

**An Experiment in Failure**

A stylized, brown-toned logo of a school building with a flag on top, positioned behind the main title text.

**Schools for the 21st Century  
Pilot Program**

**Washington State**

# Introduction

This report concerns the Schools for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Program piloted in Washington State starting in 1988. This program was a pilot for the Goals 2000: Educate America Act passed at the federal level in 1994.

This report is based on laws passed by the Washington State Legislature to govern the program, and reports drawn up for and submitted by the Washington State Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction with regard to the Schools for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Program.

# Content

Introduction ..... i

Content ..... ii

Letter to the Joint Select Committee on Education Reform ..... 1

Schools for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century; 4<sup>th</sup> Grade WASL Scores; Spring 1997 ..... 6

WASL Scores; Spring 1997; Bremerton and Pasco ..... 8

High Skills, High Wages; 1994; Page 65 ..... 10

Addendum ..... 11

The Unanswered Questions ..... 13

Presentation; Senate Education Committee ..... 15

    Preface ..... 16

    Part I – The Law ..... 17

    Part II – The Final Report ..... 21

    Part III – Foundation For Education Reform ..... 31

# Letter to the Joint Select Committee on Education Reform

Date: October 20, 1997

In an article published in the *Spokesman Review* on September 5, 1997, SPI Bergeson and Governor Gary Locke stated that "it may take a decade to beef up the schools." In 1987, the Washington state legislature passed SB 5479 establishing the Schools for the 21st Century Program. This was a *pilot program*<sup>1</sup> in education reform. In the first round of funding, in the 1988/89 school year, 21 projects were chosen; in the second round of funding, in the 1990/91 school year, 12 more projects were chosen. The program ended June 30, 1994. In all, the program affected 52,106 children in 111 schools in 27 school districts.<sup>2</sup> This *pilot program* laid the foundation for ESHB 1209, laws of 1993, bringing education reform to the entire state of Washington. The New American Schools Development Corporation (NASDC), developed to oversee the restructuring of education nationwide, was also patterned after this pilot program.<sup>3</sup> NASDC contracted with and funded design teams to accomplish the goals of restructuring education nationwide.

The programs implemented in the 21st Century Schools are programs that the entire state of Washington came to know as education reform under ESHB 1209. In the *Final Report to the Legislature on the Schools for the 21st Century Program*, this contention was made, "Kids in the Schools for the 21st Century projects are performing above the academic level of traditional schools." *Academic* by the traditional definition, or *academic* by the new definition?

By all rights, were education reform raising the standards and improving student learning as claimed, the assessment scores for schools in the 21st Century Program should have exceeded those of other schools. The question is, did they? The first clue comes in that no mention was made of the schools in this program by either Governor Locke or SPI Bergeson in their speeches, etc, on the assessment results. The second clue comes in the fact that while the assessment scores are computerized and the OSPI had them before the September 4, 1997, "State of Education" presentation and ensuing taxpayer funded media blitz, and the school districts have had them since the week of September 8-12, legislators attempts to obtain them from the OSPI were met with claims that the scores were not yet computerized.

The fourth grade **assessment scores** for the elementary schools in the Schools for the 21st Century Program are attached. Averaged, the scores fall below the state average, for both

---

<sup>1</sup> RCW 28A.630.100 Program established—Goals—Intent. (Effective until June 30, 1994.) (1) A schools for the twenty-first century pilot program is established to foster change in the state common school system. The program will enable educators and parents of selected schools or school districts to restructure certain school operations and to develop model school programs which will improve student performance. The program shall include an evaluation of the projects and be accountable for student progress. The purpose of the program is to determine whether increasing local decision-making authority will produce more effective learning.

<sup>2</sup> *Report to the Legislature on the Schools for the 21st Century Program*; Washington State: State Board of Education; 1993.

<sup>3</sup> "Bush borrows from Gardner and calls in big business to launch education reform," *The Seattle Times*; Tuesday, July 9, 1991. The article states that, "Bush yesterday said he would ask corporate leaders to raise between \$150 million and \$200 million to finance a school program based on Gardner's 'Schools for the 21st Century.'"

# Letter to the Joint Select Committee on Education Reform

round one and round two schools. The scoring guide for the assessments is as follows ...<sup>4</sup>

Content Area	L2	%	L3	%	L4	%
Mathematics	30 of 62 pts	48%	40 of 62 pts	65%	48 of 62 pts	77%
Reading	19 of 43 pts	44%	31 of 43 pts	72%	37 of 43 pts	86%
Writing			9 of 12 pts	75%		
Listening			7 of 10 pts	70%		

L2 = Below Standard

L3 = Meets Standard

L4 = Above Standard

Of particular note is the percentage required to meet (L3) or exceed (L4) the standard. To meet the standard in mathematics, to achieve the median score of 400, the child had to achieve a 65%! Coupled with the poor scores, this scoring guide paints a shocking and dismal picture of the claim that education reform is raising the standards and increasing student learning. 65% is failing, 70% is on the borderline of failing. Yet these scores meet the standard? The bar has just been surreptitiously lowered, individually as well as collectively. State education officials, however, claim otherwise, stating that the percentage required to meet or exceed the standard should not be of primary concern as some of the assessment questions *were harder than others and therefore were given greater weight!* This speaks to the subjective nature of the assessment scoring guides as alluded to by SPI Bergeson in her "State of Education" address,

*Last June, a panel of teachers, parents and business people reviewed the Essential Learnings, took the test, and analyzed extensive samples of student work. They then determined a cut score on the exam – how well you must listen, read, write, or do math to meet the standard.* (highlighting added)

As a contrast between the claims of the success of the 21st Century Program and the fourth grade assessments, two school districts will be scrutinized.

The first school district is the Yakima School District. According to the claims of education reformers, education reform will greatly increase the academic achievement of traditionally underserved populations – in particular minority students. The Yakima School District has a large minority population. As a 21st Century School, it entered the program in the first round, in the 1988/89 school year – *nine* school years ago. According to the claims of reformers, Yakima should have outscored "traditional" schools. While the scores of the individual schools within the Yakima School District are attached, the district-wide scores are as follows: of 1,031 fourth graders tested in the Yakima School District, 69 students (6.7%) met or exceeded the standard in mathematics, 243 students (23.6%) met or exceeded the standard in reading, 239 students (23.2%) met or exceeded the standard in writing, and 452 students (43.8%) met or exceeded the standard in listening.

<sup>4</sup> These figures come from the Curriculum and Assessment Division; Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction; Washington state.

# Letter to the Joint Select Committee on Education Reform

The second school district to be scrutinized here is the Orondo School District – the site of another large minority population. Orondo has a K-6 program only. The 1993 Report to the Legislature on the Schools for the 21st Century makes the following claim,

*A total of 40 percent of the student population in Orondo School District is bilingual, 50 percent is migrant, and 78 percent come from low-income households. One of the goals of the Orondo 21st Century project was to raise the schoolwide achievement scores from the 30th to the 45th percentile in five years. **In just two years, the scores climbed to the 62nd percentile.*** (highlighting added)

Two hundred-fifty (250)<sup>5</sup> children in the Orondo School District participated in the Schools for the 21st Century program. The focus of Orondo's education reform was to be accomplished through ...

*team building, participatory management, and consensus decision making at all levels to implement this project. The major components of this effort are as follows*

- ✘ a 200 day school year;
- ✘ a preschool program of all three- and four-year olds;
- ✘ 18 to 1 class ratio in kindergarten and Grade 1;
- ✘ 30 to 40 minutes of computer-assisted learning for Grades 1-6;
- ✘ establishment of a model-bilingual program;
- ✘ individual learning plans for all students (IEP's); and;
- ✘ after school experiential-learning activities for Grades 2-6.<sup>6</sup>

Orondo entered the 21st Century Program in the second round, in the 1990/91 school year. Schools participating in the 21st Century Program were to test using the Metropolitan Achievement Test (MAT).<sup>7</sup> Parents and legislators attempts to obtain the MAT scores for the 21st Century Program schools, however, have been met with claims that the state does not have them, irrespective of the laws governing the 21st Century Program which required the OSPI to obtain and circulate any information requested on this program (RCW 28A.630.230).

However, the CTBS test scores for the Orondo School District fourth grade, for the period 1991 through 1996, are available (see graph to right). A perusal of those scores shows a picture that contradicts the claims of the Report to the Legislature and the Final Report.

According to the previous statement, quoted above, the scores reached the 62 percentile on

Orondo, Gr 4	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996
<b>Reading</b>	50	24	32	22	39	14
% Tested	86	88	91	100	87	100
<b>Language</b>	40	25	37	21	43	15
% Tested	86	88	93	96	87	100
<b>Mathematics</b>	40	21	32	29	42	21
% Tested	86	92	98	100	87	100
<b>Total Battery</b>	43	21	34	22	40	14
% Tested	86	88	91	96	87	100

<sup>5</sup> Report to the Legislature on the Schools for the 21st Century Program; Washington State: State Board of Education; 1993; p 21.

<sup>6</sup> Final Report to the Legislatures on the Schools for the 21st Century Program; Washington State: State Board of Education; 1995.

<sup>7</sup> Report to the Legislature on the Schools for the 21st Century Program; Washington State: State Board of Education; 1993; p 88.

## Letter to the Joint Select Committee on Education Reform

testing in the 1992 school year. The corresponding CTBS scores for 1992 are highlighted above. It's pretty obvious that they are no where close to the 62 percentile. In fact, note the drastic drop in scores from the previous year, which, in themselves are not all that great. They take a second drastic drop in 1996. The Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills (CTBS) is an achievement test which, among other things, measures the factual knowledge base of the child. What these scores tell us is that the children do not have the factual knowledge base needed to formulate a reasoned conclusion. How, then, could these children have had the knowledge necessary to achieve a 62 percentile on any test or assessment, let alone the MAT – another achievement test? The fourth grade **assessment scores** for the Orondo School District are noted on the attached sheet. Why don't either the fourth grade assessment scores or the CTBS scores support the claims of the Report to the Legislature in 1993? Why was the funding for this project continued in light of these obvious contradictions? Who was responsible for checking the information submitted by the individual projects for accuracy?

The Schools for the 21st Century Program was a pilot program in education reform. By law, this program had to meet certain requirements and should have been closely monitored to see whether those requirements were being met; and if not, the program should have been stopped. The 1993 Report to the Legislature indicates that the evaluations of the individual projects was done by those in charge of the individual projects themselves, with an over-all evaluation being done by individuals<sup>8</sup> who had and have a vested interest in seeing education reform go forward. Indications are that no valid, non-biased evaluation of the individual projects was ever done or that the requirements of the Schools for the 21st Century law were ever met.<sup>9</sup> Why? The Final Report to the Legislature on the Schools for the 21st Century Program was supposedly published in three formats: 1) a 300 page resource document<sup>10</sup>; 2) an executive summary; and 3) a summarized document of the resource document. Although repeated requests were made of the Center for the Improvement of Student Learning for the 300 page resource document, they were unable to locate it raising the question of where this document is, who has seen it or had access to it. Who was overseeing this program and where is the accountability to the people for this pilot program, for what was going on within the schools themselves, for the \$8,700,000 in extra money that these projects received? Where was the Washington state legislature while all of this was going on?

As can be seen from just these two school districts, Yakima and Orondo, the Schools for the 21st Century Program, by any reasonable evaluation, was a failure. **Again, this program was the backbone or model for education reform for the entire state.**

---

<sup>8</sup> *The 1993 Report to the Legislature* carries evaluations submitted by Jane David representing National Center on Education and the Economy and Peter Holly and Geoff Southworth of the Cambridge Institute on Education of Cambridge, England. Peter Holly was on loan to the state of Washington from the Jefferson County Public Schools/Gheens Professional Development Academy in Louisville, Kentucky. One of those who helped create this organization, Phillip Schlechty, is the author of the book, *Schools for the 21st Century*, published in 1990. The foreword is written by Gov. Bill Clinton.

<sup>9</sup> "What is somewhat less certain is the answer to the second question, i.e., What were the causal factors that led to the increase in student performance? The quest to be definitive in such an area is problematical to say the least. Equally so, any attempt to "isolate the variables" is foolhardy, because one ends up doing just that isolating a variable from all other factors working for success, while knowing full well that the real answer lies in the interaction of the various factors." (*Final Report to the Legislature on the Schools for the 21st Century*; 1995; p 150.)

<sup>10</sup> According to Larry Davis, Executive Director of the State Board of Education, a typo was made when the summarized document was typed; that this 300-page resource document is only actually 200 pages.

# Letter to the Joint Select Committee on Education Reform

Two other school districts that have been lauded and applauded by education reformers as exemplary examples of the success of education reform are Pasco and Bremerton. When education reformers could no longer tout Pasco as an exemplary example, they turned to Bremerton, whose work on education reform was the subject of a tape produced in 1994 by the Washington State School Directors Association, entitled "Public Schools in Transition." Both **Pasco's and Bremerton's assessment scores** are dismal as shown on the attached sheet.

In conclusion, Governor Locke and SPI Terry Bergeson state that "it may take a decade to beef up the schools." It's seems clear that we have already had a decade to prove the worth of education reform through the state's pilot program – the Schools for the 21st Century. The questions we pose are:

1. How can Governor Locke, SPI Bergeson, the legislature, or the public expect that another ten years of this failed reform will ever produce higher standards and improved student learning?
2. What evidence is there to justify this optimism?

We recognize that these questions may seem to set aside our fundamental concern with the philosophical shift in the definition and purpose of education. This focus on the lack of achievement, through performance-based assessment, is not intended to de-emphasize that major over-arching concern. It is rather intended to shed light on the program's failure on the basis and terms set forth by the establishment itself. It remains our position, that performance-based assessments do not measure traditional academic achievement, but rather measure whether the child is demonstrating mastery of the new academics, defined by the Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board, as ...

*teamwork, critical thinking, making decisions, communication, adapting to change and understanding whole systems.*<sup>11</sup> ([Click here](#) to see copy of actual page)

It is imperative that parents, citizens and legislators understand that these new academics are in direct response to meeting the total quality needs of the new customer of education: **business**.

We respectfully request a written response from the Joint Select Committee on Education Reform regarding the questions posed in this letter; also, what the JSCER plans to do to rectify this situation.

*Cris Shardelman*  
*Roxanne Sitler*  
*Lynn M Stuter*

cc: House Education Committee members  
Senate Education Committee members

---

<sup>11</sup> *High Skills, High Wages*; Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board; Olympia, WA: Author; 1994; p 65.

# Schools for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century

## 4<sup>th</sup> Grade WASL Scores; Spring 1997

With between 7 and 9 years of restructuring behind them, 36 of the 38 elementary schools, participating in the Schools for the 21st Century Program, also participated in the first round of the Washington Assessment of Student Learning in the Spring of 1997. According to the final report on the Schools for the 21 Century program, January 1995, the participating schools outscored their counterparts. Following are their scores:

School District	Elementary	Rnd	Enr	Math		Reading		Writing		Listening	
				L3/4		L3/L4		L3/L4		L3/L4	
				%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#
Anacortes	Fidalgo	1	62	35.5	22	71.0	44	77.4	48	62.9	39
Bellevue	Newprt Hgts	1	69	37.7	26	66.7	46	65.2	45	82.6	57
Camas	Dorothy Fox	1	82	30.5	25	63.4	52	64.6	53	75.6	62
	Hellen Baller	1	86	24.4	21	54.7	47	58.1	50	57.0	49
	Zellerbach*	1	91	28.6	26	65.9	60	59.3	54	69.2	63
Colton		1	N/A								
Concrete	Concrete	2	64	9.4	6	46.9	30	48.4	31	60.9	39
Ferndale	Skyline	1	61	36.1	22	63.9	39	52.5	32	67.2	41
Granger	Roosevelt	2	96	4.2	4	11.5	11	9.4	9	27.1	26
Issaquah	Clark*	1	70	30.0	21	62.9	44	58.6	41	80.0	56
Moses Lake	Discover	1	25	24.0	6	56.0	14	36.0	9	64.0	16
	Knolls Vista	1	132	9.1	12	35.6	47	38.6	51	57.6	76
	Lakeview	1	136	25.7	35	37.5	51	44.1	60	59.6	81
	North	1	105	9.5	10	21.9	23	24.8	26	46.7	49
	Peninsula	1	79	6.3	5	34.2	27	8.9	7	41.8	33
N Mason	Belfair*	2	76	25.0	19	61.8	47	56.6	43	71.1	54
	Sand Hill	2	101	19.8	20	54.5	55	42.6	43	71.3	72
N Thurston	Seven Oaks	2	74	21.8	16	27.0	20	25.7	19	60.8	45
Olympia	Garfield	2	N/A								
Orondo	Orondo	2	26	3.8	1	15.4	4	0.0	0	46.2	12
Seattle	Montlake*	1	41	48.8	20	65.9	27	70.7	29	87.8	36
S Kitsap	Sunnyslope	1	72	20.8	15	55.6	40	47.2	34	68.1	49

# Schools for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century

## 4<sup>th</sup> Grade WASL Scores; Spring 1997

School District	Elementary	Rnd	Enr	Math		Reading		Writing		Listening	
				L3/4		L3/L4		L3/L4		L3/L4	
				%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#
Tacoma	Jennie Reed	1	115	3.5	4	32.2	37	40.9	47	47.8	55
Walla Walla	Edison	1	38	21.1	8	52.6	20	47.4	18	57.9	22
	Pospect Pt	1	98	20.4	20	46.9	46	39.8	39	71.4	70
Yakima	Adams	1	104	2.9	3	13.5	14	17.3	18	32.7	34
	Barge-Lincoln	1	78	0.0	0	5.1	4	14.1	11	28.2	22
	Garfield	1	83	0.0	0	13.3	11	14.5	12	28.9	24
	Gilbert	1	66	16.7	11	24.2	16	37.9	25	48.5	32
	Hoover	1	88	4.5	4	18.2	16	28.4	25	44.3	39
	ML King Jr	1	71	2.8	2	16.9	12	8.5	6	29.6	21
	McClure	1	66	3.0	2	31.8	21	22.7	15	48.5	32
	McKinley	1	61	4.9	3	32.8	20	14.8	9	39.3	24
	Nob Hill	1	84	17.9	15	50.0	42	51.2	43	56.0	47
	Ridgeview	1	91	6.6	6	20.9	19	28.6	26	60.4	55
	Robertson	1	89	9.0	8	22.5	20	22.5	20	43.8	39
	Roosevelt	1	79	7.6	6	31.6	25	13.9	11	51.9	41
Whitney	1	71	12.7	9	32.4	23	25.4	18	59.2	42	
Aggregate				15.3		38.0		36.3		54.9	
Statewide				21.1		47.0		41.7		61.3	

†

## WASL Scores; Spring 1997 Bremerton and Pasco

### Bremerton —

Elementary	Enr	Math		Reading		Writing		Listening	
		L3/L4		L3/L4		L3/L4		L3/L4	
		%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#
Armin G Jahr	78	5.1	4	37.2	29	38.5	30	55.1	43
Crownhill	82	17.1	14	43.9	36	32.9	27	64.6	53
Kitsap Lake	77	20.8	16	42.9	33	51.9	40	63.6	49
Naval Avenue	66	9.1	6	30.3	20	16.7	11	45.5	30
Olympic View	58	13.8	8	36.2	21	44.8	26	50.0	29
View Ridge	87	20.7	18	44.8	39	41.4	36	58.6	51
West Hills	68	8.8	6	32.4	22	35.3	24	48.5	33
<b>Aggregate Score</b>		<b>14.0</b>		<b>38.8</b>		<b>37.6</b>		<b>55.8</b>	

### Pasco —

Elementary	Enr	Math		Reading		Writing		Listening	
		L3/L4		L3/L4		L3/L4		L3/L4	
		%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#
Captain Gray	80	5.0	4	22.5	18	28	22	21.3	17
Edwin Markham	69	20.3	14	53.6	37	51	35	59.4	41
Emerson	76	2.6	2	15.8	12	7	5	25.0	19
James McGee	80	16.3	13	27.5	22	13	10	30.0	24
Longfellow	75	5.3	4	17.3	13	8	6	26.7	20
Mark Twain	96	4.2	4	21.1	20	17	16	35.8	34
Robert Frost	72	1.4	1	9.7	7	13	9	29.2	21

# WASL Scores; Spring 1997

## Bremerton and Pasco

Elementary	Enr	Math		Reading		Writing		Listening	
		L3/L4		L3/L4		L3/L4		L3/L4	
		%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#
Ruth Livingston	106	18.9	20	42.5	45	40	42	49.1	52
Aggregate Score		9.5		26.7		22.2		34.9	
<b>Statewide</b>		<b>21.1</b>		<b>47.0</b>		<b>41.7</b>		<b>61.3</b>	

RECOMMENDATIONS

Students at all educational levels need exposure to the world of work so they can make connections between what they learn in class and the use of that knowledge. This connection can increase engagement in learning — something that high standards alone won't do.

Workforce training and education agencies must actively support successful implementation of K-12 school reform.

And all government agencies must help ensure that public school students get the social and health services they need in order to learn.

*Developing the New "Basic Skills"*

To succeed in high performance work organizations, today's students must master the new basic skills — teamwork, critical thinking, making decisions, communication, adapting to change and understanding whole systems.

Student leadership organizations such as Distributive Education Clubs of America, Future Farmers of America, Vocational Industrial Clubs of America, Future Business Leaders of America, and Future Homemakers of America/Home Economics and Restaurant Organizations provide students with performance-based learning

# Addendum

**Re:** Final Report on the Schools for the 21st Century Program; January 1995

According to the document apparently submitted to meet the requirement of Chapter 525, Laws of 1987,

*The final report to the Legislature on the Schools for the 21st Century program has been prepared in three formats, a resource document of approximately 300 pages, an executive summary, and this digest summarizing the resource document.*

On September 9, 1997, I called the Center for the Improvement of Student Learning, requesting a copy of the "resource document of approximately 300 pages" which supposedly represented the full report on the Schools for the 21st Century Program. Two days later I received a document of approximately 100 pages that is the standard document sent out by the CISL when a request is made for the final report on the Schools for the 21st Century Program.

To make a long story short, through the plethora of phone calls to the CISL, to the State Board of Education, and to the Goals 2000 office, six weeks later, the 300-page resource document still has not been forthcoming. A message left on my answering machine on October 28, 1997, by Tom Hulst of the Goals 2000 office, indicates that this 300 page document is actually the January 1993 Report to the Legislature, plus an executive summary (of what?) of approximately 100 pages, plus the digest summarizing the resource document (the Final Report to the Legislature on the Schools for the 21st Century Program, January 1995) of approximately 100 pages.

There are several reasons that this doesn't add up:

- ✘ This is not what is indicated by the above quote which states that the summarized digest is of the 300 page resource document.
- ✘ A simple process of adding up the pages in the reports indicated to be representative of "the 300 page resource document," brings the total number of pages to 400, not 300.
- ✘ The 1993 Report to the Legislature covers the years 1991 and 1992. State law required a report every two years with a final report in January 1995. Where is the report to meet the requirement for the years 1993 and 1994?
- ✘ The report that the CISL has been sending out as the Final Report is actually the summarized digest of the resource document. A comparison of the Final Report and the 1993 Report to the Legislature does not give indication that the 1993 Report to the Legislature was a major component in the Final Report.

Where is the 300-page resource document that was supposedly the foundation of the Final Report to the Legislature on the Schools for the 21st Century Program, January 1995? If this document does not exist, then serious questions arise regarding the accuracy and efficacy of the claims made regarding the Schools for the 21st Century Program.

*Lynn M Stuter*

Lynn M Stuter

**Postscript:** The "300 page resource document" remained a mystery for three months. Then, the first week of December, 1997, the document turned up at the offices of the State Board of Education. The

## Addendum

"300 page resource document" was actually 782 pages of handwritten notes, charts, graphs, and typed pages, unbound and out of order, shoved in a file folder. The handwriting was that of Peter Holly, with whom the state of Washington had contracted to write the final report due in January 1995. For his work, Holly was paid \$15,000 dollars. I took the 782 pages of handwritten notes, very hard to read, at times almost illegible, and typed them, producing a document of 473 pages. Mike and Cris Shardelman, Jack Phillips, Roxanne Sitler, Roberta Berg, Jean English and I proofread the draft and I made the necessary corrections. We managed this feat in just over three weeks. Our compensation is in God's hands.

## The Unanswered Questions

In 1992, the Washington Legislature passed SB 6220, codified into law as RCW 28A.630.295. SB 6220 amended SB 5479, requiring that a final report be submitted to the legislature on or before January 15, 1995. This report was to answer two questions:

1. Has student performance increased?
2. If so, what factors caused the increase?

In answer to question one, the final report states,

*The answers to these two vital questions are contained within the remainder of this report. There is plenty of evidence ... that student performance has indeed increased. ... What we were not able to do was to thoroughly investigate the validity, reliability and veracity of the findings. What we can say is that we included only evidence that would seem to spring from education research that conformed to all the usual and expected standards of inquiry.*

In answer to the question two, the final report states,

*What is somewhat less certain are the answers to the second question, i.e., what were the causal factors that led to the increase in student performance? The quest to be definitive in such an area is problematical to say the least. Equally so, any attempt to 'isolate the variables' is foolhardy, because one ends up doing just that— isolating a variable from all the other factors working for success while knowing full well that the real answer lies in the combination of factors, their interplay, their chemistry. Isolating the variables takes the efficacy, the magic, out of the scenario.*

Why was the Final Report to the Legislature accepted without the report meeting the requirement of RCW 28A.630.295?

The schools involved in the Schools for the 21st Century pilot project were supposed to supply test scores showing an increase in student learning.

Why were there very few test scores included in the resource document to the final report; and why were schools allowed to draw up their own test score data for submission?

The majority of the material contained in the resource document to the final report is anecdotal which does not conform to the usual standard of scientific proof and discovery.

Why was this allowed, and why, under this circumstance, was the final report to the legislature accepted?

Peter Holly, originally of Cambridge, England, later working as a consultant for Education Development Consultants of Louisville, Kentucky, was paid \$15,000 under contract to the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction, to write the final report due by January 15, 1995. Such was done under the auspices of RCW 28A.630.295, which states, *"The state board*

## The Unanswered Questions

*of education and the superintendent of public instruction, from available funds, may contract for an independent evaluation of the schools for the twenty-first century program."* In a letter, signed by then SPI, Judith Billings, she states that Holly was contracted under that provision. Between August 15, 1990, and May 31, 1994, Peter Holly was paid \$163,400 under contract to the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction as a consultant to the Schools for the 21st Century program, representing a conflict of interest.

Why was OSPI allowed to contract Holly to write the final report? Who allowed this to happen?

The Final Report on the Schools for the 21st Century Program, states, on page 28, that *"Kids in Schools for the 21st Century projects are performing above the academic level of traditional schools."* However, with between seven and nine years of education reform already behind them; with their fourth grade students having been under education reform since entering schools, only eight of the 38 elementary schools participating in the **Schools for the 21st Century** exceeded statewide scores in all areas. Overall, the aggregated scores for the 21st Century schools were from 5.4 to 9 points below the statewide scores.

Why has the Washington state Legislature refused to investigate?

Each school participating in the Schools for the 21st Century program was granted \$50,000 additional dollars to restructure their schools. Over the term of the program, the cost to taxpayers was \$8,700,000 for the grants alone. This does not include administrative or consulting costs. The estimated cost of this program is over \$20,000,000.

Who is accountable for this money? Who is accountable for the failure of this program? Why is this program being allowed to continue under ESHB 1209 and Goals 2000?

**Why has the Washington State Legislature refused to investigate?**

# **Presentation**

**Senate Education Committee**

**January 29, 1998**

**Olympia, Washington**

## Preface

On January 29, 1998, the Senate Education Committee, chaired by Senator Harold Hochstatter, R-Moses Lake, held a hearing in Olympia on the Schools for the 21st Century Program. The hearing was boycotted by all but a few legislators, both Democrat and Republican, and WebTV – who holds the contract for video-taping public hearings at the capitol – refused to video the hearing.

Presenting at the hearing were Cris Shardelman, Roxanne Sitler and myself. Our presentation was the result of finally obtaining, deciphering, and typing the almost 800 page hand-written resource document, authored by Peter Holly, on the Schools for the 21st Century Program. By all objective measures, the program was a colossal failure, yet would become the foundation for education reform in Washington state and Goals 2000 at the federal level.

The next three sections are the testimony given by Cris Shardelman, Roxanne Sitler and Lynn Stuter on the occasion of the senate hearing.

## Part I – The Law

### Testimony of Cris Shardelman:

#### History:

It is imperative that the background of the Schools for the 21st Century be understood, as it is the foundation for America 2000 which became Goals 2000 and education reform as we have come to know it under HB1209 here in the state of Washington. Time does not permit us to cover the subject in-depth.

SSB 5479, authorizing the Schools for the 21st Century, passed in May 1987. This legislation, proposed by then Governor Booth Gardner, was heavily influenced by the much publicized report of Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy (CFEE), *A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century*. Mark Tucker, head of CFEE (later reorganized as the National Center on Education and the Economy), was a consultant to Governor Gardner at the time of the writing of the 21st Century legislation. Tucker is known to have consulted on the writing of legislation, both state and federal. As reported in the *Seattle Post Intelligencer*, Tucker testified before the House Education Committee in February 1987.

#### Requirements of the law and its purpose:

The stated purpose of the Schools for the 21st Century was to foster change in the state common school system and to develop model school programs to improve student performance through additional money, 10 extra days per year for staff, and the very controversial temporary waiver of certain state statutes, administrative rules and waivers of federal regulations in order to develop new methods and procedures.

The legislation established a ten member Governor's Task Force on the Schools for the 21st Century. Brian Benzel of the Edmonds School District was appointed the chair of the task force. Benzel would, during the course of the pilot program, become a member in other state and national education reform programs, including the National Education Goals Panel, the National Alliance for Restructuring Education (a design team of the National Center on Education and the Economy under which Washington became a site partner), National Council on Educational Standards and Testing, the Governor's Council on Education Reform and Funding known as GCERF, and the Commission on Student Learning. While Benzel was head of the Governor's Task Force on Schools for the 21st Century, a school in his district was chosen, on the recommendation of the Task Force, to be a 21st Century site.

#### Who was affected:

In the first round of funding, in the 1988-89 school year, 21 projects were chosen to be 21st Century sites through a competitive grant process. Although not specifically outlined in the legislation, all 21 projects submitted applications that held common strands. In the second round of funding, in the 1990-91 school year, 12 more projects were added, bringing the total number of projects to 33, covering 27 school districts, 111 schools, and 52,106 children. The pilot project ended June 30, 1994, having expended \$20.7 million.

## Part I – The Law

### How projects were selected, funded and monitored:

The state board of education was to review and select the projects for grant awards, monitor and evaluate the schools for the twenty-first century pilot projects. In addition, the Governor's Task Force on Schools for the 21st Century was to recommend projects for approval to the state board. The application for funding required schools or districts to include, among other things, (RCW 28A.100.038) (1) an enumeration of specific activities to be carried out as part of the pilot school project, (6) the evaluation and accountability processes to be used to measure school-wide student and project performance...

Under RCW 28A.100.042 (3), the school pilot projects, initially funded for two years, could be extended for a total period not to exceed six years. Continued funding was contingent on a positive evaluation and on sites submitting an annual report to the State Board of Education. In addition, reports were to be delivered to the State Legislature by the State Board of Education on the progress of the pilot by January 15 of each odd-numbered year. Approval of pilot projects could be modified or terminated for funding purposes, due to unsatisfactory evaluation results or a school district's failure to comply with the terms of the district's application.

In 1992, SSB 6220 added additional requirements to the legislation, mandating that a final report be provided to the legislature on January 15, 1995, which would answer two essential questions: Has student performance increased? If so, what factors caused the increase?

In addition, this RCW allowed the state board and the Superintendent of Public Instruction to contract for an **independent evaluation** of the schools. Beginning in January 1993, the state of Washington began paying Peter Holly, of Cambridge, England, for work on the final report, due January 15, 1995. Considering that Holly had worked with the Schools for the 21st Century since 1989, one has to question how independent any evaluation completed by Holly could have been. The 1993 Report to the Legislature (pg. 88) indicates that Holly was involved with schools in Washington state prior to the implementation of the 21st Century program.

### Common Restructuring Strands Funded:

Although not specifically mandated in the legislation, common themes emerged in the 21st Century grant applications. According to the 1989 Report to the Legislature,

*Common themes among the projects include staff development, enhanced use of technology, international education, outcome based education, and reorganization of the delivery system for such programs as special education, Chapter 1, and the Learning Assistance Program.*

Key among these themes is international education, exemplified by the I\*EARN program established and supported by the Copen Family Foundation. I\*EARN is an acronym for International Education And Resource Network. The purpose of I\*EARN is to link American students directly with their peers in other parts of the world, creating international joint projects. Key program coordinator was John Anderson, also coordinator for the Schools for

## Part I – The Law

the 21st Century.

In addition to the I\*EARN telecommunication project, Schools for the 21st Century, as a program, is involved in two international partnerships, the School of the 21st Century project in Moscow and the China National Institute for Education Studies/Haidian Education Bureau in Beijing. Three years prior to the breakup of the Soviet Union, Mr. Copen signed an agreement with the Soviet Academy of Sciences; a similar agreement was entered into with the People's Republic of China. The purpose of both contracts is,

*to exchange best ideas, practices, and instructional materials;*

*to exchange information and research between students, teachers, administrators, and scholars...particular emphasis on the school change process, innovative teaching strategies... and*

*To actively seek to establish exchanges of teachers and students in partner schools.*

John Anderson traveled to Moscow to help in the planning of the 21st Century project there, which was to be a laboratory for continuing educational research. Was this what the legislature intended to fund?

Another key theme, common to the projects, is outcome based education. Known as mastery learning in the 1970's when it was implemented—and ultimately failed—in the Chicago schools, it has achieved new status under the name of outcome-based education. Currently, OBE is known as performance-based, competency-based and standards-based education. Chief promoter of this concept of education based on outcomes, is Dr. William Spady, who, in 1984, successfully submitted a proposal to then Secretary of Education Terrence Bell for a grant which would eventually bring OBE to “all schools of the nation.” (Overheads) On this first overhead, we see the letter of intent as evidence that Bill Spady worked with SPI Burningham of Utah to,

*put outcome-based education in place, not only in Utah but in all schools in the nation.*

This next overhead shows how OBE results can be altered,

*(w)e want to 1) screen out those schools which do not possess defining OBE characteristics or which cannot provide evidence of substantial improvement in student achievement. (pg. 15 of application)*

The last overhead, is from the proposal (pg. 4) and speaks to the results of three OBE projects. Number 3 states,

*The Center School in New Canaan, Connecticut, where for the last eight years in a row, about 60% of the sixth graders score at the 99th percentile on the MAT, some complete Algebra 1, and virtually no students in the entire school of 300 score below grade level.*

## Part I – The Law

You might ask, *How is the school doing now?* In an interview with investigative reporter Jayna Davis, on Oklahoma TV4, Spady was asked to name a successful class where students learned mathematics without textbooks, through real life experiences. He stated that there was an elementary program called Outcome Based Mathematics that was,

*developed by a friend of mine when he was Principal in his school in Connecticut, and he and his staff put this curriculum in.*

When asked if the school was New Canaan, he stated that it was. Jayna Davis then went on to ask if the school was still open. His reply, “not the...the school’s been closed for ages. The school is a parking lot.”

When asked why, Spady’s response was, “declining enrollment.”

The reporter finally asked, “Was it an OBE school?”

Spady’s answer, “Yes it was...the closure didn’t have anything to do with the effectiveness of OBE.”

I have this video here tonight and would be happy to make it available for anyone interested in viewing this short segment. William Spady’s success or failure is important because he became a consultant to at least one of the 21st Century sites, which, in its application, outlines its outcome-based orientation. That school district was Yakima. Yakima also consulted with Johnson City Central School District, Johnson City, New York. The failure of Johnson City has since been more than adequately documented.

From page 7 of the 1995 Executive Summary on the Report to the Legislature, we find the list of the seven major restructuring strands used in 21st Century Schools. All of the projects contain at least some of the features listed under each of these seven strands. (Overhead) They are:

### **Collaborative Skills**

Cooperative Learning, Peer and Cross-Age Tutoring, Advisor/Advisee Programs, Peer Coaching, Team Teaching, Collaborative Planning, Shared Decision Making/Site-Based Management

### **Alternative Assessment**

Portfolios, Performance-Based Assessment, Peer Evaluation, Action Research

### **Outcome-Based Education**

Quality Schools, Outcomes Driven Development Model, Mastery Learning

### **Structural Change**

Latchkey Programs, Multiage Class/Upgraded School, Alternative Scheduling, Options to Pull-Out, Early Childhood Education, Class Size

### **Partnerships**

## Part I – The Law

Business, Parent/Community, College/University, Interagency

### **Technology**

Telecommunications, Networked Computers, Local Area Networked Computers, Video Production

### **Curriculum Change**

Global Awareness/Pacific Rim, Integrated Curriculum, Thinking Skills, Project-Based Learning, Math Manipulatives, Learning Styles, Whole Language

These were the reform components/strands used in the pilot schools of 21st Century sites.

To conclude this segment, we have looked at the law and its stated purpose, and looked at, to a minor degree, what that law brought to the State of Washington under the 21st Century pilot. The question remains, did the program meet the requirements of the law? As a pilot, was it successful?

## Part II – The Final Report

### Testimony of Lynn Stuter:

Cris has outlined for you, the law, and given you a peek at what the schools were doing under the law. First, I propose to answer the question that Cris asked – “Did the Schools for the 21st Century meet the requirement of the law?”

I wish to take you to page 31 of the manuscript of Peter Holly. An abbreviated version of this also exists in the summarized digest, page 15. I quote,

*Has student performance increased? If so, what factors caused the increase?*

These are the two questions that were to be answered in the final report to the legislature as required by SB6220, codified into law as RCW 28A.630.295. The manuscript then continues,

*The answers to these two vital questions are contained within the remainder of this report. There is plenty of evidence ... that student performance has indeed increased. ... What we were not able to do was to thoroughly investigate the validity, reliability and veracity of the findings. What we can say is that we included only evidence that would seem to spring from education research that conformed to all the usual and expected standards of inquiry.*

In short, while the claim is made that the evidence does exist, to show increased student performance, an immediate disclaimer thereafter follows, stating that the “validity, reliability and veracity” of the “evidence” cannot be provided. I shall expound on this further in a moment.

In answer to the second question, “If so, what factors caused the increase?” the manuscript continues,

*What is somewhat less certain are the answers to the second question, i.e., what were the causal factors that led to the increase in student performance? The quest to be definitive in such an area is problematical to say the least. Equally so, any attempt to ‘isolate the variables’ is foolhardy, because one ends up doing just that— isolating a variable from all the other factors working for success while knowing full well that the real answer lies in the combination of factors, their interplay, their chemistry. Isolating the variables takes the efficacy, the magic, out of the scenario.*

Meeting the requirement of the law was “foolhardy?” Need more be said?

It becomes apparent in reading this manuscript – and I do hope that you will all make the effort to read the document in its entirety – is that the “evidence” provided is anecdotal, and does not conform to the usual standards associated with scientifically validated research. To quote page 482 of the manuscript,

*But in education, so much that is achieved is not measurable – unless students are*

## Part II – The Final Report

*tracked over a 10/15 year period to college and beyond, follow their routes taken, connections made to the 21st Century experiences. We have to use anecdotal evidence – otherwise, we are not going to be able to measure Century 21! ... You can talk it, you can feel it, you can communicate it - anecdotally.*

A similar quote is to be found on page 26 of the manuscript,

*You cannot evaluate Schools for the 21st Century...so much that has been achieved is not measurable, and the true results will only appear over time. There's a need to shadow students from 10-15 years—through college and beyond—following their routes taken, decisions made, key incidents encountered and all the time, making connections with the 21st Century experiences... You can talk it, you can communicate it, but you can't quantify it.*

You can talk it, you can feel it, you can communicate it, but you can't measure it. In earlier reports to the legislature on the Schools for the 21st Century, we glimpsed impending problems with evaluation of the projects. Consider these quotes from page 88 of the 1993 Report to the Legislature,

*The original Schools for the 21st Century legislation stated that the purpose of the program was to see if locally developed projects in school restructuring and innovation could improve student performance. However, no definition of student performance was given, no assessment tools were indicated, and no evaluation plan was proposed. As a result, no baseline data was collected prior to implementation, other than scores from the Metropolitan Achievement Test required of all schools.*

Now contrast that statement with this one found in the 1991 Annual Report to the State Board of Education, pg. 10,

*Because many of the variables in schools are uncontrollable or unknown, standardized test scores viewed alone can be misleading when viewed as effects of complex educational programs. However, when integrated with other types of data, they can become meaningful indicators. Metropolitan Achievement Test scores, available for all 21st Century projects as baseline data prior to being selected by the State Board, will be the standard objective data reported in an overall Schools for the 21st Century evaluation.*

The question now becomes—did the MAT tests become the baseline data and the standard objective data reported in a overall evaluation? From page 109 of the 1993 Report to the Legislature, five years into the project, we read,

*For now, however, when asked if they were doing any formal evaluation of student outcomes resulting from the implementation of the various innovations, the majority of respondents said, 'No', contrary to the strong proposal for 'extensive Action Research' and the data collected for annual reports and staff surveys.*

I will add, at this point that the attempts of citizens to obtain the MAT test scores for the

## Part II – The Final Report

Schools for the 21st Century have been futile. I will also add that the test score information contained in this manuscript, supposedly evidence of increased student learning, was supplied by the school districts themselves in the form of charts and graphs. Said information has not been audited for accuracy or efficacy; it does not represent information supplied directly from an achievement test company that shows how many children were tested, how many tests were validated, and what the score was for the tests validated.

Returning to the evaluation of the 21st Century project - what was used to evaluate this pilot?

Again, we shall turn to the manuscript, page 32,

*School transformation, by its very nature, is complex and swirling. It is a deep, rich tapestry of interacting factors. It is characterized by connectedness, not isolation. The challenge is to get inside this richness in order to experience it, not to measure it: 'to talk it and feel it, not to quantify it.' The best that can be done is to do two things. The first is to watch closely and listen intently: to capture the complexity from the inside and to gain understanding by interacting with all the many different kinds of participants—parents (as above), teachers, administrators, students ... support agents, etc. —and asking the same basic questions ('I'm seeing this, I'm picking up this - is this how you see it?') and then entering into dialogue around the responses. This is called communicative validation – the story is validated within the communication with key participants. And within the story-telling, the connections, the causal links, begin to emerge.*

Further clarification of the evaluative and accountability process comes from page 300 of the manuscript,

*The essence of accountability (as with this report) are the questions, 'has student success occurred?' and 'what caused this success?' By asking these questions in this documenting, we are reporting the fruits of the assessment and evaluation activities and, in so doing, we are rendering accountable Schools for the Twenty-first Century.*

The 21st Century program is rendered accountable merely by asking the questions? It becomes very apparent that accountability is based on evaluation consisting of anecdotal excerpts from interviews, etc., with people involved with the project; interviews, I might add, that were guided, as noted above, by the evaluation team members. Beyond that, quote after quote after quote, reveals not what the participants (usually nameless, in the report) knew about what was being implemented, but how the various participants felt about the project. The words feel and feeling appear probably more times in this document than any other word. They are joined by the terms emotionality and affectivity. This was how the 21st Century Schools were evaluated—on how the participants felt about the program.

Projects throughout the report have indicated an aversion to standardized testing as evidenced by these quotes from page 26 of the 1995 Report to the Legislature,

*Indeed, many teachers in many schools feel that they are being pulled in two directions at once - by the undoubted popular vote for standardized tests in the*

## Part II – The Final Report

*community at large and by their own personal and professional misgivings. Many educators disparage these tests; they have no time for them- mainly because they do not see their educational worth.*

It goes on to state,

*Many respondents - educators especially - echoed the thoughts of Peter Block in his book, Stewardship, 'A heavy hand, however, leads people to give more attention to the measurement than to the service, product or outcome. We see it in schools when we care more about grades than we do about learning...' For an extended discussion of the flaws of standardized tests, please consult the resource document.*

Remember, we just read from the 1991 Annual Report to the State Board of Education that,

*MAT scores...will be the standard objective data reported in an overall Schools for the 21st Century evaluation.*

There are other aspects of this report that also need to be addressed. Citizens have repeatedly expressed concern over the parental role under education reform; concern that centers around who is and who is not allowed to participate and have a voice in restructuring. Consider these quotes,

*At Clark Elementary, the parent involvement school, every teacher trains their own parents at the beginning of the year. It requires a lot of work, but its worth it... (p 69)*

*I have mixed feelings over the site-based council. Parent involvement at the governance level can be a mistake. They have good hearts but they don't have all the information; they don't know what they should or shouldn't know. They bring their personal agendas to the table. (p 529)*

*Is parent involvement in governance a good thing? Of course; but only if it works for all those concerned. (p 531)*

*...I am cautious about parents and site councils. Schools are evolving, complex; they are leading and influencing...On site councils, parents should not try to micro-manage. ... Parents have to be immersed operationally; when they are adjuncts, volunteers should they be guiding on operational questions? It's asking a lot of them. (p 530)*

*In terms of the development of the site council, it's taken all year for parents to understand how things work. It's an informational issue. There needs to be a controlled setting in order to ask for parent's feedback, receive a perspective on the family and their kids. (p 550-51)*

These are but five of the many, many quotes referring to the role of 'parents' in the school. This quote, from page 673, just about sums up the role of parents,

## Part II – The Final Report

*Such schools develop extended families that include parents and members of the community in responsible roles. Teachers increase their conversations with parents about learning and development. Parents take on increased responsibilities for their children's growth and development, participate in developing new programs and services, and contribute their time to assisting teachers in facilitating learning.*

This certainly defines the role of parent as partner. This quote translates into the school becoming the new family of the child and the parent being the adjunct. The following quote on pages 363 & 364, is but one of the several that defines the new family,

*the strengths of the program are the continuous progress, the family group, the extended periods of time with the same teacher...They have social knowledge through ongoing peer interaction. They've formed a 'society', a family group.*

On page 434 of the manuscript, the necessity of emotional bonding as a family concept with the school is discussed,

*we have a holistic approach here...we deal with the whole child - in terms of social, emotional and academic learning. Maslow's basic needs - safety, warmth, caring, the emotional needs of 'family'; you have all this first. From this you build the social and academic. It's a school built on friendship (parents helped design it), or feeling of 'I can do it', on bonding and positive attitudes.*

No wonder parents are upset!

With the advent of education reform, parents need a new dictionary. Old words seem to have attained new meanings. Repeatedly in the context of the Schools for the 21st Century, more recently statewide restructuring, we hear how education reform is "content and process." The overhead you are about to see gives us the new definition of "content." (p 630) I ask you, do you define "content" as "excellence in terms of the quality of the change agenda?" No wonder parents are screaming about the loss of academics in their local school while the education establishment is busy telling us that the essential learnings are content-rich.

Speaking of process, consider these quotes from the manuscript,

*The students of today and the future will need to know how to process, search and organize information in order to make sound decisions. The need to know facts will become less important and the need to know how to acquire, decode, judge, and create and solve problems will become more important. (p 167)*

*We keep looking to find the product - it's the process and if we don't have the process we will go backwards. The destination is the process; we're teaching the kids to be life-long learners. (p 373)*

*...the students are getting the chance to explore, to make mistakes, to realize that there's no one answer, to understand that learning is about processing. (p 374)*

## Part II – The Final Report

This manuscript also refers to the facilitative process that parents have found themselves subjected to in the name of achieving “consensus”. One parent, unwittingly, laid bare the truth about the process of consensus building when she said,

*She knows just how to facilitate so that everyone thinks it is their idea... (p 597)*

That facilitative process is being used in every facet of our society and government today, including education reform. It promotes collectivist values over individual values; it promotes the collective, the community, over the individual; it has no tolerance for differing views.

The whole of education reform is based on a process. That process is defined throughout this manuscript by such terms as outcome-based education, total quality management, the learning organization, quality schools, continuous quality improvement, and systems thinking - all being synonymous, all springing from the same developmental theory, all synonymous in structure. Each views the school, the organization, the world as a wholistic or holistic system, **interdependent and interconnected**; that what affects one part affects all parts, that within any subsystem is an infrastructure that is analogous across systems, irrespective of physical appearance. The systems approach finds basis in the writings of one Alfred North Whitehead, a man quoted several times in this document. Other supporters of the systems approach are also heavily quoted in this book, to include Peter Senge and Stephen Covey. Consider these quotes from pages 428 and 429,

*In this chapter on the real curriculum we have included connected learning as one of its essential components. We are now, however, making a bigger claim for connectedness... Connectedness, to borrow an apt phrase, is the river running through it...*

- *the biggest danger of the Twenty-first Century is people feeling out of touch and alienated from their lives which are too fast-paced, too depersonalized, too disconnected... During the discussion at Skyline, a Native American parent reminded the group that the greatest accomplishment of Schools for the 21st Century is the deeper sense of presence achieved - the healing, the spirit, the shamen - the connectedness; the deeper sense of community.*

*it's about 'in thereness'; it's the same feeling you get on mountains, by the side of rivers, on starry nights - it's the feeling of living in them, being of them, understanding balance.*

- *interpersonal connectedness (collaboration, co-operative learning, teaming, sharing and learning together, co-creating the collective spirit) is balanced by intra-personal connectedness (self-understanding, reflexivity; being in touch with one's own feelings). Personal strength comes from personal connectedness.*

Ladies and gentlemen, they've just been Borged!!

It is easy to see that, under this concept, education would be seen as wholistic, addressing the whole child - mentally, physically, and emotionally; constructivist, hands-on, real-life, or

## Part II – The Final Report

life-role education. This is the frame of reference for whole language and whole math. The focus of education would move away from academics to real-life issues taught in the context of unit themes or thematic units with knowledge only incorporated as it is used and applied in addressing the social or life-related issue; integrated curriculum instead of individual disciplines, etc. Consider these quotes,

*First, we found learning that was relevant (to children and their lives in the real world); applicable, alive, active, experiential, hands-on, practical and above all, non-artificial. The learning was connected with reality, not separated from it. Second, we found learning that is really learned, i.e., understood, assimilated, internalized. It grabbed the students. (p 412)*

*Self-actualizing individuals come to respect the need for a self-actualizing organization which unites around 'life themes' in which all the individual members feel they have an investment. (p 645)*

A case in point of "life themes" in which all individual members feel they have an investment, in real-life, is elucidated in this quote,

*We've made big gains, firstly on the environmental side. What was done last is paramount to me - the Wetlands; a real story book.*

Throughout the manuscript we find similar references to environmentalism.

The systems approach dictates that mankind can "create the future" by deciding what the child should know and be able to do as a result of his or her educational experience. This is defined by the state essential academic learning requirements. Once the end result of learning is established, then everything done to achieve the end result (also known as the goal or exit outcomes) is aligned to the end result to ensure that it is achieved. The measure of mastery is the assessment. It is easy to recognize this systems approach as our own education reform. For instance, in the Schools for the Twenty-first Century, it was utilized as the GRASP concept in a backward-mapping mode. GRASP means Governance, Real Curriculum, Assessment, Support for Restructuring and Professional Development. According to Holly's model, this was implemented in a 1,4,5,2,3 sequence or G,S,P,R,A fashion with Assessment as the final component to determine whether the system is achieving the end result. Systems thinking is the basis of planned economies in which all component parts are carefully managed according to a state driven and state managed economy. Need I say that this is the economic system of socialist/communist nations where people are considered to be human capital, and the education system the means of producing that human capital.

Speaking to the learning organization, the manuscript, page 713, states,

*(These same schools) attend to their organizational health creating humanistic environments in which all members can learn and grow.*

The following quote comes from *Strategic Planning for Educators* (1986) by Dr. Shirley McCune, currently administrative assistant to Dr. Terry Bergeson,

## Part II – The Final Report

*The synthesis of technology with educational tasks opens new possibilities for more humanistic schools and educational systems.*

Humanistic? Repeatedly, throughout books written on education reform, this term comes into play. **Humanism** runs parallel to systems thinking. Humanism sees man as devoid of spirituality and self-determinism; that man must, therefore, be conditioned to his environment whatever it is decided that environment will be. This futuristic tone is relayed in these two quotes from the manuscript,

*Some Century 21 teachers feel particularly aggrieved because they were exhorted to be innovative in the classroom and then, in their perception, get saddled with an inappropriate way of assessing progress and capturing achievement. They feel constrained, less than futuristic in their change efforts. (p 233)*

*Originally, we got ourselves a lot of information from Futurists (concerning what kids will need in the 21st Century - a backward mapping exercise - plus alternative instruction strategies, active learning, etc.) (p 477)*

The exit outcomes established in school districts were based on the work of Futurists - people who attempt to decide what the future should look like. How many times have we heard, "what the world will be like in the 21st Century", "Creating the Future" etc. Education, under Schools for the 21st Century, under current reform measures, is not about producing innovative, creative, intelligent individuals; rather, it is about conditioning children to the perceived environment as it has been decided that it will be in the near future. Again, we are aligning everything we do to achieve the outcome.

Repeatedly, in the context of restructuring, in this manuscript, appears the phrase "paradigm shift." Paradigm means "model;" according to Stephen Covey, much quoted in this manuscript, *paradigm* is how one "perceives the world" – it is your world view. A *paradigm shift*, then, would be a shift in world view. From what world view to what world view? This newspaper article that has been included in your packet reveals that 90% of Americans still hold to the world view of our Founding Fathers. I will remind you, ladies and gentlemen, that the foundations of our nation were to ensure "freedom, liberty, and justice." Humanism has a track record; it has a history. It has been the world view of every totalitarian, dictatorial government ever established on the face of this earth.

I have heard the term non-sectarian bandied about in addressing education. The word "non-sectarian" is an oxymoron. Non-sectarian means non-religious. Every educational philosophy has a sectarian basis – has a religious basis. Education is religious; the two are inseparable. The prejudice of our Founding Fathers was Judeo-Christian. That is the religion upon which our nation was founded. If we intend to retain our freedom, liberty, and justice, wouldn't it behoove us to guard our educational institutions and their religious foundations closely?

Because these issues are ones which may deeply divide us, we have a tendency to sweep them under the rug - we don't look at them, we don't want to discuss them, and therefore, we don't deal with them. It becomes much easier to call names than to address philosophical differences.

## Part II – The Final Report

In closing, I draw your attention to this quote from the manuscript, page 49 and again on page 289,

*Kids in Schools for the Twenty-first Century are performing above the academic level of traditional schools.*

This manuscript disparages standardized testing based, again, on anecdotal testimony—how teachers feel about standardized tests. In the Spring of 1997, schools state-wide participated in the first run of the fourth grade assessment. The schools involved in the 21st Century program would be, for the first time, measured according to their own criteria. As 21st Century Schools, with between seven and nine years of education reform behind them, with fourth graders who have been in “the system” since day one, these students should have outperformed the ‘traditional’ schools. Did they? The results of this assessment, more than this 782 page manuscript, provides the evidence of the success or failure of the Schools for the Twenty-first Century. (overhead) These scores were figured and aggregated using the same formulas and figures used by the state to figure and aggregate the scores. Of the 38 elementary schools in the 21st Century program, 36 participated in the assessment. Of those 36, only 8 managed to meet or exceed the state-wide scores in all categories. That is 22%, ladies and gentlemen. Is this how we define success? With this kind of ‘success rate’, what will our schools, statewide, be producing in three to five years?

## Part III – Foundation for Education Reform

### Testimony of Roxanne Sitler –

In summary, what we have presented to you, for your consideration, is just a small part of a much bigger story - a story which is fully revealed within the pages of this manuscript. As citizens, what we discovered in researching Schools for the 21st Century, is that the success of this program has, in our estimation, been grossly exaggerated, even to the point of misrepresentation. As revealed in an earlier quote, those inside the project stated that the improvements in student learning, their "success", could not be measured or quantified. Therefore, the statement in the final report which states that C21 kids are performing above the academic level of traditional schools must be questioned as to its validity and reliability.

You might be tempted to brush all this off as insignificant; but, given the fact that this program was used as a pilot, not only for the State of Washington, but for the entire nation, it would be wise to look into these concerns further. Again, this project was important, not only to the foundation of education reform here in our state, but was also influential at the national level. In order to support that statement, I will read just a few of the many quotes from 21st Century Reports and national documents which indicate that this project did indeed pilot a state and national philosophy of education reform.

#### 1993 Full Report to the Legislature

State Board of Education Letter

*We believe that the Schools for the 21st Century program has played a key role in educational restructuring throughout the state and has been a catalyst for significant changes, such as the movement towards outcome-based education, site-based management, and the passage of the Education Reform bill of 1992.*

Page 5,

*Since 1987, Washington has made a sizable investment in the Schools for the 21st Century Program. With the passage of the School Reform bill of 1992 and its plan for transitioning to locally-based decision making and outcome-based education by 1998, the state is now well positioned to make good use of its Schools for the 21st Century resources. The next years are the time for final reporting and for dissemination of the most effective accomplishments of the Schools for the 21st Century projects. Therefore, a process must be developed to establish a statewide network to link these projects with other schools at varying stages of educational reform. The State Board of Education recommends mentor relationships under current levels of funding as the most effective and cost efficient way of accomplishing this.*

Page 130,

*Compared with restructuring schools and districts across the country, Washington provides many of the cutting edge examples of changes in school culture,*

## Part III – Foundation for Education Reform

*organization, and practice* (Jane David-NCEE as part of a report to the Governor's Council on Reform and Funding)

### 1993 Report to the Legislature - Executive Summary

Page 5,

*It is interesting to note that with passage of the 1992 Education Reform Bill (SSB5953), other districts will have the opportunity to request similar waivers, and the entire state will transition toward outcome-based education.*

### 1995 Final Report to the Legislature

Page 5,

*What we have learned from the Schools for the 21st Century projects will continue to provide firsthand educational restructuring information to the state as it moves ahead with systemwide reform under ESHB 1209 in 1993 and ESHB 2950 in 1994.*

### 1995 Final Report - Executive Summary

Page 10,

*Policymakers and educators across the country have been following the nation's first and most far-reaching of the school restructuring initiatives. Included in the complete Report to the Legislature on the Schools for the 21st Century Program are reports written about the program by the following: Jane David of National Center on Education and the Economy, Peter Holly of Gheens Academy for Educational Research in Louisville, Kentucky, Geoff Southworth of Cambridge Institute of Education in England, additional reports from Policy Research Associates in Washington DC and SRI and Associates in Palo Alto, CA...*

### The Seattle Times - July 9, 1991

*"President Bush has announced a new education initiative based on a program borrowed from a source some Washington teachers might question - Gov. Booth Gardner. Bush yesterday said he would ask corporate leaders to raise between \$150 million and \$200 million to finance a school program based on Gardner's Schools for the 21st Century...good ideas are at work out there in the state of Washington," Bush said in the White House Rose Garden after a meeting with Lt. Governor Joel Pritchard and school officials from Edmonds and Bellevue. Bush's national schools campaign called America 2000 was announced in April.*

### America 2000, An Education Strategy, George Bush

Track II, For Tomorrow's Students: A New Generation of American Schools, Strategy:

## Part III – Foundation for Education Reform

*We will unleash America's creative genius to invent and establish a New Generation of American Schools...A number of excellent projects and inspired initiatives already point the way. These include Washington State's Schools for the 21st Century...the mission is to help create schools that will reach to National Education Goals and the World Class Standards...Governors will work within their own states to develop strategies for restructuring their education system in order to achieve the goals. (Note: This refers to the Design Teams which were chosen by Bush's New American Schools Development Corporation. Washington state signed into an agreement with Marc Tucker's NCEE design team, National Alliance for Restructuring Education - as noted earlier, Tucker was a consultant to Governor Gardner's staff at the time of the writing of the Schools For the 21st Century Legislation)*

### Resource Document

Page 76 & 77,

*This venture will provide an extensive support infrastructure for state-wide reform in the form of 'nested' site-based development. The nesting will take place in seven state-wide regional clusters within which individual school sites and school districts will form what we like to refer to as the implementation zone.*

*Networking will be a key feature of this initiative - both within and across the regional clusters.*

*These sites, ably supported by the internal facilitators, will provide the 'front-line' for implementation of reforms initiated at the State and Federal levels, e.g. Goals 2000.*

I believe these statements present the irrefutable evidence that this pilot has had widespread impact on the present reality of education reform. Clearly, here in our state, the intention was to use the information learned and the practices of those themes common to the pilot projects, as a basis for restructuring our statewide system.

Shouldn't we be asking ourselves the question of why the pilot schools, which were deep into the philosophies of the paradigm shift of education restructuring, didn't do any better on an assessment which was supposedly designed to assess so-called "authentic learning"? Washington's new 4th grade assessment is a "performance-based" assessment. As noted previously, the consultants and those stakeholders of C21 projects stated their belief that standardized testing does a poor job of measuring what children should know and be able to do; what children should "be like" - the essence of their definition of student learning. And yet, by an assessment tool specifically designed to measure this definition of learning, Schools for the 21st Century scored lower, as a whole, than did more "traditional" schools whose exposure to reform practices has been less comprehensive. I would say we need to ask some hard questions here.

## Part III – Foundation for Education Reform

The theories and philosophies of education, upon which we are securing our future, are failing by measurable standards. After studying the reports on the Schools for the 21st Century, we have concerns about what we see is meant by student learning and we have concerns about how success is defined and measured. Semantics are critical, definitions are critical - knowing exactly what is meant by increased student learning and knowing how that learning is measured is fundamental to the issue. Citizens, for the most part, have the basic understanding that student learning is about academic achievement in the traditional sense. They do not understand this "paradigm shift" - this shift which is presented wholly in Peter Holly's report - **this report that never saw the light of day**. It's in here; this is the place where you find the truth of what is meant by student learning. Few have ever seen it, including those who were supposed to have considered its contents. Our fear is that, like so many reports that have gone before it, it will sit in the archives, gathering dust while education restructuring goes on, undisturbed in its implementation.

Considering the little bit of this that we have been able to pare down for you, we respectfully encourage you to undertake a full investigation into this matter of education restructuring in the state of Washington. As you know, education takes over 50% of the entire state budget but, more importantly, education lays a foundation for all of our futures. To allow restructuring to continue without answering some of the obvious questions and concerns raised here tonight, would seem like rather careless stewardship. Do we not owe it to the citizens of this state, and our children to make sure that we know NOW if we are making a costly mistake, a mistake that costs not only in terms of dollars - but even more importantly, a mistake from which children may never recover.

Thank you for allowing us to come before you tonight - we have appreciated this opportunity afforded us by the Senate Education Committee. We thank you for your time and your attentiveness.