersonalize the educational process to such a degree that teachers and students become little more than "rule followers" or "role players" without the freedom to express and explore purposes entirely their own as they are obliged to meet systems-designed objectives. We must recognize that the development of the mind and spirit--which is what education is all about--is intensely individual and continuous throughout life. Growth may be uneven: Some phases go quickly for some people; some go slowly. If educators try to process everyone through the same assembly line at the same rate, it simply will not work. All education should be as individualized as possible, allowing for slow or rapid growth, individual pacing, and time for catching up.

The problem of education is not to figure out the ideal program of instruction, and then impose it on all students; rather, it is to create an environment in which each individual student can pursue learning according to his own style, pace, and aspiration. This can only be accomplished if the technical requirements of a system are intended to support educational purposes, not to dictate those purposes.

As necessary as it is for the objectives of a program to be situation-specific, it is also equally necessary that accountability develop a climate whereby individual initiative and creativity can flourish. In some cases this may be accomplished by focusing on what is relevant in terms of what is required of teachers and administrators to "get the job done," suggesting the elimination of arbitrary requirements and standards for teaching, particularly in the area of teacher education and certification. In other cases, it may require that the establishment of "desired results" reach beyond a series of stratified test scores to encompass more than levels of achievement.

Implications for the Future

Educational accountability as described herein holds at least three very significant implications for education:

First, schools must make a decision as to those things for which they will assume responsibility. Schools must communicate clearly to parents and to the public regarding expectations which should be considered reasonable.

Second, the schools must avoid practices which needlessly label individuals and usurp their right to make decisions for themselves. There is an ever-present possibility that an urge for accountability can lead to a point where the students are serving the schools, rather than vice versa. Those objectives specified at the State level should be limited to objectives which are essential for the welfare of society.

Third, school officials will enjoy much greater discretion in allocating resources, but will also be under greater pressure to use those resources wisely. In order for accountability to be meaningful, it is necessary to give those who are accountable a sufficient amount of flexibility in allocating resources so that they also assume a degree of responsibility. Otherwise, accountability means only that professional educators have become accountants for the department of education.

On November 15, 1972, the Council of Chief State School Officers, during their annual meeting, passed a resolution that clearly indicated the State education agencies' focus and role in accountability. This resolution read:

> The Council of Chief State School Officers believes that a clear set of goals, and a reporting of the degree to which these goals are met, are essential in American education.
>
> Therefore, the Council urges each chief State school officer to provide required leadership in setting of goals and the evaluation and assessment of all programs involving student time and public funds, appropriately publicizing achievements and deficiencies, so that all citizens may know the results of their investment in education.

The concept of accountability in education is still embryonic, but the possibilities of its application in the future stagger the imagination. With enthusiasm must go caution, however, for there are still many questions that remain to be answered. The product of research is understanding; the product of development is proven and practical procedures; and the goal of dissemination is the adoption of these procedures. These processes must not be confused as the leadership personnel of State agencies work toward designing new educational standards. To cling to outmoded standards in education is to ignore the responsibility for leadership; to champion new causes without a recognized commitment to research and evaluation of the new as well as the old may only result in an exchange of one set of inadequacies for another.

It is a fact that educational accountability is in the interest of the tax paying public. Competition for increasingly limited tax dollars has given rise to demands for assurance that public monies be used most wisely in accomplishing the purposes of public institutions. Moreover, the lack of any large scale pay-off for the millions of State and Federal dollars already expended in an attempt to solve the old and new problems of the Nation's schools has frustrated both the dreamer and the realist.

If and when State education agencies can articulate their ends in terms of affecting the performance of the individuals who are a part of the larger educational system and can measure each of its present actions against these same criteria, then it becomes possible to envision new ways to bridge the gap between goal attainment and the desired goals of the future. All the working pieces are visible and identifiable from a common reference point. With "where we are" and "where we want to be" clearly defined, the management of education may well become a goal-directed evolutionary process.

V. COMPETENCY BASED TEACHER EDUCATION AND CERTIFICATION

The Council recognizes the need for quality instruction in the classroom and supports the concept of competency-based teacher education (CBTE) by encouraging State education agencies to employ competency-based certification policies. The basic differences between competency-based and conventional education systems are evident in the amount of choice allowed students with respect to goals and instructional and evaluation procedures, the amount of information given students concerning the instructional goals, and the sensitivity of the system to individual differences.

Since the emphasis in CBTE is on achievement of specified objectives and not the ranking of learners, an effort is made to increase the probability of learner success by providing different instructional routes from which the learner may select the one most compatible with his or her unique learning style. In selecting a route to follow toward the accomplishment of an objective, the learner may be able to choose from a lecture, a list of selected readings, a videotape presentation, a slide-tape package, a programed instruction manual, or numerous other options. Should the alternative selected by the learner prove unsuccessful, other experiences or options are usually available for the purpose of allowing a recycling process.[6]

The competency-based teacher education programs attempt to overcome those often criticized faults of traditional programs:

1. All education courses are alike; little new content is developed from course to course.

2. Education instructors talk about individualization but do not practice it.

3. The content in education courses is either innocuous or simplistic.

4. Education instructors provide general philosophical ideologies, but rarely relate these to common classroom problems and subsequent solutions.

5. The use of media and technology is discussed frequently, but few education instructors provide constant examples of this use in their classes.

6. As a result of the great duplication of material from course to course, gaps in important educational areas are often found.

7. Educational innovations along with the changing role of the teacher are often discussed, but few examples are utilized by the pedagogue.[7]

It is almost impossible to deal with competency-based teacher education without also considering certification, but certification issues can be considered in isolation from the problems of preparation. State certification officials do share the following basic assumptions: (a) competency-based certification can be defined; (b) the present system for certifying teachers is either inadequate or could be vastly improved; (c) unless one knows what a teacher is expected to do, to know, to feel (the definition of teaching), it is impossible to set up any kind of system; (d) once one makes explicit the responsibilities of the teacher, it is possible to devise objective systems to decide whether or not the person possesses those desired behaviors; (e) enough is known about the relationship between teacher behavior and pupil learning to devise a certification system based on objective criteria; and (f) educators should move now for the development of competency-based certification policies.

What system of competency-based teacher education should a State use? The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education completed a national survey in September 1971 which revealed that 32 States were at various stages of commitment to competency-based teacher education (from mild interest to initial implementation). Some few States are attempting to develop a State system to grant certification based on demonstrated performance by the candidates. In New Jersey, where qualified teams labored long to establish behavioral objectives for specific certification areas, the focus is now on finding the appropriate instruments and techniques for analyzing these behaviors.

Given the interest of some 30 States and the work already done, it is possible to see some of the more evident problems that emerge when promoting a competency-based certification system:

1. There is great difficulty in establishing a competency-based certification system without first conceptualizing and defining in specific terms the role (or roles) of the professional person who will receive the certificate. The States, however, that are promoting their own competency-based certification programs must face those issues at the State level and must obtain some form of consensus on literally thousands of such issues before they can develop a program.

2. The lack of research is a tremendous deterrent to the successful implementation of a competency-based certification policy. It is undoubtedly an improvement to develop a policy that describes the specific teaching skills of the candidate to be licensed. However, that

is still a long way from guaranteeing that the teachers so licensed or so trained are going to be able to be effective teachers in the classroom--that children will learn.

3. Many States engaged in promoting competency-based certification are spending a considerable amount of that effort engaged in the politics of local education systems. The demands by the teaching profession for greater authority over the licensing of teachers, the militancy of teacher groups--both union and professional associations--the distrust that often exists between the practitioners in the field (e.g., the teachers) and those that in some respects control the teachers (e.g., the State education agencies) are long-founded and hard to diminish. As a result, State education agencies find they must spend an exorbitant amount of time in building trust before they can start to construct bridges.

4. Almost all States are suffering from a lack of funds, which has resulted in cutbacks in staff, lack of funds to travel to out-of-State activities that may be absolutely necessary for planning to develop a competency-based certification program, and the inability to hire desperately needed consultants at the appropriate times.

5. A major problem facing State education agencies is developing a system to manage the formulation and implementation of competency-based certification. Because resources are usually allocated on a need basis, the requisite planning often has not taken place. A nine-State consortium has been funded to develop a management approach to the establishment of a competency-based teacher education and certification policy.[8]

Because of the nature of their relationship, changes in accreditation standards must necessarily follow changes in certification standards; if certification is based on carefully prescribed course-credit requirements, then programs seeking accreditation must verify that they provide such courses to preservice teachers. Similarly, if certification criteria are performance-based, teacher training programs must include stated competencies, instructional strategies for achieving these competencies and appropriate criterion-referenced evaluation techniques. A survey of State directors of teacher education has found that seven States are currently using a course-credit approach to certification, 42 States are using an approved program approach, and one State is using a performance-based approach.[9]

In formulating accreditation standards and related guidelines for program developers, State education agencies are faced with the task of determining

what elements are essential and what elements are desirable in a performance-based teacher education program. In a 1971 publication of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE), Elam presented the findings of the AACTE Committee on Performance-Based Teacher Education. Following a 15-month study, the committee concluded that there appears to be general agreement that a teacher education program is performance-based if:

1. Competencies (knowledge, skills, behaviors) to be demonstrated by program graduates are derived from explicit conceptions of teacher roles stated in measurable terms and made public in advance;

2. Criteria for assessing competencies are congruent with specified competencies, make explicit expected levels of mastery under specified conditions, and are made public in advance;

3. Assessment of the student's competence is based on his performance, takes into account evidence of his knowledge relevant to planning for, analyzing, interpreting or evaluating situations or behavior, and strives for objectivity;

4. The student's rate of progress through the program is determined by demonstrated competence rather than by time or course completion; and

5. The instructional program is intended to facilitate the development and evaluation of the student's achievements of specified competencies.

Implementation of a product-oriented systems approach is normally a correlate of a performance-based approach to teacher education. The following are characteristics of a systematic program in performance-based teacher education: emphasis on exit, not entrance, requirements; modularized instruction; student accountability in terms of performance; field-centered instructional strategies; broad-based decisionmaking; and instruction which includes skill development and concept identification and utilization.

There are a number of special problems generally associated with teacher education. These include the problem of giving status to professional courses, the problem overlapping jurisdiction in accreditation, the problem of restricting the national accrediting agency's jurisdiction over certain aspects of professional programs and the problem of accrediting specialized areas.

Accreditation standards have come full circle with the current trend toward product standards brought about by the performance-based teacher

education movement. The technology necessary for successful implementation is largely available. Further progress would appear to depend more on consensus regarding desirability and on the existence of a spirit of cooperation in working toward the solutions of the major problems than on the development of new techniques.[10]

Steps that should be considered in order to assure competency-based teacher education/certification include the following:

1. To provide competency-based teacher education and certification is an effort that will require the cooperation of State education agencies, institutions of higher learning, and local school districts.

2. Institutions of higher learning, in concert with the offices of teacher certification of State education agencies, should establish performance objectives in their preservice and inservice preparation programs. This mechanism will provide a guideline to ensure an accountability procedure to enhance quality education for the benefit of children.

3. State education agencies, institutions of higher education, and local schools should develop and implement staff development programs to equip supervisors of student interns with the skills necessary to perform the role of supervisor effectively.

VI. EMPLOYMENT AND EDUCATION OF WOMEN

The Council of Chief State School Officers recognizes that women comprise more than half the number of persons employed in the education profession and that women represent untapped reservoirs of talent and ability which have not up to this time been fully realized in employment and advancement opportunities. Chief State school officers have been encouraged to take positive action to assure equal educational and employment opportunities for women.

Because sexism is a component in many aspects of our American society, women have often been placed in a secondary role position in the educational system. This deemphasized role of women in American society is reflected in our encyclopedias, textbooks, literature, guidance practices, and in the general attitudes and practices of institutions of elementary, secondary, and higher education. As a result, women have been conditioned to limit their role expectations. Choices for women are, for the most part, restricted to service-oriented roles. Educational institutions should provide women with employment and learning opportunities so that they might contribute their talents and abilities to the betterment of society.

Linda Kraft, in her study "Lost Herstory, Treatment of Women in Children's Encyclopedias"[11] concerning whether encyclopedias intended for use by children provide adequate and accurate information on the roles and problems of women, past and present, includes in her analysis five sets of encyclopedias recommended for children's home use by the Reference and Subscription Books Committee of the American Library Association: Britannica Junior (Encyclopedia Britannica, 1972), Compton's Encyclopedia and Fact Index (F. E. Compton, 1972), Merit Students Encyclopedia (Crowell Collier, 1970), The World Book Encyclopedia (Field Enterprises Educational Corp., 1972), and the New Book of Knowledge: The Children's Encyclopedia (Grolier, 1971).

Kraft concludes through her research that treatment of women by children's encyclopedias produce examples of the following content categories in greater or lesser degree:

> Significant omissions from history.
>
> Role assigning, the implication that most or many present-day work roles are necessarily distributed along sex lines; emphasis upon women collectively as housewives, to the exclusion of their other roles, past and present...
>
> Exclusion of illustrations of women, preponderance of stereotyped portrayals of women as housewives, generally in the background, and an overwhelming number of illustrations in which men only are shown or in which they are dominant.

Glorification of males and the implications that men only held opinions and that they are or were the only people in the social milieu.

Girl Watching, noting the physical attributes of particular women even when these are irrelevant to the discussion at hand.

Subsuming terminology, use of terms such as man, men, or mankind in the sense of human being, he meaning both he and she and subsuming terms such as manpower and brotherhood.

The hypothetical person as male. For example "if a man travelled from New York to Virginia in 1800..."

Male-oriented quoted material which is not identified as such. For example, "These are the times which try men's souls."

Nobody knows her name, females referred to as wives, daughters, or mothers of males clearly identified by name and occupation, e.g., Archduke Ferdinand and his wife.

Differential generic terminology, in which men stand for people in general and women do not, e.g., peasants versus peasant women. This category gives women a separate and less than equal status.

Women as luggage, language implying that all women were involuntarily shipped, taken, or brought along by men during various migrations when, in fact, some independent women did set out on their own.

Male-oriented glossing of terms, the definition of words applicable to either or both sexes as though they applied exclusively to males, e.g., "A farmer is a man who farms."

Male-oriented occupational terminology, use of occupational terms ending in "man," which suggest that certain fields of endeavor are closed to women, e.g., cameraman.

Feminine suffixes, e.g. launderess, which imply that females are a special and unequal form of the correct neuter expression.

Daniel J. Chase reports in his article "Sexism in Textbooks"[12] that two studies that are the current bible on schoolbook sex bias, "Feminist Look at Children's Books" and "Dick and Jane as Victims," are revealing. Chase includes in this article:

"Dick and Jane" is based on a detailed content analysis of 134 readers used in three suburban school districts in New Jersey. After examining past and current editions from 14 major publishers, WOW [Women on Words and Images] indicts readers not only for reinforcing sexism, but also for "limiting girls" aspirations, and lowering their self-esteem. Little girls can't help but get the impression, consciously or unconsciously, concludes WOW, that boys are more important, more intelligent, have broader career opportunities and considerably more fun.

WOW researchers found that reader girls do have a big statistical edge when it comes to negative characteristics--passivity, dependency and incompetence. Pint-sized heroines are scairdy-cats, too--terrified of woods, snakes, and insects. Especially disturbing to WOW is that girls are allowed--even encouraged--to cling to irrational fears. For boys, a recurrent theme is conquering fears.

The WOW study continues by looking at the narrow vocational prospects for females:

Adult role models fit the same stereotypes as the child protagonists. Adult males are portrayed in 147 wide-ranging occupations, adult females in 25. Actually 22--if you cull the undesirable or improbable prospects: fat lady, queen, and witch.

Adult males are job-holders and parents. Adult females almost never both. Despite U. S. Department of Labor statistics showing that nearly 40 percent of working women have children, WOW unearthed only three working mothers.

The typical reader mother comes across as a "colorless, mindless creature" for whom household chores "constitute the only happiness." In illustrations, she frequently appears in the classic servant's posture, "Body slightly bent forward, hands clasped, eyes...on the master of the house..."

Girl-baiting, a pernicious type of sexism that has the potential for damaging a young female's self-confidence, is another item that WOW explored:

The study isolated 67 stories in which one sex demeans the other and found that 65 were directed against girls. Girl characters frequently join in the sport of belittling other females or putting themselves down with remarks like: "I'm just a girl, but I know enough not to do that," or "even I can do that and you know how stupid I am."

In his article, Chase notes other sources dealing with sexism in textbooks: Elementary and Secondary Textbook Evaluation Sheets, Let Them Aspire! and Sexism in Education.

Constance Williams writes in her article, "Does Different Equal Less? a high school woman speaks out."[13]

> Being a high school woman means seeing women treated as supplementary materials in textbooks. Used in a variety of ways, our texts in nearly all fields reinforce the stereotyped image of American women and our place in society. They generally leave out most women of importance and minimize the legal, social and cultural disabilities they face.

In an article entitled "Women in U. S. History Text Books,"[14] author Janice Law Trecker examines 12 of the most popular history texts and concludes that:

> Based on information included in these commonly used high school texts, one might summarize the history and contribution of American women as follows: "Women arrived in 1619. They held the Seneca Falls Convention in 1848. During the rest of the 19th Century, they participated in reform movements, chiefly temperance, and were exploited in factories. In 1923 they were given the vote. They joined the armed forces for the first time during the Second World War and thereafter have enjoyed the good life in America." Add the names of the women who are invariably mentioned, Harriet Beecher Stowe, Jane Addams, Dorothea Dix, and Francis Perkins, with perhaps Susan B. Anthony, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, with almost as frequently Carrie Nation, and you have the basic text.

Higgs and Stewig limited their survey, as reported in their article "Girls Grow Up--A Study of Sexism in Children's Literature,"[15] to one specific type of children's literature--picture books. Since psychologists report that 50 percent of intelligence development takes place from birth until children enter kindergarten and researchers have clearly established that sex role identification begins in the earliest months of life and is for the most part completed when a child is 5 years old, this study is interesting. The authors of this article report:

> Our analysis included 154 picture books, representing the work of 78 authors, randomly selected from a collection of 957 picture books available in a university education department library (a complete list of books used in the study is available from the authors upon request).

The unfortunate conclusion reached as a result of our research is that women do indeed play a subordinate, home-related role. In fact, in 13 of the books surveyed, no women were included at all, though these books did include men.

Of the books which did portray women, 83 percent of them showed women in the homemaking roles, only 17 percent showed them in more professional roles.

...women's homemaking roles in picture book literature are not essentially intellectual or creative. While reading is included, it is not prominent. Artistic expression (painting, playing musical instruments, creative writing) is minimal or non-existent.

...noticeably absent, at least in the books surveyed, are women portrayed in such professional roles as doctors, lawyers, concert musicians, scientists, and many others.

...the books seldom show men involved in the household tasks that many of them perform today, as a result of having a working wife.

The authors conclude the following:

...from this set of books women are not depicted in the rich variety of professional roles in which they are engaged today.

A wider presentation of women's roles in picture books would undoubtedly result in young children, particularly girls, having a more realistic picture of career opportunities now open to women. This seems especially crucial in picture books which are used at a time when children are extremely impressionable and learning much in the way of both facts and attitudes. Attitudes would be more positive if the facts presented through picture books were more reflective of the nature of our society today.

At the high school level, Constance Williams writes:

The 1968 report of the President's Commission on the Status of Women reports that only 40 percent of college "freshpeople" are women. Only one in three of B.A. and M.A. degrees are earned by women in the United States--and only one in ten of the doctorates were earned by women. Among the top 10 percent graduating high school

seniors, there are twice as many girls as boys--with no college plans. The commission found that some of the reasons for the loss in motivation on the part of high school women was the stereotyping of women in our culture and the lingering ideas of female inferiority, both of which persist in U. S. history books.

In essence, being a high school woman means needing information--and support. We must have books, films, and records about all kinds of women in all aspects of life. We also need reviews of the images of girls and women in all high school materials--new and old.

Fishel and Pottker in their article "Women Teachers and Teacher Power"[16] note the following among educational attitudes and practices which are detrimental to female growth:

Although two-thirds of all teachers are women, 95 percent of all principals are men. Discrimination against women at the principalship level is particularly harmful since the principalship is frequently a stepping-stone to higher administrative posts.

Out of 50 state superintendents of schools, only one is female.

Women also comprise only 18 percent of the members on the 50 state school boards.

Out of 14,379 local superintendents of schools, only 90 or 0.6 percent are women.

Until 1970 there were no women in major policymaking positions in the U. S. Office of Education.

In the U. S. only one out of ten school board positions is held by a woman, and 56 percent of all school boards have no women members.

Besides these obvious areas of discrimination in education, there are more subtle forms of sex discrimination at work. Women teachers are also discriminated against in pay for extra duties: male teachers receive far higher salary supplementals for coaching sports than women teachers receive for supervising non-athletic activities. Lower pay supplementals for women holds true even when the activities require the same amount of time; this is a dramatic example of unequal pay for equal work.

Preferential treatment is also frequently given to male teachers in terms of tenure and sabbaticals. The total experience of women in teaching has shown that sex discrimination is as great in public employment as it is in private employment.

Beginning women teachers were more eager to achieve an administrative position than were the more experienced women teachers, who have seen how difficult it is for a woman to obtain such a position.

Women see that they have little chance to advance and therefore do not think it is worth the effort to obtain the academic credentials needed to do so. This process can be seen in the fact that women receive three-quarters of all bachelor's degrees in education, but under half of master's degrees and under one-fifth of doctorates in education.

...Many administrators use the protege system; they choose "their man" from the pool of availables to sponsor...

It must be stated that the task to equalize opportunities for women is an enormous one. In order that the talent and ability of women may be realized for the benefit of society the following suggestions are presented.

1. State education agency personnel, instructional materials specialists, librarians, and subject specialists should develop guidelines that relate to women as <u>human beings</u> in order that positive evaluation of present materials may take place and that the positive selection of future materials may be assured.

2. State education agency personnel, instructional materials specialists, subject specialists, and librarians should develop a comprehensive listing of materials that view women as human beings, not as secondary role beings.

3. State education agency personnel should support the efforts of personnel within higher education in order to eliminate biased sexism attitudes and practices at institutions that prepare school personnel, thereby attacking negative trends at a major source.

4. State education agency personnel in concert with local school district personnel should assess by means of established guidelines present attitudes and practices of school personnel and, after base-line data is

obtained, develop strategies for the implementation of positive practices which reflect alternative role selections for women.

5. State education agency personnel in cooperation with local school districts and institutions of higher learning should eliminate existing sex-segregated classes and activities at all levels of education where such sex-segregated classes and activities thwart students from developing into self-actualizing human beings.

6. It is essential that State education agencies set positive examples of equality of opportunity by affirmative action in the areas of department hiring practices and department promotion practices.

7. State education agencies should eliminate remaining instances of salary inequality for women.

   For example, where agency salary policies are still based upon salary in relation to past salaries and not based upon job performance, some inequality may still exist since past salaries for women have often been based on negative sexism rather than job performance.

VII. SELECTED AREAS FOR PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

Mindful of the increasing susceptibility of education to all forms of crises and pressures, State education agencies must reaffirm their goal that pubic education should provide the maximum opportunity for each learner to acquire the knowledge, skills, attitudes, and ideals that will enable him to live happily and productively while providing our society with citizens who contribute support and enhancement for its moral, social, aesthetic, economic, and political values. State education agencies, in their deliberations involving the direction of education in this country, must consider the requests of various educational communities on behalf of their clientele for additional resources, facilities, programs, and services while at the same time responding to the persistent demands of the general tax paying public and governmental agencies for priority setting, program planning and budgeting, productivity, and other forms of accountability. Only through a satisfied climate and careful and deliberate analysis of our educational enterprise will the public be reassured that the management of education is in responsible hands.

Having examined a wide range of program areas that need further development, we have selected six specific areas as especially worthy of consideration by individual State education agencies and the Federal government. These programs have been selected for a variety of reasons including: (1) the desirability for new program efforts in these areas, (2) their potential for benefiting specific client groups, (3) the need for State education agency involvement, and (4) the future availability of Federal funds. In each case, we have attempted to briefly describe the problems and potential benefits associated with the development of the program area, suggested appropriate actions for individual State education agencies related to that area, and described any recent Council policies and resolutions related to those areas. The program areas that have been included are career education, adult-continuing education, bilingual-bicultural education, early childhood education, Indian education, and educational television.

Career Education

Career education has assumed a greater significance in our current era where major job changes have become the norm rather than the exception during a person's career. Since the average high school graduate can now expect at least four major job changes during his lifetime, schools can no longer think in terms of career education as a one-time-only educational experience that is oriented exclusively to the acquisition of a specific type of job. In many cases, the job that is initially obtained by a new high school graduate or by a young person prior to high school graduation may no longer exist in 10 years or will have been modified to the point where career retraining and redirection is a necessity for the worker.

In spite of the fact that some industries have emphasized an interest in providing their own career training and retraining, preparation remains one of the basic responsibilities of our educational system. In carrying out this responsibility, the public schools must develop educational programs for all persons that will assure both initial and continuing access to equal opportunity in career development keeping in mind that certain occupational areas may be over-emphasized at particular times thus creating an imbalance in the number of qualified personnel available for particular occupational fields.

In taking on the responsibility for developing balanced and effective career education opportunities that enable students to continue their educational and career growth opportunities once they have begun a career, it is extremely important that programs emphasize an awareness of available career choices as well as a realistic understanding of the possible consequences of each career choice. Since many career decisions currently take place at the high school level and since many awareness and exploratory experiences should take place during the elementary and junior high school years, this is an extremely crucial matter.[17]

At the November 1972 meeting of the Council, the following resolution was passed:

> The Council of Chief State School Officers believes that preparation for careers should be a basic policy of education and pledges its commitment to this principle. The Council believes that educational programs should be developed for all individuals to help assure equal opportunity for career development. The Council also believes that a continuing program of training, retraining, advancement, and promotion should be provided for out-of-school youth and adults.
>
> Public education continues to make a valuable contribution to manpower development and training efforts and this Council opposes legislation and rules which dilute the role of public education in manpower training policies and programs.

State education agencies should consider the following factors in examining their own career education programs:

1. Career education programs should be designed in such a way that they prepare students for open-ended career areas and also provide those students with the necessary self-directed growth skills that will enable them to continue making effective career choices after they begin their careers.

2. Coordinating responsibility for all new Federal and State manpower development and training efforts should be placed within the State education agencies. In addition, State education agencies should assume responsibility for coordinating their existing and future career education efforts with similar programs currently available or emerging within the private sector.

3. State education agencies should assume responsibility for providing effective program linkages between their own career education components and the wide range of adult and continuing education program options that are currently available both within and outside of State education agencies.

Adult and Continuing Education

Every person should have access to opportunities for the continuation of their education from childhood through their adult years in keeping with the individual's ability, need, and desire for that education. The emerging emphasis upon adult and continuing education is intended to supplement the more traditional approaches to providing diverse educational opportunities on a full time basis to the youth of our Nation at least through high school.

Existing school systems that are oriented primarily toward full time precollegiate students have experienced financial difficulty in also supporting part time educational opportunities for youth and adults as supplementary options beyond the regular full-time school day. In spite of the current financial difficulty in meeting adult and continuing education needs, school systems as they are presently structured have the potential for providing an extremely effective service to the general public in the area of adult and continuing education since one of the major cost factors in any such programmatic extension would be the availability of facilities. Since resources for these programs will continue to be scarce in the foreseeable future, it is imperative that effective linkages among the present K-12 school systems, community and 4-year colleges, and universities be developed and maintained so that coordinated adult and continuing education programs might be developed.

At its annual meeting in November of 1972, the Council passed the following resolutions:

> The Council of Chief State School Officers recognizes adult and continuing education as an integral part of the educational system of each state and urges that more emphasis be placed on expansion of these opportunities for youth and adults.

> The Council believes that schools should be community centers, not only for individuals, but for family, civic and other groups to pursue educational desires throughout life. These opportunities should be expanded through increased funding at the State and Federal level.

If thoroughly integrated adult and continuing education programs are to be developed within the States, State education agencies must provide effective leadership in coordinating the various agencies that are to be involved. Opportunities for creative program options are many since adult and continuing education need not take place only within sharply circumscribed public school and college campuses but can also occur within homes in industrial settings, through internships, independent study and field experiences, or in a variety of other settings depending on the needs of individual students. In designing new programs, it is also possible to modify the traditional use of grades and credit points which, however they are added or averaged, do not always yield a satisfactory measure of education within the adult and continuing education context. Furthermore, State education agencies might emphasize an enlargement of the traditional faculty to also include knowledgeable people from outside the traditional public school and academic world and, in addition, make use of various new techniques for the storage, retrieval and communication of knowledge. Emphasis can increasingly be placed upon self-directed student learning within the adult and continuing education context while still maintaining close teaching-learning relationships between students and instructors.

Attempting to bring existing educational structures within a given State together to focus upon their common interests and concerns within adult and continuing education will not be an easy task. However, the task can be accomplished if the Federal Government supports this necessary coordination mechanism by utilizing State education agencies as a vehicle for providing financial support for new programs and activities in adult and continuing education.

Bilingual-Bicultural Education

Bilingual-bicultural education is perhaps the greatest educational priority today in bilingual communities. Its primary goal is to include previously excluded children into an improved, more flexible educational structure. Bilingual-bicultural education is neither remedial nor does it seek to compensate children for their supposed deficiencies; instead, it seeks to develop bilingualism as a valuable asset rather than to stigmatize it as a defect. By adopting a bilingual-bicultural program that recognizes the existence of language and cultural pluralism within our society, it may be possible to modify the traditionally negative view of the child who is different by emphasizing the fact that diversity is to be enjoyed and valued rather than feared and suspected.

A variety of strong supportive arguments have been developed with regard to bilingual-bicultural education.[18] For example, allowing children to begin their schooling in the language they understand best, it is more likely that the child's first experience with school will be positive rather than negative. And since language is one of the principal tools through which children learn problemsolving skills in their crucial early schooling years, previous attitudes and policies toward children who spoke a native language other than English often caused permanent damage to the child's learning potential by ignoring or refusing to utilize the major intellectual channel available to that child upon arrival at school. Our previous emphasis toward utilizing English as a vehicle for teaching the non-English speaking child overlooked the fact that it takes a certain amount of time for a child who is unfamiliar with the language to achieve a level of proficiency approaching that of the child who is raised in an English-speaking home. In the meantime the non-English speaking child falls hopelessly behind in his struggle to understand other academic subjects.

In a bilingual program, two languages are used as mediums of instruction and a child is able to study academic subjects in his own language at the same time that he is beginning to master the English language. Bilingual programs teach children to read their own language and to understand, speak, read, and write the English language.

In addition to facilitating the learning of English, bilingual education programs have other benefits. For example, although more than $1 billion a year are spent on foreign language instruction, virtually no part of that money ever goes to maintain the native language competence which already exists in American bilingual children. Bilingual education also allows English speaking children to learn a second language far more effectively than they could in a foreign language program because their classmates are native bilingual speakers. Bilingualism also develops and enhances the children's intellectual capabilities.

In 1967, a bilingual education bill was passed at the Federal level as an amendment to Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. The psychological impact of the Federal bilingual education act cannot be over-estimated since it reversed a fifty year old "one language" policy and committed the moral force of the national government to meeting the educational needs of the large numbers of children of limited English-speaking ability in the United States. The Act provides financial assistance to local educational agencies for, among other things: (1) bilingual educational programs; (2) programs designed to impart to students a knowledge of the history and culture associated with their languages; and (3) efforts to establish closer cooperation between the school and the home.

This commitment by the Federal Government has gradually influenced State and local communities. Since 1968, at least eleven States have passed laws permitting local school districts to provide bilingual instruction

and at least two States (Massachusetts and Pennsylvania) have passed legislation requiring school districts to provide bilingual education programs.

In November of 1972, the Council of Chief State School Officers passed the following resolution:

> It is recognized that many children enter school without a functional command of the English language and have value systems and cultures different from those of the English-speaking majority in the Nation; and that these children are handicapped throughout their formal education when they are forced to learn through the medium of English and when their culture and their mastery of another language are ignored.
>
> The Council of Chief State School Officers encourages the use throughout the Nation of bilingual-bicultural education programs, where appropriate, to enhance the self-esteem and the learning and earning power of individuals from non-English speaking homes.

State education agencies should consider the following activities related to the development of bilingual-bicultural education programs:

1. Explore the possibility of conducting a statewide needs assessment designed to identify the educational needs of children and adults with limited English speaking ability.

2. If appropriate, develop a State bilingual-bicultural education program on the basis of information obtained from such a needs assessment survey as well as a thorough analysis of existing bilingual-bicultural education programs in other States and at the Federal level.

3. Develop linkages with existing Federal programs that support bilingual-bicultural efforts and stress the expansion of Federal support for bilingual-bicultural education utilizing State education agencies as the coordinating mechanisms.

Early Childhood Education

During the past several decades, the Federal Government has gradually increased its financial support for early childhood education to include both part time and full time care for preschool children and after school and summer programs for children of school age. More recently, Federal programs have begun to emphasize a broader range of developmental opportunities for children including education, health, nutrition,

social services, and parent involvement. The major Federal programs that currently provide financial support for child care include: (1) The 1967 Social Security Amendments (Title IV-A: Aid to Families with Dependent Children; Title IV-B: Child Welfare; and Title IV-C: Work Incentive Program); (2) The 1964 Economic Opportunity Act (Head Start; and Parent and Child Centers); and (3) Model Cities Legislation.

Federal interest in early childhood education has steadily increased with the major focus currently upon the design of a comprehensive child development program.[19] Although extensive legislative hearings were held in response to four early childhood education bills introduced into Congress during the 3-year period from 1969 through 1971,[20] the Comprehensive Child Development Act that was passed by Congress was eventually vetoed by President Nixon. In spite of the presidential veto, there continues to be a strong interest in some form of comprehensive early childhood education legislation.

The crucial issues in early childhood education appear to be: (1) whether or not any attempt will be made at the State level to effectively design and coordinate all of the early childhood education programs that currently exist and presumably will continue to be developed under various forms of Federal and State financial support, (2) assuming that such a designing and coordinating effort would be of value, what will be the role of the State education agency in providing leadership, and (3) what will the eventual scope of the educational components be within those emerging early childhood education programs.

In November of 1972, the Council of Chief State School Officers passed the following resolution:

> The quality of early childhood experiences is of critical importance to the further development of the child and his future success.
>
> It is strongly urged that early childhood programs have an education component, that State Education Agencies assume a leadership position in the evolution of these programs, and that plans for the development of these programs be coordinated by the State Education Agencies.

Indian Education

Public Law 92-318, approved June 23, 1972, amended Title 45, Code of Federal Regulations by adding a new part 186. Part 186 contains regulations governing grants to local and non-local educational agencies for the purpose of developing and carrying out elementary and secondary school programs specifically designed to meet the special educational needs of Indian students. Examples of programs that are eligible for funding include: (1) remedial and compensatory

instruction, school health, physical education, psychological, and other services designed to assist and encourage Indian children to enter, remain in or re-enter elementary or secondary school; (2) comprehensive academic and vocational instruction; (3) instructional materials and equipment; (4) comprehensive guidance, counseling, and testing services; (5) special education programs for handicapped; (6) preschool programs; and (7) bilingual and bicultural education programs.[21]

In November of 1972, the following resolution was passed by the Council:

> The Council of Chief State School Officers applauds the intent of the education amendments of 1972 with regard to assistance to Indian children, especially the provisions aimed at determination of educational policy by Indians. The legislation also provides for new per capita aid and funds for innovative programs.
>
> The Council urges the Federal Government to recognize and promote steady jobs, steady incomes, and personal development programs for economically disadvantaged adults, as a prerequisite to preserving the family unit and to the effective development of individual potential through education.

During the next several years, coordination of these new Indian education programs will be the responsibility of State education agencies throughout the Nation. In spite of the delays in Federal funding, these new support measures for Indian education will provide a unique opportunity for leadership on the part of State education agency personnel.

Educational Television

Educational television has been utilized as a means of instruction within a wide range of diverse educational settings during the past decade. School systems have at times been able to utilize selected Federal and State financial support to purchase the equipment necessary to develop and broadcast their own regional programs. More frequently, schools have utilized video equipment as a means of recording and subsequently viewing selected educational activities to relatively small audiences. Although the methods of using television as an instructional tool may vary, both advocates and critics of educational television agree that one of the major obstacles to more effective use of instructional television is the current scarcity and high developmental costs of good programs. During the current era of limited fiscal support, it has become increasingly difficult for individual school systems to justify the development of new instructional television programs.

An awareness of the current problems in the use of educational television resulted in the passage of the following resolution in November of 1972:

The Council of Chief State School Officers reaffirms its belief in and support of educational television as a media form with great potential for improving public education. The Council encourages the act of participation of State departments of education in experimentation and research to determine the ways in which television may best be utilized in education.

The Council believes that the full benefits of television cannot be realized until an adequate amount of educationally significant, high quality programing is developed and used both widely, and well.

Individually, local and State educational authorities lack the resources required to develop adequate programing. Interstate production consortia have demonstrated that necessary resources can be pooled and quality programing developed and shared. The development of an adequate amount of quality programing is possible if cooperative activity can be continued and expanded.

The Council urges its members to participate in national consortia and other cooperative efforts to the end that such quality programing can be developed.

VIII. FISCAL REFORM IN EDUCATION

Fiscal reform in education, both at the Federal and State levels, deals with how much money is to be provided, by whom, under what arrangements, and for what purposes. Concern for fiscal reform centers around at least six major issues:

1. continuity of support for program advancements made over the past several years--clarification and consistency of the Federal mission in education

2. adequacy of levels of Federal fiscal support for education

3. flexibility in the use of Federal monies to support educational priorities in the States and communities--categorical versus general support

4. timeliness of appropriations relative to State/local planning--advance versus late funding

5. administrative impoundment of appropriated funds

6. responsibility of individual States to support education and to equalize educational opportunity.

The purpose of this section on fiscal reform in education is to clarify and document each of these issues, state the problem(s) involved, and suggest steps which might be taken or advocated by State education agencies to overcome the problems.

The Federal Mission in Education--Continuity of National Priorities

It is a truism that public education in the United States is a responsibility of the individual States --a residual power left to the States by the U. S. Constitution. Over the past several decades, however, the Federal Government has increasingly recognized that it has a compelling interest in upgrading the educational level of the American population to support other responsibilities vested in the Federal Government by the Constitution, and that the Federal Government does have the broadest possible view of national needs, welfare, and concerns. The Council of Chief State School Officers, in State and Local Responsibilities in Education, observed that

> The Federal Government has a significant role in education based on its concern for the national welfare . . . . There has been recurrent emphasis upon the need for educational reform, for developing a cohesive Federal educational policy to implement change. Emphasis has been directed toward the need for eliminating the "patchwork patterns" of Federal financing of education. . . .[22]

The American Association of School Administrators, in The Federal Government in Public Schools,[23] advocates a partnership among local, State, and Federal levels of government, with provisions for wise assignment of educational responsibilities so that the special strength of each level of government is fully utilized. The special strength which the Federal Government can bring to public education is its ability to identify national priorities, to support programs aimed at those priorities over long periods of time, and to equalize educational opportunities in ways that individual States cannot.

The Problem

There are several problems connected with the Federal mission in education and its continuity over time:

1. Lack of clear articulation of specific national priorities for education--leading to (a) fragmented categorical programs aimed at isolated problems, supported by prestigious members of Congress, and (b) dissension between the Congress and the Administration about what the specific national priorities should be.

2. Lack of a long-range perspective on whatever national priorities are supported by legislative programs--leading to an enthusiastic start-up for a particular program followed by abandonment of it when legislative or executive leadership changes.

3. Lack of a clear concept on the parts of Federal policy makers with regard to complementary roles of Federal and State governments in education--leading to duplication of State responsibilities in some instances, and neglect of Federal responsibilities in others.

4. Most immediately, the retrenchment from the pursuit of the entire Federal mission in education during the 5 years that the present Administration has been in office. This turn-about in the position of the Administration is reflected in a statement made by Assistant Secretary Marland last December:[24]

The lessons of the 1960's are not lost, a time of fervid/social-reformist rhetoric and the mass production of hasty promises and their inevitable byproduct, overexpectation. . . In order to gain support for the host of new education programs of those years, there was a pronounced tendency to promise the stars, sun, and moon to the disadvantaged people of this country before anyone in Washington could begin to be certain that the programs would work or even

whether the funds necessary to give them a fair chance would be forthcoming. On both accounts we have fallen short; the programs were presented as glowing solutions, not as the experiments they were, and some inevitably have failed; and funds began leveling off as the initial flush of enthusiasms faded, as the Byzantine intricacies of the problems were increasingly laid open, and finally, as more politically compelling priorities took precedence over education.

Some Possible Solutions

It is likely that only Congress can effectively alter these problems and directions in national educational policy by directing a different ordering of the present Administration's policies and priorities. Even the U. S. Supreme Court has reinforced the concept that an equalized educational opportunity is not one of the rights guaranteed to every citizen under the Constitution[25] and that only the legislative branch of the government has the authority to equalize educational opportunity.

State education agencies and the Council of Chief State School Officers could take some of the following steps to encourage assumption of a more aggressive policy stance by the Congress:

1. Develop positive initiatives to advance enlightened Federal educational policy, through increased influence on Federal legislation and appropriations, as suggested by New York Education Commissioner Ewald Nyquist.[26]

2. Stress the need for "prior formal consultations by USOE with groups of Chief State School Officers and other State education agency personnel before legislative, regulatory guidelines, or budgetary initiatives are taken by USOE. . . "as stated in Council Resolution XVIII adopted last November.[27]

3. Select a few crucial priorities and attempt to marshal professional, lay and legislative support for these.

4. Mount public information programs to mobilize public opinion in support of placing a higher priority on public education.

5. Consider personal support of political candidates who have demonstrated high priority support for public education.

Levels of Federal Funding

How much public money should be dedicated to public education and how much of this money should come from the Federal Government? The Council of Chief State School Officers took the position in 1971[28] that 30 percent of public expenditures for education should come from Federal sources. The Council's 1972 Resolutions XII and II[29] urged:

> Four appropriations bills for the DOE have been vetoed by President Nixon. In the light of the statement made by the President during American Education Week, that education is the Nation's first priority, the CCSSO calls on the President to increase significantly the Federal funding for elementary and secondary education.
>
> The Federal Government should provide leadership by establishing a higher national budget priority for education..., should assume one-third of the total national cost of elementary and secondary education.
>
> The Council also seeks increased Federal funds from the Congress for administration of Federal programs that will be sufficient to permit State education agencies to more adequately supervise and evaluate results of those programs.

Senator Cranston addressed the CCSSO last November. He advocated[30] "greater State aid and greater Federal aid in financing education...," and suggested that "by reordering priorities--by cutting back expenditures elsewhere--we can increase the Federal contribution to education without increasing taxes and without increasing the national debt."

Pennsylvania Education Secretary John Pittenger, speaking for the CCSSO in testimony before the House Appropriations Subcommittee[31] said that public opinion polls reveal that "two-thirds of the public supports increased Federal assistance to public education."

The Problem

The Congress is willing, but the Executive is meek! The present Administration, despite earlier rhetoric, has not come forward to support education as a high priority responsibility of the Federal Government. Council Executive Secretary Byron Hansford stated in a recent memo[32] "This has been a year of unusual questioning of the role of the Federal government with regard to support for education and relations with the States." He stated in another memo[33] that the increase in the FY 1974 budget for the Department of Defense ($4.7 billion) is almost as much as the total FY 1974 outlay for education ($4.9 billion).

Testimony given to the House Appropriations Subcommittee by the National Education Association[34] stressed concern over the "extremely low level of funding requested for the basic education programs." The Administration's current budget request is $0.5 billion short of the FY 1972 level.

A continuing problem that plagues education is the difficulty of objectively evaluating the results of educational programs and using reliable evaluative information in testimony before legislative committees. A case in point is the controversy over the effectiveness of ESEA Title I in overcoming educational disadvantagedness. Several national evaluation studies have questioned the effectiveness of these programs in producing increased pupil achievement. The National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children[35] claims these programs have been effective in raising the achievement levels of disadvantaged children and that the major national evaluations have been disappointing because they have dealt with too narrow criteria for results produced. The evidence available to legislative bodies is inconclusive, and it will continue to be difficult to convince Congress to put more money into education as long as reliable and consistent evaluative information is lacking.

The Better Schools Act, flaunted as an advancement in Federal funding of education, is in our view regressive in terms of level of funding for education. The bill "zeroes" several crucial areas of Federal support for education, including ESEA Title V support for strengthening the leadership functions of State education agencies.

Secretary Pittenger[36] strongly urged Congress to reestablish its control over Federal budget priorities. He recommended that Congress pass an appropriations bill for education, separate from appropriations for health, welfare, and labor, so that the public can more clearly see what the Federal Government is spending for education. This proposal is also supported by NEA.

The Council urged the House Appropriations Subcommittee, through Dr. Pittenger's testimony,[37] to pass an appropriation bill for education at funding levels at least equal to the FY 1972 funding levels (as expressed in H. R. 15417 which was vetoed), with the addition of a 6 to 10 percent increase to allow for inflation.

These proposals by the Council and NEA would not achieve the Council's goal of the Federal Government providing one-third of the funds for public education; they would provide less than 10 percent Federal support for public education. The immediate problem, however, appears to be not how to advance the participation of the Federal Government in the funding of education, but how to prevent retrenchment from present Federal funding levels in several crucial areas.

Some Possible Solutions

The major step that State education agencies should take is to continue, both as individual States and collectively through the Council, to urge that the Congress carry out the measures outlined by Dr. Pittenger for the Congress: reassertion of congressional control over budget priorities, raising the position of education in the Federal priorities structure, passing appropriations for education in a separate bill, and maintaining at least FY 1972 funding levels for FY 1973 and FY 1974.

Another immediate action that could be taken by the Council is to oppose the funding levels in the Administration's proposed education revenue sharing bill, without opposing the bill's provisions for flexibility and program consolidation. NEA[38] does oppose this bill.

In addition to these more immediate actions to maintain present funding levels, there appear to be two actions that State education agencies and the Council might undertake on a long-range basis:

1. Develop a 5-year strategy to move the Federal commitment up to the level of a one-third of the total cost of public education. Such a strategy would be coupled with the plan for general aid suggested in the following section and might include proposals for actual bills with prescribed dollar amounts for elements that are considered crucial. Coming forward with a specific plan for 5-year development of the Federal role would be an assertive step which builds upon the Council's earlier resolutions.

2. Take leadership in developing a practical system of accountability in the total public education enterprise, a system that accurately describes the results being produced for the public funds expended. Such a viable accountability system would be essential if we are to convince Congress and subsequent Federal Administrations that, by moving the Federal support level up to one-third of total expenditures, acceptable cost-benefit relationships will result. A more reliable accountability system would enhance the management credibility of education as a whole, and would provide convincing information for use in working with State and Federal legislative committees.

General Aid to Education

The question of general Federal aid to education, as contrasted with categorical aid, has long been a matter of concern to State education agencies. In 1964 the Council adopted as one of its annual Resolutions[39] that "the largest portion of Federal funds should be invested in State

systems of general school support as authorized by the legislature of each State." In 1971 the Council stated in State and Federal Relationships in Education[40] that "the bulk of Federal government funds should be in the form of general or block grant aids. Categorical aids should, with the exception of critical national emergency needs, be limited to excess of cost programs that deal with national goals."

In the same document[41] the Council recommended that the Federal Government supply 30 percent of the funds needed for public education. About one-third of this Federal share (10 percent), it was suggested, should be categorically targeted upon national goals; the remaining two-thirds (20 percent) should be distributed to States for use on priorities identified by the States.

The most recent resolutions, adopted by the Council last November,[42] include two strong statements supporting general aid to education. Resolutions II and XII, respectively, state that the Council:

> seeks changes in legislation and rules and regulations which would provide increased flexibility, program consolidation, and single application for categorical programs, and
>
> places first priority in its 1973 legislative program on passage of legislation to provide general Federal financial assistance to states for education.

The Problem

The preoccupation with categorical funding authorizations, many in number and often focused upon narrowly specific program elements, has led to much criticism of this mode of Federal assistance to State and local educational efforts. In a recent speech[43] Assistant Secretary Marland described categorical funding as an effort to focus "precise rifle shots" upon specific educational weaknesses to be remedied. Mr. Marland continued:

> Unfortunately, instead of a rifle we seem to have produced a blunderbuss which fires tons of paper...a bewildering array of bureaucratic bookkeeping relating to more than 100 categorical grant programs operated by the Office of Education....
>
> ...Notwithstanding the good intentions of the vast array of categorical systems of Federal aid, we have reached the point where their accumulated bureaucratic weight has virtually immobilized them. The system can prevent a state...from putting Federal money to work where it is needed most.... It can...distort state educational priorities since a state may be forced to shortchange its

own programs in order to supply matching funds required by a Federal Program.

He stated further that Special Education Revenue Sharing legislation now before Congress would consolidate more than 30 categorical programs into five broad areas of assistance and would significantly ameliorate some of the problems of fragmentation and red tape.

The Administration's revenue sharing bill (HR 5823) would permit a State to transfer earmarked funds from one to another of five broad categories, based upon identified needs. A State would develop a plan describing how it proposes to use the funds, but such a plan would not be subject to approval by the Office of Education as a requirement for receiving the funds. A major intent of HR 5823 is clearly to render more flexible the use of Federal funds by State and local educational agencies. However, there is concern in the minds of many that this specific approach may deprive public education of more benefits than it will yield.

The National Education Association[44] expressed its opposition to the decentralization of USOE administrative authority and staff to the regional offices, justified by the Administration as a means of implementing the proposed Special Education Revenue Sharing legislation. Secretary Pittenger[45] expressed the Council's concern over the decentralization of USOE program decisions and the delegation of these to HEW regional offices. The Council feels, he said, that "regionalization of the authority of the Commissioner of Education is contrary to the will of the Congress and contrary to the best interests of educators at the state and local level."

Another serious concern about HR 5823, the Better Schools Act, is that, while it does consolidate 30 categorical programs into five broad areas, the only programs affected are State formula grant programs, and, according to Education Funding News,[46] represents only about one-third of the Office of Education's budget. This would leave about 70 discretionary programs which would continue to be operated by the Office of Education on a categorical basis. The National Education Association[47] expressed opposition to the Better Schools Act and its assumption that "only formula grants are subject to these bureaucratic ills while discretionary grants, of which a multitude are retained, are not affected."

One further concern over the concept of revenue sharing strikes at the heart of the problem. Education Funding News,[48] observed that ..."members of the House Education and Labor Committee in hearings on HR 5823 last week clearly felt revenue sharing provided too little control over Federal money and became alarmed when told that Federal regulations under the new system would drop to one-tenth their number. Committee Chairman Carl Perkins complained that almost every study of Title I urged more, not less, vigorous Federal control."

The education profession has long advocated general aid to education, but its recommendations have only been of a general type. Rather than

come forward with specific proposals about how general aid should be accomplished, the education profession has largely responded critically to proposals developed in other quarters.

A Possible Solution

One way to address this problem aggressively would be for the Council to convene a group of educators to propose a specific plan for general aid to education. Such a plan would include an exhaustive survey of existing Federal programs, both formula-based and discretionary, which affect education. Based on this survey of present status, the group would identify major themes around which Congress could be requested to consolidate legislative authority and appropriations. It might be desirable for the group to propose a detailed legislative program, perhaps even to the extent of writing a bill, that would go beyond merely citing the names of the major elements to be included. The Council could appoint a task force of its own membership to develop such a plan, or it could charge the Study Commission to do this task. Other options would be to involve local school officials or higher education officials in the process or to contract with a competent agency to manage the task.

Timeliness of Federal Appropriations--Advance Funding

In testimony before the House Appropriations Subcommittee[49] the National Education Association stressed that "budget planning in most local school systems begins early in the year--prior to the Federal fiscal year. Many school systems have already addressed budgets for the school year 1973-74." They stressed the difficulties caused by not being able to notify personnel of the status of their employment before the school year starts. The Council in its 1967 Resolutions[50] stated that "the problem results primarily from the fact that Federal funds become available beyond the time when planning for their use can be effective."

In State and Federal Relationships in Education[51] the Council advocated ample planning and lead time for federally funded education programs so that local and state officials might have "final fiscal commitment by the first of March preceding the operational year." In its 1972 policies[52] the Council supports as a priority item..."at least one year advance appropriation for Federal education programs...." Secretary Pittenger[53] stressed the need for advance information for educational planning and urged that Federal appropriations be made before July 1.

The Problem

Increasingly over the past several years Federal appropriations have not been made before the beginning of the Federal fiscal year; in fact, there has been considerable worry that they will not be made before the end of the fiscal year in question. The legislative device of the

continuing resolution has come to be used more extensively in recent years. The Council's Executive Secretary, Byron Hansford, stated in May[54] that it is very unlikely that we will have new Federal authorizing legislation for education or an appropriation for FY 1974 by July 1. He stated that we can expect to operate on a continuing resolution as of July 1. Education Funding News[55] opined that "should HR 5823 fail, the ESEA statute provides for automatic, 1 year extension. In addition, the General Education Provisions Act (Section 404) provides for an automatic 1-year extension for all expiring legislation. Congress could use that provision to fund ESEA and PL 874 for 1974...." Even with these safeguards, however, there is some speculation that the Administration may refuse to release funds appropriated under Title V for FY 1974.

One factor that mitigates against advance appropriations is the committee system in both Houses of Congress and the dichotomy between authorization committees and appropriations committees. Often the resemblance between authorizations and appropriations is minimal. The question arises, why is it not possible for Congress to appropriate monies for important educational programs, perhaps for two or more years, at the time the authorization is enacted?

Some Possible Solutions

State education agencies and the Council could step up their efforts to promote:

1. passage of a separate education appropriations bill that would not get tied up with controversies about health, welfare, and labor appropriations.

2. splitting up the House Education and Labor Committee as suggested by Congressman Quie, and creating an education committee with responsibility to coordinate all Federal education policy, which now falls under the jurisdiction of nine separate committees.

3. simultaneous enactment of program authorizations and appropriations for at least a 3 to 5 years periods, a position adopted by the Council in 1972.[56]

It would seem to be most productive for State education agencies and the Council to reduce efforts to urge passage of appropriation bills before the fiscal year has passed, and concentrate on specific strategies to promote advance funding, hopefully on a timeframe of 2 or more years. The legal and constitutional constraints for advance funding would have to be studied. Most helpful would probably be a specific plan, stated in operational terms, which could then be proposed to appropriate members of Congress.

Impoundment of Federal Funds

The phenomenon of impoundment of Federal funds has been used increasingly by the present Administration, and appears to be a manifestation of the struggle between Congress and the President over the control of the Federal budget. The controversy over whether the President has the authority to refuse to spend monies appropriated by Congress, or whether he is constitutionally required to carry out the will of Congress, has not yet been adequately tested in the courts. There is no question about a thrifty Congress' capability to restrain a spending president; but a spending Congress seems to have difficulty forcing a thrifty president to spend monies appropriated. Members of the Senate have expressed concern over the recent diminution of Congress' "power of the purse" given to it in the U. S. Constitution. Even Senator Goldwater[57] cited a statement by Madison in the Federalist Papers that it is "particularly dangerous to give the keys of the Treasury and the command of the Army into the same hands." Newsweek[58] observed that "Mr. Nixon--through his policies of impoundment, executive reorganization, and revenue sharing--seems to be remaking the basic balances of American government, concentrating more power in the White House and proportionately less on Capitol Hill."

At its meeting in November of 1972, the Council of Chief State School Officers adopted Resolution XIII:[59]

> The CCSSO is unequivocally opposed to any administrative action by Federal agencies which has the effect of impounding or not expending funds appropriated for education by the Congress, including appropriations by continuing resolutions.
>
> Such action deprives State and local education agencies of badly needed resources and opportunities for realistic planning. We further view this practice as an unconstitutional encroachment on congressional authority. The Executive Secretary is authorized in appropriate court action to test the constitutionality of impoundment.

The Problem

The practice of executive impoundment is easiest in cases where the language of appropriations bills is ambiguous or lacking in specificity. According to a representative of the Lawyer's Committee for Civil Rights Under Law,[60] "There is some ambiguity in the continuing appropriations resolutions of Congress as to whether or not the level established by the Administration for educational expenditures is the one that Congress has intended." Secretary Pittenger, in his testimony before the House Appropriations Subcommittee[61] stated that "the incumbent administration has succeeded in confusing lawyers and laymen as to minimum levels of funding received by this current language." He went on to say that

"the incumbent Administration has taken advantage of the continuing resolution to reduce funding levels and delay the release of funds." Former Washington State Superintendent Louis Bruno, in letters circulated among Chief State School Officers,[62] indicated that there appears to be a deliberate misinterpretation of the continuing resolution language, and that the Administration is impounding funds which have already been counted upon in the budgets of school districts. He indicated further that careful examination of the language of the continuing resolution (PL 92-334) mandates rather than permits that the administration make available the same level of funds in FY 1973 as those appropriated in FY 1972. He also observed that the General Counsel for HEW ruled in 1969 that the executive branch has no authority to impound mandatory or formula grants under ESEA, NDEA, PL 874, EPDA, or VEA.

The May 7 issue of the Washington Monitor[63] stated $134 million approved by Congress under impact aid were still being impounded by the Administration.

Impoundment of Federal monies appropriated for specific purposes by Congress is regarded by many as the President's deliberate ignoring of legitimate instructions given to him by the legislative branch. He is viewed as actively refusing to carry out orders which are constitutionally binding upon him.

Senator Cranston, addressing the Council of Chief State School Officers last November[64] made several important observations:

> A large number of congressmen and senators share my apprehension that educational policy is being made increasingly by Executive fiat.
>
> We must...discourage the practice known as "reprogramming of funds", under which the Executive--without the consent of Congress or of educators--takes funds away from one program--or another--or cancels them altogether--to influence other programs which it prefers.
>
> We must stop the Executive from impounding funds which were appropriated by Congress for vital educational programs.

Several moves are now underway in Congress to specifically prevent the executive branch from impounding appropriated funds. S. 373, introduced by Senator Ervin, was reported out by the Committee on Government Operations in April.[65] On the House side, H. R. 4722 and H. R. 6020 have been introduced by Representatives Rosenthal and Culver respectively. Both are still under consideration by the Rules Committee. All of these bills are aimed at preserving the Congress' constitutional powers and at preventing the presumption of these powers by the executive branch.

Executive Secretary Hansford, in a recent memo,[66] expressed the hope that the new White House team will try to present a positive image, and at the same time will not have the opportunity to exercise the rigid control which the old team had. This probably means that the climate is now more hopeful than ever that some checks can be established to prevent irresponsible executive impoundment practices.

Some Possible Solutions

There appear to be several constructive steps which the Council could take to discourage or prevent executive impoundment, and to encourage congressional efforts to limit executive power in this area. These include the following:

1. Urge congressional delegations to reassure their constitutional prerogatives for policy direction and budgetary control of domestic programs.

2. Initiate or join lawsuits against the executive practice of unauthorized impoundment, in order to bring the judicial branch into support of congressional authority under the Constitution.

3. Serve as a clearinghouse to identify specific instances of executive impoundment practices and make these known to the public and the educational profession.

4. Support and encourage the passage of reasonable anti-impoundment legislation (more than merely Senate resolutions, which the Administration "notes" but does not change its operations).

5. Encourage and assist in the writing of appropriations bills so that they state in affirmative language the minimum level of spending required by Congress, leaving no possible escape clauses for impoundment.

State Responsibility for Financing Public Education

Resolutions of the Council of Chief State School Officers, cited earlier in this section[67] advocated that the Federal government provide about one-third of the financial support for public education; the remaining two-thirds would be supplied by State and local governments in the respective States. There are today two major questions related to this State/local share:

1. What proportion of this amount should be provided by the State?

2. What responsibility does the State have to equalize differences in fiscal capability among the local school districts within the State?

In 1971 the Council[68] took the following positions:

> the State is finally responsible for acceptable levels of quality programs of instruction within its borders. It is also responsible for supplying the necessary funds to all local education agencies required to establish and maintain such programs.
>
> the State should supply funds to augment local funds in providing at least minimum programs in the local schools and with incentives to exceed such minimums.

Resolutions XI and VII, adopted by the Council last November[69] state that:

> The CCSSO encourages the several states to assume a positive role in developing a plan for securing fiscal reform necessary to the support of public education that will be constitutional, will decrease dependence on the local property tax, increase reliance on more progressive revenue sources so that all citizens will bear an equitable share of the costs of education, and will provide a greater percentage of state support while preserving a high degree of local determination.
>
> The CCSSO strongly urges that educators, legislators, and the executive branch of government take the initiative in solving educational problems rather than wait for such initiative by the courts.

The Problem

The unequal distribution of available wealth among communities within a State and the resulting differential capability of local communities to pay for quality educational programs for their children have resulted in a number of recent lawsuits attacking the constitutionality of significant reliance upon local wealth to support public schools. The central argument in the Rodriguez case was that if the State permits the fiscal support of a local school to be a function of the level of wealth of the community, then the constitutional rights, under the Fourteenth Amendment, of students in poor communities to have the opportunity for a free public education are violated. The U. S. District Court held this to be the case and ordered the Legislature to take action to remedy the situation in Texas where much of local financial support for education is based upon taxable property values in communities. The U. S. Supreme Court overturned the District Court's decision[70] and

explained that, while the Supreme Court recognized that unequal distribution of local wealth does result in unequal educational opportunity for children in different communities, this could not be construed as one of the rights recognized by the Court under the U. S. Constitution. The Court essentially said that, while changes in public school finance systems are urgently needed, it is not within the authority of the courts to bring these about. That task, the Court said, must be performed by the legislative branches of Federal and State government.

The reliance upon local property taxes, coupled with the difficulty of obtaining fair and reliable assessments of property values across a State, have focused much criticism upon local property taxes as a method of financing education. Secretary Pittenger, testifying before the House Appropriations Subcommittee,[71] said that "the local property tax revenues which support the bulk of education are the most regressive, the most visible, and the most vulnerable portion of the entire tax structure of this nation."

Discussions about equity in the level of financing of local school programs are still very much alive in State legislatures, notwithstanding the Supreme Court's ruling on Rodriguez. Numerous bills for reform of State financing of public education have been introduced and debated. The pros and cons have been well aired through the media, and public awareness of the issues has been heightened.

Turning from the concern for more adequate State support for local school programs, there is also a pressing problem in terms of State support for State education agencies and the leadership functions they perform. This need has been intensified by the possibility of a reduction in Federal funds to support State departments of education, since a number of State departments receive a majority of their operating funds from Federal sources. In State and Federal Relationships in Education[72] the Council took the position that

> Leadership within the State is of utmost importance...if the State's responsibility for high quality education is to be faithfully discharged. Such leadership...must stem especially from a strong State department of education with adequate support from the legislature....
>
> Adequate support of a strong State department of education by the State legislature is essential if the State is to develop and maintain its leadership function in education.

A third aspect of the problem of State fiscal support is related to educational research and development. In recent years the Federal government has invested increasing amounts of money to support educational experimentation and innovation. Some States have also developed well-funded educational research and development programs;

other States have relied largely upon Federal support. Where substantial State support for research and development is available, there is likely to be more flexibility for the State education agency to identify priority educational problems and to combine Federal and State resources in patterns that will advance the quality of education in the State. Where more dependence is placed upon Federal sources, it is more likely that research and development efforts will follow national priorities with only limited attention being given to identified needs in the State.

Thus, the intensity of this problem varies from State to State, depending upon financial equalization provisions built into the State system of school finance, the level of State support for the State education agency, and the State support given to priority research and development efforts.

Some Possible Solutions

Since the magnitude of these problems varies among the States, and since the legal and economic structures of the different States vary considerably, there is probably less that the Council can do directly to attack these problems than is the case for the foregoing five issues connected with Federal funding. However, there are some steps which the Council could take to assist and support State education departments and State legislatures which are addressing these problems:

1. Serve as a "clearinghouse" for the exchange of information about legislative proposals, lawsuits, and other developments underway in various States aimed at reforming the State system of school finance.

2. Devote more time and attention to this topic at meetings of the Council, and design special workshops or seminars devoted to these problems, perhaps inviting national authorities in the field to participate in the meetings.

3. Undertake a comprehensive study of the problem of State educational finance, the varying conditions among the States, the different problems which may occur, and the identification of some promising solutions. This could be a topic assigned to the Council's Study Commission to investigate and report back.

4. Include as part of a systematic public information campaign the issues and opportunities involved in State financing of education as well as concerns about Federal financial support.

NOTES

[1]Additional NCIES Reports are being developed by Task Forces representing the following groups: (1) Teachers, (2) Administration and Supervision, (3) Higher Education, (4) Community, and (5) Basic Studies.

[2]Edgar L. Morphet, David L. Jesser, and Arthur P. Ludka (eds.). Planning and Providing Excellence in Education (Denver: Implementing State Leadership in Education Project, 1971), p. 125.

[3]Charles W. Nix, "Internal Planning by State Education Agencies." A report of a special study sponsored by the project, Improving State Leadership in Education.

[4]This report was based upon an informal seminar held at Stanford University during the Spring of 1972. Members of the seminar included Lee J. Cronbach, Henry M. Levin, James G. March, David Tyack, and David E. Wiley, all members of the Task Force on Accountability.

[5]The term "resources" used here and hereafter in this paper includes time, space (facilities), materials, and personnel (teachers, students, and support personnel.) In order for most of these resources to be available a general resource--money--is also required.

[6]J. J. Kelingstedt, "Philosophical Basis for Competency-Based Education," Educational Technology, 12; November 1972.

[7]Howard Getz and others, "From Traditional to Competency-Based Teacher Education," Phi Delta Kappa, 54:301; January 1973.

[8]Theodore B. Andrews, "Certification Issues in Competency-Based Teacher Education," Educational Technology, 12:43-45; November 1972.

[9]M. L. Frinks, "An Analytical Study of Teacher Certification Processes as Perceived by Leadership Personnel within the Teacher Education and Certification Sections of the Fifty State Education Agencies with Special Emphasis on the Development of the Performance-Based Movement" (unpublished Doctor's dissertation, University of Massachusetts, 1971).

[10]Lorraine R. Gay and K. Fred Daniel. "Accreditation and Performance-Based Teacher Education," Educational Technology, 12: 45-49; November 1972.

[11]Linda Kraft, "Lost Herstory-The Treatment of Women in Children's Encyclopedias," Library Journal, 98:218-27; January 15, 1973.

[12]Dennis J. Chase, "Sexism in Textbooks," Nation's Schools, 90:31-35; December 1972.

[13]Constance Williams, "Does Different Equal Less?" Library Journal, 98:228-30; January 15, 1973.

[14]Janice Law Trecker, "Women in U. S. History Text Books," Social Education, 35:249-60; March 1971.

[15]M. Higgs and J. Stewig. "Girls Grow Up--A Study of Sexism in Children's Literature," Library Journal, 98:236-41; January 15, 1973.

[16]A. Fishel and J. Pottker. "Women Teachers and Teacher Power," The Urban Review, 6:40-44; November/December, 1972.

[17]For additional information on current trends in Career Education, see David Rogers, "Vocational and Career Education: A Critique and Some New Directions," Teachers College Record, 74:471-511; May 1973 Rupert Evans and others, Education for Employment: The Background and Potential of the 1968 Vocational Education Amendments. Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations, University of Michigan and Wayne State University and the National Manpower Policy Task Force, 1969.

[18]See for example: Ethnic Isolation of Mexican Americans in the Public Schools of the Southwest, Report I of the Mexican American Education Study of the United States Commission on Civil Rights (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, April 1971; The Unfinished Education: Outcomes for Minorities in the Five Southwestern States, Report II of the Mexican American Education Study of the United States Commission on Civil Rights (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, October 1971); and Jeffrey W. Kobcick, "The Compelling Case for Bilingual Education," Saturday Review, 55:54-58; April 29, 1972.

[19]For additional information about Comprehensive Child Development Programs, see (1) Early Childhood Education, Seventy-first Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1972); Raymond Moore and others, Early Schooling for All? Hewitt Research Center, 1972; and Sheldon White, A Summary Report on Federal Programs for Young Children (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University, Huron Institute, 1972).

[20]Hearings were held on the following bills: (1) Head Start Child Development Act, 1969: S. 2060; (2) Comprehensive Preschool Education and Child Day Care Act of 1969: H.R. 13520; (3) Child Care Services Act of 1971: S. 2003; and Comprehensive Child Development Act of 1971: H.R. 6748 and S. 1512.

[21]For additional details on these and other program options, see Indian Elementary and Secondary School Assistance Act and Indian Education Act Public Law 92-318, 86 STAT. 335-345.

[22]Council of Chief State School Officers, State and Local Responsibilities in Education (Washington, D.C.: the Council, 1968), pp. 24-25. (The Council is hereafter referred to as CCSSO.)

[23]American Association of School Administrators, The Federal Government in Public Schools (Washington, D.C.: the Association, 1965), pp. 58.

[24]Sidney P. Marland, Jr., "A Time for Responsibility" (address delivered to the Joint Conference of Florida School Boards Association and School Board Attorneys, December 1972, Miami Beach, Florida), p. 5.

[25]San Antonio ISD et al v. Rodriguez et al: Appeal from the U. S. District Court for the Western District of Texas, March 21, 1973, p. B1664.

[26]Ewald B. Nyquist, "Legislative Committee Report for CCSSO Annual Meeting," (Memo to CCSSO Legislative Committee, November 3, 1973), p. 1.

[27]CCSSO, Policies and Resolutions Adopted at Annual Business Meeting of the Council (San Francisco: the Council, 1972), p. 6.

[28]CCSSO, State and Federal Relationships in Education (Washington, D.C.: the Council, 1971), pp. 18, 19.

[29]CCSSO, Policies and Resolutions, pp. 1, 4.

[30]Alan Cranston, "How Will Education Fare in the 93rd Congress?" (an address to the CCSSO, November 1972, San Francisco), p. 4.

[31]John C. Pittenger, "Statement to the House Appropriations Committee, Subcommittee on Labor--Health, Education, and Welfare," (representing CCSSO, May 14, 1973, Washington), p. 2.

[32]Byron W. Hansford, "Memorandum No. 23-73" (memo to CCSSO, May 17, 1973), p. 1.

[33]Byron W. Hansford, "Memorandum No. 7-73 (memo to CCSSO, February 2, 1973), p. 3.

[34]Catherine Barrett, "Statement of the National Education Association on Labor-HEW Appropriations for F.Y. 1974" (given to the Labor-HEW Subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations, May 14, 1973, Washington), p. 2.

[35]Washington Monitor, May 7, 1973, p. 1.

[36]Pittenger, op. cit., pp. 2,3.

[37]Ibid., p. 5.

[38]Barrett, op. cit., p. 7.

[39]Council of Chief State School Officers, Resolutions, Adopted at the Annual Meeting of the Council in 1964, Resolution XVII.

[40]Council of Chief State School Officers, State and Federal Relationships in Education (Washington, D.C.: the Council, 1971), p. 56.

[41]Council of Chief State School Officers, State and Federal Relationships in Education (Washington, D.C.: the Council, 1971), pp. 18, 19.

[42]CCSSO, Policies and Resolutions, pp. 2, 12.

[43]Marland, op. cit., pp. 5, 6.

[44]Barrett, op. cit., pp. 3, 4.

[45]Pittenger, op. cit., p. 8.

[46]Education Funding News [Washington, D.C.], March 30, 1973, p. 1.

[47]Barrett, op. cit., p. 3.

[48]Education Funding News [Washington, D.C.], March 30, 1973, p. 2.

[49]Barrett, op. cit., p. 20.

[50]CCSSO, Resolutions (1967), resolution XX.

[51]CCSSO, State and Federal Relationships, p. 54.

[52]CCSSO, Policies and Resolutions, p. 2.

[53]Pittenger, op. cit., p. 2.

[54]Hansford, "Memorandum 7-73," p. 3.

[55]Education Funding News [Washington, D.C.], March 30, 1973, p. 1.

[56]CCSSO, State and Federal Relationships, p. 54.

[57]Intellectual Digest, 68; June 1973 (reproduced from the Congressional Record, April 6, 1972).

[58]Newsweek, 18; March 26, 1973.

[59]CCSSO, Policies and Resolutions, p. 4.

[60]Correspondence from Stephen R. Browning, Staff Attorney for the Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights under Law, to Robert G. Lindemuth, December 1, 1972.

[61]Pittenger, op. cit., pp. 1, 9.

[62]Correspondence from Louis Bruno to Senator Warren G. Magnuson, November 21, 1972.

[63]Washington Monitor, May 7, 1973, p. 2.

[64]Cranston, op. cit., p. 2.

[65]U. S. Congress, Senate, Committee on Government Operations, Report: Federal Impoundment Control Procedure Act (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1973), p. 32.

[66]Byron W. Hansford, "After Watergate What?" (memo to CCSSO, May 17, 1973), p. 1.

[67]CCSSO, Policies and Resolutions, p. 4.

[68]CCSSO, State and Local Responsibilities, p. 24.

[69]CCSSO, Policies and Resolutions, p. 4.

[70]San Antonio ISD et al v. Rodriguez et al: Appeal to the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Texas, March 21, 1973, pp. B1663-4.

[71]Pittenger, op. cit., p. 2.

[72]CCSSO, State and Federal Relationships, p. 8.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

American Association of School Administrators. The Federal Government in Public Schools. Washington, D.C.: the Association, 1965.

Andrews, Theodore B. "Certification Issues in Competency-Based Teacher Education," Educational Technology, 12; November 1972.

Barrett, Catherine. "Statement of the National Education Association on Labor-HEW Appropriations for F.Y. 1974." Given to the Labor-HEW Subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations, May 14, 1973, Washington, D.C.

Browning, R. Stephen (Staff Attorney for the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law). Letter to Robert G. Lindemuth, December 1, 1972.

Bruno, Louis. Letter to Senator Warren G. Magnuson, November 21, 1972.

Chase, Dennis J. "Sexism in Textbooks," Nation's Schools, 90; December 1972.

Council of Chief State School Officers. Policies and Resolutions. Adopted at Annual Business Meeting of the Council. San Francisco: the Council, November 15, 1972.

Council of Chief State School Officers. State and Local Responsibilities In Education. Washington, D.C.: the Council, 1968.

Council of Chief State School Officers. Resolutions. Adopted at the Annual Meeting of the Council, 1964.

Council of Chief State School Officers. Resolutions. Adopted at the Annual Meeting of the Council, 1967.

Council of Chief State School Officers. State and Federal Relationships in Education. Washington, D.C.: the Council, 1971.

Cranston, Senator Alan, "How Will Education Fare in the 93rd Congress?" Address to the CCSSO, November 14, 1972, San Francisco.

Education Funding News. 2; Washington, D.C., March 30, 1973.

Frinks, M. L. "An Analytical Study of Teacher Certification Processes as Perceived by Leadership Personnel Within the Teacher Education and Certification Sections of the Fifty State Education Agencies with Special Emphasis on the Development of the Performance-Based Movement." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, University of Massachusetts, 1971.

Fishel, A. and J. Pottker. "Women Teachers and Teacher Power," The Urban Review, 6; November/December 1972.

Florida Department of Education. "There's A New School Coming," The Florida Educational Research and Development Third Annual Report. Tallahassee: the Department, January 1972.

Gay, Lorraine R. and K. Fred Daniel. "Accreditation and Performance-Based Teacher Education," Educational Technology, 12; November 1972.

Getz, Howard and others. "From Traditional to Competency-Based Teacher Education," Phi Delta Kappa, 54; January 1973.

H. R. 5823. "Better Schools Act of 1972," March 20, 1973.

Hansford, Byron W. "Memorandum No. 23-73." Memo to Chief State School Officers, May 17, 1973.

_____. "Memorandum No. 7-73." Memo to Chief State School Officers, February 2, 1973.

_____. "After Watergate What?" Memorandum No. 22. Memo to Chief State School Officers, May 17, 1973.

Hawthorne, Phyllis. Legislation by the States: Accountability and Assessment in Education. Denver: State Educational Accountability Depository, Cooperative Accountability Project, 1972.

Higgs, M. and J. Stewig. "Girls Grow Up-A Study of Sexism in Children's Literature," Library Journal, 98; January 15, 1973.

Instruction and Professional Development, National Education Association. Accountability. 4 parts. Washington, D.C.: the Association, December 1972.

Intellectual Digest, June 1973. (Reproduced from the Congressional Record, April 6, 1972.)

Kelingstedt, J. J. "Philosophical Basis for Competency-Based Education," Educational Technology, 21; November 1972.

Kraft, Linda. "Lost Herstory-The Treatment of Women in Children's Encyclopedias," Library Journal, 98; January 15, 1973.

Lessinger, Leon M. and Ralph W. Tyler (eds.). Accountability in Education. Worthington, Ohio: Charles A. Jones Publishing Co., 1971.

_____, Dale Parnell and Roger Kaufman. Accountability: Policies and Procedures. Vol. I, Learning. Vol. II, Students. Vol. III, Personnel. Vol. IV, Management. New London, Conn: Croft Educational Services, Inc., 1972.

_____. Every Kid A Winner: Accountability in Education. Palo Alto, Calif.: Science Research Associates, Inc., 1970.

Levin, Henry M. Report to the National Academy of Education's Task Force on Accountability. Palo Alto, Calif.: Stanford University, Spring 1972.

Marland, S. P., Jr., "A Time for Responsibility." Address delivered to the Joint Conference of Florida School Boards Association and School Board Attorneys, December 7, 1972, Miami Beach, Florida.

Morphet, Edgar L. and David L. Jesser (eds.). "Emerging State Responsibilities for Education." Denver: Implementing State Leadership in Education Project, 1970.

_____, Roe L. Johns, and Theodore Reller. Educational Organization and Administration: Concepts, Practices and Issues. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967.

_____, David L. Jesser, and Arthur P. Ludka (eds.). Planning & Providing Excellence in Education. Denver: Implementing State Leadership in Education Project, 1971.

Nix, Charles W. "Internal Planning by State Education Agencies." A report of a special study sponsored by the project, Improving State Leadership in Education.

Nyquist, Ewald B. "Legislative Committee Report for CCSSO Annual Meeting." Memo to CCSSO Legislative Committee, November 3, 1973.

Pittenger, John C. "Statement to the House Appropriations Committee, Subcommittee on Labor--Health, Education, and Welfare," May 14, 1973, Washington, D.C.

PREP Report #35. "Educational Accountability and Evaluation," A national survey on accountability for the Office of Education, available in micro-fiche and hard copy from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service, P. O. Drawer O, Bethesda, Md., 20014. Also available from the Superintendent of Documents, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402. 55 cents.

Rhodes, Lewis A. "Educational Accountability: Getting It All Together." Paper presented to the seminar on Educational Accountability of the Annual Flordia Supervisor's Conference, October 28-30, 1970.

Rodriguez et al. v. San Antonio ISD et al: Civil Action No. 68-175-SA, U. S. District Court, Western District of Texas, December 23, 1971.

Ruth, Leo. Accountability and the Teaching of English. Urbana, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1972.

San Antonio ISD et al v. Rodriguez et al: Appeal from the U. S. District Court for the Western District of Texas, March 31, 1973.

Schmieder, Allen. Community-Based Education: The State of the Scene. Washington, D.C.: The AACTE National Committee on Performance Based Teacher Education, the Association of Teacher Educators and the GRIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, 1973.

State Education Accountability Repository, 1362 Lincoln Street, Denver, Colorado 80203. A library of reports and articles published by the 50 states and outlying possessions on the accountability movement to provide state and local education agency personnel with access to a central source of materials and reports regarding practices and procedures for developing and implementing accountability and/or assessment programs.

Trecker, Janice Law. "Women in U. S. History Text Books," Social Education, 35: March 1971.

Washington Monitor, May 7, 1973.

Williams, Constance. "Does Different Equal Less?" Library Journal, 98; January 15, 1973.