1¾ « ¡Ï ¡└É└É└Ø└Ù└Ù└NORMAL.STY
@ -çÐ┐ ┘ Ê└É└ NATIONAL GOVERNORS' ASSOCIATION
1999 WINTER MEETING
* * *
MONDAY PLENARY SESSION

J.W. Marriott Hotel
1331 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Grand Ballroom
Washington, D. C.

Monday, February 22, 1999
3:10 p.m.

71459.0
DAV/TPack

P R O C E E D I N G S

GOVERNOR CARPER (Presiding): Let's go ahead and get started again. Ladies and Gentlemen, please have a seat.

(Pause.)

GOVERNOR CARPER: We welcome each of you and we are just breaking up from a Governors-only luncheon that ran for some time on education issues. It was a really good off-the-record sharing between Governors from across the country.

Now, we are going to begin a plenary session, our next-to-last plenary session for this National Governors' Association meeting. This plenary session grows out of the opportunity that the members of this organization give to our chairman each year to set a theme which will underlie the efforts of the National Governors' Association throughout the year of that chairmanship.

Previously that theme has been on a number of occasions early childhood development focusing on the early years of zero to three. In consulting with a number of Governors when I was about to assume the chairmanship from George Voinovich last August, I heard from a lot of Governors that we ought to grow those kids up from zero to three; grow them up and put them in school and focus more on the years from kindergarten to grade 12; to figure out what is working in our schools; to raise student achievement so that when kids walk out of our schools and graduate at the end of the 12th grade, they are better to read, write, think, do math, have computer skills and go on to be successful in school or in work or in both.

One of the hard things for me as your chairman is try to narrow that focus a little bit more from such a broad spectrum of raising student achievement. What we decided to do was focus on three areas. The first of those is: How are we raising student achievement across our country? What are some of the best practices using education technology? Where is it really being harnessed effectively to push students and help them to do markedly better?

The second: Where are we requiring accountability? Where is it showing great results in raising student achievement?

The third: Where are schools, school districts, and States doing an especially good job of providing additional learning time, extra learning time to enable kids to reach the higher standards that we are setting in States all over America?

Today from those earlier discussions and that earlier setting of a theme, we have since that time had lead Governors; we have established a Smarter Kids Task Force; we have had Governors from Alaska and Connecticut who have said they would be willing to head up a task force on accountability; we have had Governors from Tennessee and from Kentucky say they would be ready and willing to lead the charge on technology.

We spent a fair amount of our time with the President this morning for a meeting that lasted almost two hours, and from a Governors-only luncheon that we have just concluded where we just focused exclusively on education issues.

For our session this afternoon, we are inviting some of the best and brightest people from across America to share with us their ideas. Tomorrow when we meet with our Congressional leaders, my guess is that we will talk a bit more about educational issues.

Finally, over the next four or five months to come, we are going to spread out across America and we are going to be coming to a lot of the States that are represented around this table. I expect we will be in California, as well as Nashville, Tennessee; hopefully in New Jersey with regional forums to look at how this technology is doing a great job to move students along.

My hope is that Governor Bush will let us come down to Texas to learn a little bit about their accountability systems. My hope is that we will be able to do the same thing in Washington State. Similarly, maybe Governor O'Bannon will let us come up to Indiana or maybe Governor Janklow will invite us over to South Dakota to see some exciting stuff that they are doing to raise student achievement with extra learning-time opportunities for kids.

Finally, it will all culminate in the National Governors' Association meeting in St. Louis. I think it is going to be a little different from any that we have ever had before. Virtually the whole meeting will focus on what we have learned from all of those efforts. What did we learn when we reached across America and looked across America? Then we can celebrate those successes to see what we can replicate for Governors to go home with a fistful of good ideas, action items that we can go home with and ideas that we can put to work right away to help our kids and our schools.

Well, that is sort of where the idea came from, from raising student achievement, and then where we are in the process now. I would invite all of you to participate with us today. My hope is that you will have a chance to participate in at least one of our regional forums in the months ahead and then in St. Louis, when we gather in August for our annual meeting.

Today we are going to kick it off. Here is sort of the way I propose that we do it. I am going to look to the lead Governors to make a couple of comments as we lead into each of these particular areas. Our first one that we are going to focus on today is education technology.

Governor Sundquist is one of our two lead Governors and also Governor Patton. I see Governor Sundquist here. I don't see Governor Patton yet, but I think he is en route. I am just going to ask Don Sundquist from Tennessee, who will be our host next month for the first regional forum, to give us a bit of introduction. Then we are going to be hearing from one of the school representatives from a school district in New Jersey that is doing exciting things to raise student achievement using technology.

That having been said, Don, we thank you for your willingness to provide this leadership, you and Paul. We are looking forward to being in Nashville in a month or so. We are very much looking forward to hearing from Fred Carrigg.

Governor Sundquist?

GOVERNOR SUNDQUIST: Governor Carper, thank you very much. I am pleased to serve as co-chairman with my colleague, Governor Patton, for the Smart Kids Task Force on Technology in Education. Also, I want to commend you, Governor Carper, for taking the initiative in an area that is of vital interest to all of us in education.

We spent the morning virtually talking about education, most of the time at the White House. It is on everybody's mind; the President has made new proposals. So, obviously education is one of the most important things, if not the most important thing we are doing.

To give you an update on the work of the Technology in Education Task Force, Governor Patton and I are hosting a conference, Transforming Education through Technology in Nashville, Tennessee, on March 23rd and 24th. While we all have good examples in educational technology in all of our States, the key is how do we make sure that technology is available and used effectively with all of our students. So, that is going to be the main part of our focus.

We are also looking forward to showcasing some of the exciting ways that Tennessee and Kentucky are using technology in the classroom. We think our focus on financing professional development and improvement in student learning will prove to be extremely informative for all of us. So, Governor Patton and I hope that you and the teams from all of our States -- by you, I am talking about our colleagues as Governors -- will be able to join us in Tennessee.

A word about what we have done in Tennessee. We have taken a great initiative in the area of technology and education. It was two years ago when we started on the path to assure that every child in Tennessee had access to new technology through the Internet. We were the first to link all of our schools and public libraries; as of today we have reached our targeted three hours of time per child, per week with 96,000 computers fully connected to the Internet.

Tennessee was ranked by Education Week, along with Maine, as first in the nation with the percentage in schools connected to the Internet. We are also the first State to provide local school districts with filtering software that have been nominated for a Smithsonian Institution Award commending the innovation in education technology. I might add that this filtering meets the First Amendment advocates' measurements in evaluation.

At this point Tennessee is now concentrating on teacher professional development and how best to incorporate technology into our curriculum. We have developed some innovative approaches that we expect will help 15,000 or approximately 1/3 of our teachers integrate this technology into classroom learning.

So, I look forward to the continued work on this task force and working with our colleague, Governor Patton. I don't believe he is here right this minute. We can call on him later.

GOVERNOR CARPER: I'm sure we will hear from him in a few minutes. Don, we very much appreciate your leadership and that of Paul.

I have an extensive introduction for Fred Carrigg, but Fred, rather than do that, I want to read just one paragraph from what has been prepared. If Governor Whitman were here, I would ask her to introduce you as her constituent. Listen to this. It says, "The integration of new technologies into Union City, New Jersey's, schools' everyday classroom curriculum has already led to a significant rise in standardized tests scores and in attendance, plus an impressive fall in dropout rates." I will say that again, "It has lead to a significant rise in standardized tests scores and a significant rise in attendance plus, an impressive fall in dropout rates."

We are here and anxious to hear how you are doing that. With that having been said, ladies and gentlemen, let me invite you to join us in welcoming Fred Carrigg from Union City, New Jersey, please.

MR. CARRIGG: Thank you, Governor Carper. I am very happy to be here this afternoon. I am happy for this opportunity to address you.

(Slide.)

MR. CARRIGG: In the short time I have been given, I would like to touch upon three current issues with educational technology. The first of those issues will be test data and national research. But more importantly, my second issue is the matter in which educational technology is integrated into schools is absolutely critical to whether or not it is successful. Then finally my third issue is that all educational technology should be and needs to be centered around the students. That is probably the key to any success dealing with educational technology.

(Slide.)

MR. CARRIGG: The nature of the national data that is available; I know there have been very positive headlines and some very negative headlines lately. I point to this study from the Software Publishers Association in 1996. As you look at those headlines, remember that the outcome of that information is really dependent on these factors that I have up on the screen.

You need to look at the specific student population that is being studied, the design of the software that is being studied, the teacher practices that are absolutely critical. Everybody has mentioned that. The student groupings; are they isolated classes? Are the students grouped heterogeneously, homogeneously? Who's participating in that study?

The last point, which I think is a very big point, is the nature of that student's access. Is it a single computer in the back of the media center? Are there just a few computers in the computer lab or are those computers available throughout the school building? What type of computers are they?

Those are the critical issues as to whether or not technology is integrated with success. What I mean by success is that it makes a change in student achievement.

(Slide.)

MR. CARRIGG: One of my favorite studies to look at was done in 1996 by the National Study Tour of the Center for Children and Technology. This study began with 14 districts that had implemented educational technology to an extensive degree at district level. Then they narrowed it to four that they considered to be quite successful, Union City being one of them; another district from Kentucky and from California.

This is what they found at a district level. For those districts that were successful there was clear leadership from the district level, usually the superintendent. There was a clear purpose in the integration of that technology that was universally understood in the district. It wasn't in a single pilot project in one school, but a universal purpose to the integration of that technology.

Each of the successful districts began small with a pilot program that they replicated to a larger extent throughout the district and left room for experimentation and growth. Each of the successful districts had a clear design for infrastructure. By infrastructure I mean two infrastructures, technological infrastructure and the human infrastructure to support that technology.

Professional development; there's a clear, long-term plan for professional development, not focusing just on the new teachers, but in most districts -- certainly my district -- the core of the staff is an

aging teacher population, over 40. Those teachers need to be retrained and re-tooled and not left out.

You have to have clear community support that includes business partnerships. I am going to mention our business partner who has been absolutely key to our success.

Software selection cannot be a new program, an add-on. It has to be something that is clearly enhancing the curriculum goals of that district so that every teacher immediately sees the purpose and need for using that software.

Finally, there must be adequate financing for the technology infrastructure. With just those two brief comments --

(Slide.)

MR. CARRIGG: -- I really want to turn my attention to Union City, my district. That is what I know most about and that is what I would like to share with you for a couple of minutes. I am going to assume that most of you do not know about Union City. So, I intend to spend ten seconds on it.

We have 60,000 people in 1.4 square miles, making us the most urban district in the United States. We have 10,000 students in that 1 square mile in 11 buildings. My community is 93 percent Latino; 95 percent minority. 80 percent of our students are poor. In spite of all those conditions, we have had amazing turnaround since 1989 when we were on the verge of a State takeover. Since then we have received State certification, a real rarity, an oddity for a city district.

Test scores have gone way up. As Governor Carper mentioned, dropout rates are down, our high schools have moved up, and our students are doing very well. But that is part of a major systemic reform taking place in my district. I will be the first to say it is not technology alone.

(Slide.)

MR. CARRIGG: It is part of an overall reform effort. These are the key ingredients that exist in my school district which I believe have created a technology-friendly atmosphere. They are: We have had major organizational changes in curriculum and methodology. You will not find the traditional classroom in Union City where the teacher stands at the chalkboard and students are arranged in rows of isolated desks looking forward toward that teacher.

My district has undergone the adoption of cooperative and collaborative learning. That began three years before the integration of technology into my district. Our time has completely changed. We no longer have the isolated single periods of 40 minutes. Rather, we have large blocks of time. At the elementary level that consists of a whole morning being dedicated to literacy and to social sciences in a single block of time.

At the high school we have 80-minute periods that are wheeled. For example, English and United States history are wheeled. English and United States history form a 120-minute block of time. Time is critical for the intelligent use of technology. Teachers cannot in 40 minutes utilize technology to serve the purposes that it is available for.

Staff development: A systematic plan of staff development that is long-term; our staff development plan goes over four years using teachers. Sustained growth in technology in that classroom is individualized around that teacher. We have multiple opportunities in

the summer before school, after school, during holidays for teachers to attend those sessions.

(Slide.)

MR. CARRIGG: Finances and business and community partners go together for me. We have been very, very blessed that our start-up costs for Project Explore were supported by Bell Atlantic. That was critical to our getting started. Since then, Union City Online has been supported by the National Science Foundation Funds which paid for the wiring of our high schools. Since then, we have taken over our own funding, but especially through State Distance Learning Allocation and State equalization aid by which we are now paying for the final wiring of the rest of our schools.

Also, the human infrastructure, which we have referred to as Professional Development. Finally we have a significant educational partner in the Center for Children and Technology who has been assisting us. So, our partners are both business partners and educational partners.

(Slide.)

MR. CARRIGG: I truly believe that a picture is worth a thousand words. What you see right now is an English-2 class at Emerson High School. This is what the classrooms do look like in Union City. At the elementary level, it is almost 100 percent. At the high school level, it is probably around 60 percent.

What you see here is a classroom library for English-2 class with hundreds of books in it. Technology is not anti-print. In fact, technology brings print to make it even more available. Here is the computer center against another wall and then students working in groups. It happens to be a book circle. We call it a "talk circle" discussing literature.

This is a classroom that is not atypical. Teachers are facilitators. That front of the room is gone. Students are working in groups to accomplish mutual purposes.

(Slide.)

MR. CARRIGG: That brings me to the student. Technology must first and foremost be about the students. It must be meaningful in assisting them to accomplish their goals. It must be totally integrated and supported across the curriculum and not isolated in computer labs, but present in the port-of-entry bilingual class; the special-needs class in the English curriculum; in the language curriculum, world languages.

Everyone must have the technology available to them so that it becomes a whole school and a whole district tool to accomplish goals. Those products that students produce must be meaningful for academic achievement. If a student is going to build a power-point presentation on Othello, not only must the computer-application teacher value that for having used a multi-media tool, but the English teacher must recognize it as a valuable way of demonstrating knowledge of English literature. That is what is taking place in my district.

(Slide.)

MR. CARRIGG: Finally, I have two examples of that. These are student products. This is the web site for the Road to College developed by a senior, Jonathan Moore at Emerson High School. He has been working on it for a year. During that year, he has received credit in computer applications for his School-to-Career Program. When he works on it during the extended-day program, he is paid for it.

It is a meaningful product because students in Union City need this; they can go to this site, find out more information about colleges, PSAT and SAT dates, how to build a resume, what courses they need to get into the various colleges, et cetera.

(Slide.)

MR. CARRIGG: And the Second City is our Youth Career Development Initiative site, developed by another senior at Emerson High School, Carlos Cruz. These are not exceptions; this is typical. There are over 160 products in my district right now. This site deals with all of our school-to-work and school-to-career opportunities.

It has connections to 26 other sites so that a student can choose, view or preview, if you will, the different opportunities. "Shall I go the traditional path of cooperative business education. Maybe I want to be a summer scholar. What are these programs about?"

So, it is another meaningful site available to the students in Union City.

(Slide.)

MR. CARRIGG: Finally, my wrap-up. I hope I have achieved in the last five minutes three issues for you. The national research is mixed at best. It is not all good; it is not all bad. We really need to take a closer look, and we certainly need much more research on good programs for the implementation of educational technology. I wholeheartedly believe that that success is dependent on systemic reform within the school systems. If you attempt to just dump or to add on educational technology, I don't see any reason to expect that there will be changes in student outcomes.

Finally, that technology must be integrated and everywhere. More importantly, it must be about the students that are going to use it, because it is their future tool that is going to provide an avenue for them to succeed.

Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

GOVERNOR LEAVITT (Presiding): Thank you, Mr. Carrigg. We are appreciative of your being here. Governor Carper has asked that I conduct some questions and answers of you. Would you submit yourself to those?

MR. CARRIGG: Surely.

GOVERNOR LEAVITT: Let me begin by just asking you to expound on something on the level of training that you have provided to your faculty and staff and the degree to which you have found that necessary to implement your strategy. Then I want to invite my colleagues to ask you some questions.

MR. CARRIGG: I'd be very happy to. It really emerged over the last seven years. Initially we began by providing informational workshops, hands-on workshops in applications and tools. We very quickly became aware that that was totally insufficient. Teachers could learn how to use Power Point or word processing applications, but then using it in the classroom would be very different.

What developed from that was a second series of workshops that we called interdisciplinary technology workshops where teachers, after beginning instruction, were taught to use those tools to build applications within the curriculum, to build collaborative projects. Our district is very much sold on interdisciplinary, collaborative projects.

That simply means that biology works with English or biology works with math at the same level.

So, we used workshops to provide teachers the opportunity to build together applications, tools, Power Point, HTML that were readily useable in their classes. That resulted in another series of workshops which we called Advanced HTML Workshops. The bottom line is that we have a series that goes on, and once you enter, there are multiple opportunities.

Those programs take place many different times during the year. Some schools hold them on weekends where the faculty tell us that is the best time for them. Other schools do it over the summer; some do it during the extended day. It is a very, very open program centered around the individual teachers in those schools. We have found the best teachers to be our students working with those teachers on the application tools.

GOVERNOR LEAVITT: Thank you.

Are there other questions from the Governors? Yes, Governor Taft?

GOVERNOR TAFT: Mr. Carrigg, to what extent are you using technology to improve the reading and literacy skills of students in the early elementary years?

MR. CARRIGG: That is one of our primary goals. The initial reforms in Union City were all based on literacy. We realized with a Latino community that 75 percent LEP, limited-English proficient, that literacy had to be our highest priority. We simply were not getting enough of that in the '80s.

How technology has emerged is that we have put three to four computers in every kindergarten through third grade classroom in Union City. We have networked children's literature and it is available through every computer in every classroom. Students have individualized learning programs using that children's literature which is in total support of our existing curriculum.

It has been a tremendous boost. I can quite proudly say that our kindergarten through third grade scores are all above State and national norms.

GOVERNOR TAFT: How much time might a student in those years spend at the computer? Do you have any idea?

MR. CARRIGG: It is a tremendous amount. As I said before, 120 minutes is dedicated to literacy in Union City. We call it the under-interrupted block of time. Teachers are guaranteed that no one is pulled during that 120 minutes. Support service comes in to work with the teacher. So, it is commonplace in Union City for half of that time, about 60 minutes of the 120, that there are two teachers present in the room.

It is completely cooperative-learning based so that there are different groups working on different projects. Therefore, the computer learning center, which is one of five or six centers in an elementary class in Union City, is always utilized. My guess would be that a typical student would spend up to at least an hour a day, probably two hours a day using technology in some form.

GOVERNOR CARPER (Presiding): Any others have questions on technology? I know I have several for you, myself, but I would ask you to hold those until the end, until after all of our three presenters have had a chance to present. Then we will come back to those questions.

We have now been joined by Kentucky Governor Paul Patton who is the partner, not in crime, but in education technology with Governor

Sundquist. I would ask Paul to take a minute to make some opening statements. Then we will head on to accountability.

Governor Patton?

GOVERNOR PATTON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I do apologize for my tardiness.

Wherever we go these days to attend any meeting or conference related to education, one thing we can count on is that technology will be a major topic of discussion. As Mr. Carrigg said, just having technology won't guarantee you that it will be used effectively. But not having it will guarantee you that it will not be used at all.

So, investing heavily in technology is very, very important not just for the operation of our State governments, but also in our educational processes. Too often government does tend to measure progress or success towards addressing the problem by the number of dollars that it has spent. That is one important criterion.

In Kentucky we have made a substantial financial commitment to educational technology in grades K through 12. Since passage of the Kentucky Education Reform Act in 1990, we have allocated some $621 million for technology in our elementary and secondary school classrooms. We have invested in accordance with a Statewide technology plan, and we believe that we are investing wisely. Kentucky's goal is to have one high-performance-networked computer for each six students. At the present time we are at a ratio of 1-to-8.8 students with funding available in the current budget with positions to reach the desired 1-to-6 ratio by July of 2000. Also among our goals is one high-performance-networked computer available for each of Kentucky's 44,600 teachers. We are presently at a 1-to-1.9 ratio, again with adequate funding available to reach the desired goal of 1-to-1 by July of the year 2000.

Today 73 percent of our schools are fully wired for voice, video and data. We have 63 percent of our 37,800 individual classrooms that are fully wired with access to the Internet as well as e-mail. Again, sufficient dollars are available in the current budget to allow us to reach our goal of 100 percent by July of 2000.

We know, however, that just spending money alone for software, hardware and infrastructure is not enough. As our States direct more and more of our education dollars towards improving technology, we owe it to our constituency to find answers to some very important questions.

First, are today's teachers that are currently in the classrooms adequately trained with the knowledge and skills that they need to effectively use technology to improve learning? If not, how can we best address this critical issue? Just as important, is today's teacher-training curriculum preparing our new, incoming teachers to utilize technology for improved student learning to its fullest extent.

Do our current licensing and certification agencies require new teachers to demonstrate a standard of proficiency in educational technology? Finally, does technology actually improve student learning? If the answer is yes, do we have sufficient evidence to demonstrate to policy-makers and the public that the proper application of educational technology does, in fact, improve student learning?

It is my hope that Governor Carper's Smart Kids Task Force Technologies Work Group will have us answer these and other important questions about the use of technology in the classroom. I also hope the group's final report will give some direction to us Governors and policy-makers as to what steps we must take to establish performance standards

in technology for teachers. What should they know and what should they be able to do with this knowledge?

As Governors and policy-makers, we must be able to demonstrate to the public convincingly that the hundreds of millions of dollars that we are investing in technology will be wisely invested and utilized to their fullest potential extent to improve student learning. The goal is not technology in and of itself; the goal is improved student learning.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

GOVERNOR CARPER: Thank you very much, Paul. We are about to get to Tony Knowles and to Governor John Roland to focus a little bit on accountability.

Before doing that, let me just share something with all of you. This is the kind of thing that we need help in Delaware and maybe it will resonate with the rest of you too. We have taken a lot of money -- and I think Don Sundquist was mentioning how they have invested in their schools to provide Internet access from literally every public school. We have it for every public classroom now in Delaware. We have had the wiring done.

The thing that is still ahead of us and the struggle we face is that, once we have the wiring done and have the ability to plug in the computer in every classroom, how do you make sure that you have a computer and maybe the right computer? How do you make sure that you have the teacher that knows how to use this stuff, who is comfortable with taking that technology and incorporating it into lesson plans and really making the learning come alive?

Finally, how do you keep the computer working during the course of the day so that you do not have technology that is, itself, going down and with teacher whose lesson plans depend on having access to the Internet or access to the technology and the technology simply is not working?

We have got one school district in our State that is doing a great job in that regard. It is a little school district in the southern part of our State called Milford where they have learned how to put a computer on every teacher's desk. They have bought them a new computer, a good computer with the expectation that maybe you will put it on your desk and provide good training. The teacher will learn how to use it, get more comfortable in using it and its workings.

They have bought good computers that do not break down a whole lot. They have also bought service contracts, so that when they do go down, they have folks that come in -- not employees within the school districts, themselves, but folks who are on contract with the school district and who will come in literally at a moment's notice and fix the computer and get them back up and running, the entire school system back up and running.

That is just one example of what we have up and running in a little school district which seems to have sort of figured it out on this front. There are a number of others in our State that have not. My guess is there are number of other school districts around the country who have not. Just like we can learn from that little school district in southern Delaware, I guess we could learn a lot from what you are doing in Kentucky, Paul; and Don, what you are doing in Tennessee; as well as what Fred is doing in Union City.

That having been said, we are going to go to our two lead Governors on accountability. Then we are going to be introducing -- I think the

Governor of Illinois might be introducing our next keynoter here who is doing some great things, I am told, in the Chicago School District.

Let me go again to our lead Democratic Governor on accountability, the gentleman from Alaska, Governor Tony Knowles.

Tony?

GOVERNOR KNOWLES: Thank you, Governor Carper and fellow Governors. That was a great report, Governor Patton and Governor Sundquist on technology. Technology is exciting; it is universally applauded as a great way for some benefits for students. Meanwhile, accountability is in the trenches. I am very pleased to join with Governor Roland to be co-chairs of accountability in schools.

I thank you, Governor Carper, for letting me serve on your Smarter Kids Task Force. I enthusiastically join my colleagues, many of which have not only led their States, but have led the nation in what is America's number one agenda which is raising student achievement. Governor Roland will speak after me. We will show some of the, I believe, courageous and difficult decisions that he has had to make as he has faced accountability and some issues in Connecticut.

I would like to address a couple of points in general on accountability with some of the progress made. There is no subject, I believe, that is more essential to addressing America's agenda of increasing student achievement than accountability. There is also no subject that is probably more controversial. Accountability is really two parts. First it is a measurement of achievement and secondly it is actions taken in response to that measurement and that is consequences.

Accountability, I believe, boils down to the assumption of responsibility beginning, of course, with the student, then broadening to the teacher, parents, the principal, the community, business leadership, the State and then also in partnership with the Federal government. There has been an extraordinary amount of activity since the last national summit on accountability.

Today some 48 States test their students; 36 States publish annual school-based report cards; 19 States rate the performance of all schools or identify low-performing schools; 6 States have recently passed legislation on that. Today 16 States have the power to close, take over or overhaul chronically failing schools. Also, 14 States provide monetary rewards for individual schools based on performance; 19 States have an exit exam.

There are four statutory parameters to accountability. Standards in assessment is number one. Number two is school-based public reporting. Number three is sanctions for low-performing schools and providing resources to remedy that. Finally, three is financial improvements for distinguished or improving schools.

Alaska's challenge in meeting accountability, I think, is made perhaps most clear by understanding that we have to meet that responsibility by delivering a relative education to 130,000 public school students in cities and in more that 150 tiny villages, some or most of them accessible only by bush airplane where Yupik or Athabascan Indian or Aleut is the primary language. It's a State that is 1,400 miles long and 2,300 miles wide.

We approached our accountability with a number of principles. The first, obviously, is recognizing independent school districts and also demanding individual school accountability. We also emphasize choice in the public schools and we recognize that no child can fail. We know the

consequences; it is no mystery that the average education level in our Department of Corrections institutions is 7th grade. Whereas the ability to compete for tomorrow's jobs requires at least a 14-year education.

We acknowledge that education is a lifetime experience, and we have a responsibility to make sure that kids are ready to learn when they go to school. The quality-school initiative that was passed last year in Alaska was built on three principles, three goals. First is that each student must meet or exceed standards in reading, writing, and math. Secondly, the measurement of these standards would be at the 3rd-grade level in reading, the 6th-grade level in creative writing, and the 8th-grade level in algebra. Then this is completed with an exit exam.

Finally, low-performing schools are required to improve. Schools are labeled primarily based on test scores into the areas of distinguished, successful, deficient, or in-crisis. Those that are labeled either deficient or in-crisis are met with a ramp-up of consequences going from having distinguished educators assist the local school all the way up to eventual reconstitution of the school itself with a takeover by the State.

Perhaps just a little bit in summary, while there has been a lot of activity, there have also been a lot of questions that remain in terms of where we go with accountability. Certainly testing is one; it is noted that on some of the tests that all of the students have been tested above average, somewhat similar to Garrison Keillor's geography where all the students are above average.

What kind of accountability is this that raises that question? Also, do we have tests that just merely measure or are they, in and of themselves, a learning experience? Does the universality of the tests apply to different student groups? Do they reflect sensitivity to cultural differences and others? How do we set the bar for public reporting on report cards and how do we involve the parents in a meaningful way?

Low-performing schools clearly are an as-yet undefined challenge to accountability systems. Student accountability, teacher accountability and reward systems are all, I think, some fascinating subjects that we will be hopefully addressing in the regional conferences which will be coming up soon. There are a lot of answers needed, but that should not discourage those who are excited with the progress that has been made.

Irish poet, William Butler Yeats had one of my favorite quotes on education. He said that education was not the filling of a pail, but the lighting of a fire. As we all know, the fire for education has been lit in America. With our continued support and work, we will light the way into the next century.

Thank you very much.

GOVERNOR CARPER: Governor Knowles, thank you so much and thank you for your willingness to provide leadership on this subject along with our other Governor who will be on the floor for the next few minutes, Governor Roland.

GOVERNOR ROLAND: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you, my colleague from Alaska.

I will begin with a quote as well. My favorite quote is FDR's. He said, "We can't always build a future for our youth, but we can build our youth for the future." I think that is what all of us as Governors are trying to do.

Mr. Chairman, I want to applaud you for taking the resources of the National Governors' Association and all of our energies and focusing them almost in a laser-like way on accountability and standards and trying to do things a little bit smarter and a little bit better, while at the same time trying to stay within all of our budgets and to work with the Federal government as well.

First I would recommend to all of our colleagues many of the reports that have been put out by the task force, "Preparing Kids for Success" and "The Smart-Kids Future" brochures.

Governor Knowles and I have responsibility for the accountability portion. It gets into everything from teacher accountability to creating rewards and creating punishments in some cases for bad performance. We also have accountability policies, as we are looking at all 50 States and Territories, getting into report cards, ratings, rewards, assistance and sanctions. I would commend you to take a look at that.

I think, Mr. Chairman, you have said it in so many ways throughout the weekend, that our first goal should be raising expectations; raising expectations not only for our students, but for our teachers and for the entire system as well.

There has also been a lot of talk about Federal controls and State controls. When we talk about accountability, I think that there is an assumption that you have to give up local control. I think many of us have served on local school boards, and many of us have been involved in local government and there is a kind of mantra there that you never give up local control of the education system.

So, how can you have accountability and still allow for local control and perhaps even to enhance that? We have had some unique problems in Connecticut and, in particular, in my capital city of Hartford. It has been well publicized over the year, I might add, where we have had such a troubled school system that they tried to privatize the administration of the school system which turned out to be an absolute disaster.

Tremendous frustration was mounting. We had one high school that was about to lose accreditation and is still on the watch list for losing accreditation by the board. Believe it or not, in that process basically the local school board gave up and the State literally stepped in. I had to appoint a board of trustees to oversee the local school system and actually administer the programs on a daily basis. That is not something I enjoyed doing. Quite frankly that flew in the face of our empowerment policies that so many of us had adhered to.

One of the things we did in that process of having the board of trustees taking over the school system, we, in essence, reconstituted in some part that relationship. One of the things I would propose -- and these are some dramatic ideas and, I think issues that none of us will ever have to address as we did in Hartford -- but I think we need to consider avoiding that happening and giving the local control to the board of education. Indeed, if they have problems, if they have a chronically failing school in their school district, in their city or town, the local school board should have the right to reconstitute that chronically failing school.

I guess what that means is that we actually give the power to the school board to close down the school, to close down a portion, to bring in new staff, to bring in new administrators or basically whatever it

takes to get the job done. I believe that is an accountability tool that we can give to the local educators and the local decision-makers.

Another issue, again somewhat controversial, is that many of our school boards are saddled by tremendous pressure brought on by teacher contract negotiations. We all live through those. The arbitrators' decisions sometimes break the bank, and they are constantly putting students' needs against teachers' needs. I have tried to implement language in those contracts that basically says in one simple phrase that any arbitrated decision must take into consideration the best interest of the children, keeping focus on the students and keeping focus on the children at all times.

Many of us have adopted and built new charter schools, magnate schools in our States. We are moving ahead in Connecticut with the proposal to basically create charter-school districts. So, rather than just building a new charter school, we are turning to at least two school districts and basically saying to them, "You are going to be charter-school districts. You are going to be laboratories for experimentation.

"We are going to allow you to start new programs that fall outside the traditional guidelines. We are going to let you get rid of some of the mandates. We will allow you to work around State and Federal mandates whenever possible."

We are, in essence, empowering those school districts to try new and different things. They will then be accountable for the results. I think that is dramatic, because when you have an existing system, it really stirs it up versus creating a stand-alone charter school where expectations are slightly different.

Throughout the last few days we have heard a lot of discussion, both informally and formally, about ending social promotion, mastering tests and all other kinds of tests that we use in our States' school report cards which can be used by our local boards of education and our State boards of education. We have heard about the need for what I like to call lifelong learning, which I think is our long-term goal. Earlier we talked about falling back on the importance of making sure that all of our students are ready to work computers and to be computer-literate.

I will end with one statistic that really got my attention last year. I found that we had approximately 27,000 students that graduated from high school in Connecticut last year, which I thought was an interesting number. The number that really caught my attention was that during that same year, 42,000 young people started first grade. So, 27,000 high schoolers graduated; 42,000 first-graders began school.

The point is there is a wave coming our way. As Governors and as people concerned with the quality of education for our young people, the pressure on all of us is going to be extraordinary. The size of classes, accountability, testing, reading at an early age; these are all the things we have been focusing on during this entire year in the National Governors' Association.

Mr. Chairman, again I thank you. I look forward to continuing this work and to our next meeting. I appreciate your continued support.

GOVERNOR CARPER: John, I appreciate your willingness to serve as a leader along with Governor Knowles of Alaska. We are just grateful to you.

Let me come back to Governor Ryan, the Governor from Illinois. I will ask him to introduce our next presenter.

GOVERNOR RYAN: Thank you very much, Governor Carper.

Thank you also, Governors Knowles and Roland for the excellent presentation on accountability. I don't know of anyplace in the United States today where accountability has made the difference that it has made in the Chicago School System. One of our guest speakers today is the chief executive officer there.

Back in 1995, the Illinois General Assembly changed the law to restructure the Chicago School System to make it more accountable, basically to the mayor and to his appointees. The mayor wasted no time, Mayor Daley, in appointing two very qualified people. One was a fellow by the name of Gary Chico who was the president. Our guest speaker on accountability today, Mr. Paul Vallas, is the chief executive officer of the Chicago School System.

Paul is a man who knows what he has to do and is willing to do what it takes to get it done. He has a great reputation in Illinois and, I believe, across the country today. It is the only reason that the Chicago Public School System can brag about the successes it has seen in recent years. I might add that President Clinton during his State of the Union message pointed out the successes of the Chicago School System. A lot of that can be laid at the doorstep of Mr. Paul Vallas.

Paul oversees more than 550 public schools and more than 400,000 students and has a budget of $2 billion-plus annually. He is part of a team with the mayor and the school board president. Previously Paul had the honor of being the City of Chicago's budget director and the director of revenue for five years. You can see that he brought a great deal of experience to the job. However, now that he is able to work with children and with some parents who really care, I think he likes this job a lot better than the one he had before.

Paul also has the honor of being born in Chicago. He earned his bachelor's degree and his master's degree from Western Illinois University and taught at elementary school, high school and college levels. He still loves education as is indicated by the job that he does. He was also the executive director of the Illinois Economic and Fiscal Commission and has been an officer in the Illinois Army National Guard which, of course, really explains his training for working in the City of Chicago.

(Laughter.)

GOVERNOR RYAN: With all of that he learned the most valuable lesson, I think, of all and that is that you must spend time with your family. Let me tell you that we are all very proud of the job that Paul Vallas has done in the Chicago School System and for the reputation and goodwill that he has brought to the State of Illinois.

Mr. Paul Vallas.

MR. VALLAS: Thank you very much.

Obviously I am sitting next to the technology expert here and I did not know where to press the button.

(Laughter.)

MR. VALLAS: What I would like to do very quickly is talk about accountability, but I really want to put it into perspective because we are successful in Chicago because we are demanding accountability, but we are not just doing it in a vacuum.

First of all, let me give you a few more details about the system. There are over 550 schools, actually 430,000 with 84 percent of the children living below the poverty level. 90 percent of the system's school children are minority. The school system has been beset with

crises really for the last 20 years prior to the mayor taking responsibility.

It has certainly been well publicized. William Bennett rolled through town one day 13 years ago and characterized the system as the worst in the nation. Obviously that was an over-generalization, but clearly the system had some serious problems.

In 1995 the mayor was given responsibility for the schools. In a period of a little over three years, we have seen three years of rising test scores on every single standardized test, State tests, ACT, national standardized tests. Attendance is up, truancy has been cut in half, graduation rates are at their second-highest level in 15 years, the dropout rate is down. By all indicators the system is improving.

After 20 years of declining enrollment that saw the school system go from 584,000 students to 404,000 students, in the last three years the system has picked up 26,000 new students. So, the old adage, people vote with their feet. Clearly a lot of things have happened since the mayor took responsibility.

Well, what are the major reasons why this transformation has taken place? I am not going to suggest for a second that we are out of the woods. When we came in, a little over 20 percent of our children system-wide were reading and computing at the national averages. We are now approaching 40 percent. That means we still have 60 percent of our children who are reading and computing below national averages. On any national or State standard that is unacceptable. So, we have a long way to go, but clearly dramatic progress has been made.

After nine years of labor unrest, we just completed the negotiations on our second four-year contract a year early. We have gone from not having repaired a building in 20 years to $2 billion in school construction repair. So, clearly something magical happened when the mayor was given responsibility.

If I can articulate the reasons why changes are being made, you will see it is not magic at all. It is just basically common sense. There are really six basic reasons why the system is being transformed. Each of these reasons to a certain extent falls into the category of accountability.

Let's look at reason number one. First of all the mayor was given responsibility. In other words, political responsibility for the schools lay on the doorstep of the political leader in the City of Chicago. He had to appoint the board and he had to appoint me, obviously, as CEO. So, you no longer had the divide-and-conquer game of the superintendent being circumvented with special interests going to the board or maybe the board being circumvented by certain individuals and special interests going to the mayor.

We call it the holy trinity in Chicago. It is the mayor, it is Chico, the board president, and Vallas. Basically there is unity of vision, there is unity of approach, there is always a focus and a plan. Special interest groups cannot play the divide-and-conquer game with the school leadership.

By giving the mayor responsibility, this man has now made education his number one priority. So, every single agency, every community-development block grant that is handed out, everything that is done from the city standpoint is done with the impact on the educational system in the back of the mayor's mind.

So, as a result there is greater unity than there has ever been. We have gone from 100 schools with corporate sponsors to 400 schools with corporate sponsors; from three citywide corporate-funded school events to over 200. The amount of support that we are getting is critical. But that is because political responsibility was laid on the doorstep. Someone had to take responsibility for the schools. Ultimately the mayor of the City of Chicago got this responsibility.

Second the legislature gave the mayor complete control over his resources. If you are going to make someone accountable you have got to give him the power to make decisions. Let me point out that while we have gotten praise in a lot of circles, it was the Republican legislature that empowered the mayor of the City of Chicago to basically take responsibility for his schools. Governor Ryan, who at the time was Secretary of State Ryan, was one of the big supporters of that initiative.

Let me point out that when we talk about controlling resources, all of our money, our 27 categorical block grants were given to the school system in two grants, not just special education grants. All of our tax levies were consolidated into one. The mayor and the board were given authority over work rules. No longer did the State legislature dictate work rules. Things such as class size, things like privatization, things like work rules in the classroom were no longer things that the school system could bargain away in the collective-bargaining process.

So, complete discretion and complete control were given. Incidentally, that freeing up of the resources, the consolidating of our resources -- the legislature did not cut us. A lot of time the Federal government plays the bait-and-switch game. They are going to consolidate and block-grant your money, but they are going to cut 10 percent off the top arguing that you can spend it more efficiently and you can make up for it.

The legislature never cut us. They continued to give us increases, but they gave us the flexibility of our resources over our work rules. So, clearly we have the ability to prioritize how our money would be spent to pay for new collective-bargaining agreements. For the first time in 20 years, we began a major, massive school renovation project.

The third reason has been standards of accountability. The entire system is now in uniform, high-academic standards. Teachers know what they should be teaching; students know what they should be learning. The standards-based assessment system that we have set up in our schools is driving, is ensuring that the curriculum is content-based. The curriculum is really a subject-based curriculum, because in the past you could not figure out what was being done in the 591 schools that exists in the City of Chicago.

So, the entire system is on standards and these standards are not dummied-down standards. These are national and international standards. They are standards that are as competitive with any standards of any school system in the country. So, the objective here was that just through the act of raising standards and raising expectations, children are going to rise to the challenge.

The fourth thing was to set up a system of accountability that was comprehensive. For example, administrators do not have contracts. I do not have a contract. If I screw up, I am gone; I am history; no golden parachute, no buyout. None of my administrators, none of my education

team members have a contract. Everybody is hired and their longevity and their jobs are dependent on performance.

Likewise with principals; principals don't have tenure. If principals don't perform, principals can be removed as heads of our schools. They are almost like mini-CEO's in their own right. So, there is no principal tenure in our system. We still have teacher tenure in the City of Chicago, but the process of removing teachers or ineffective teachers has certainly been streamlined.

The bottom line is no one is guaranteed anything. In our system, for example, when jobs are eliminated at one school, when positions are closed, teachers do not bounce teachers in other schools. Seniority may exist within the school, but seniority does not exist among schools. Teachers are guaranteed the right to look for a job in our system if they are laid off from one school, but they are not guaranteed a right to that job in that system. So, there is accountability system-wide.

In addition, there is also accountability for the students. All of our students know that the failure to show up at school consistently will mean expulsion to an alternative school. We expel students for non-attendance.

We also expel students for any sort of dangerous behavior. Our zero-tolerance policy is not limited to activities on school time. It is 24 hours zero-tolerance. If you are in possession of a dangerous weapon or you are arrested for serious drug offenses on a Saturday, you can be expelled from that school on Monday. So, the bottom line is every student know that they are expected to come to school and they are expected to behave and be a participant.

If children are struggling academically, we will support them and we will never give up on them. But if they are not going to attend school and they are not going to behave themselves in school, then basically we will put them in alternative schools. We expel no one to the street; we have 22 alternative schools for dropouts. We have 7 alternative schools for disruptive students. They are all private schools that we contract out with.

So, accountability is comprehensive, but we don't just talk about accountability. It is not all about just raising standards and raising expectations. It is not all just pass or fail; it is not just our holding everybody responsible, because our students also know from an academic standpoint that if they are struggling academically, we will provide them with additional academic help to get them through. But ultimately academic failure will result in students being retained.

There has been a lot of controversy over social promotion. Some people have said that if you retain students, you are going to encourage students to drop out. Let me give you a snapshot of 8th-grade graduates in the City of Chicago four years ago. 30,000 graduates graduated in 1994 before the mayor took responsibility for the schools. 9,700 were reading at the 6th-grade reading level or below. 1,100 of those 9,700 were reading at the 4th-grade level or below. The average reading level, the average reading score among our 8th grade graduating class for that year was barely 7th grade.

How many of those kids are on the street right now? How many of those kids who happened to be socially promoted through high school did, in fact, not get into a city college or did, in fact, find themselves on the streets anyway; they could not even survive in the community college? Four years ago 96 percent of our graduates had to take remedial reading

and remedial math in city colleges. So, socially promoting kids is just giving them phony diplomas.

Visualize the impact of social promotion on children in the classroom who are at or above grade level. You have a child in the classroom. Picture a teacher who has 1/3 of his or her kids two years below grade level or one year below grade level; maybe 1/3 are three years below grade level. What do you do? You dummy down the standards; you dummy down the curriculum.

The net effect is the kids who are behind never get caught up, and the kids who are at grade level or above are adversely impacted. So, if you are a parent and you have the financial wherewithal, they are out of here; send them to suburban schools, parochial schools, private schools. So, what you have is you have an academic segregation and an economic segregation that exists within the city. As the smart kids, whose parents have the means, exit the system, the school system is then left with the rest.

So, social promotion has been a cancer that has undermined the quality of education across America. However, let me just say this; while we demand accountability, while we had ended social promotion, while we don't give principals tenured contracts, while there is tough accountability on teachers, I will tell you something. We close schools that are not performing. Two years ago we closed seven high schools, laid off everybody in those schools, and then started them up as brand-new schools.

We basically re-staffed the entire school and started from the beginning. We did this for two reasons. The schools were academically failing and we wanted to make a point that academic failure would not be tolerated. All those new schools incidentally have shown improvement since the reconstitution.

We just do not demand accountability; we just do not demand that children perform to higher standards without the realization that 84 percent of our kids live below the poverty level; that we have 90 percent of the State's special education children and 70 percent of the State's DCFS children and 80 percent of the State's bilingual education children who obviously have critical language-support needs. We have, therefore, also instituted a system of comprehensive support designed to ensure that our children can reach the higher standards.

Let me just summarize very quickly. Our system of comprehensive intervention and support begins at the age of zero. In our high schools we have a program that identifies every single pregnant teen. Those pregnant teens are put into a special parent-advocacy program where they work with nurses, counselors, and parent advocates who are, in other words, mothers from the school system.

The objective is to keep the pregnant teens in school to teach them prenatal care and postnatal care. What happens is that our children who become pregnant, typically 80- to 90 percent of them drop out. Within three years they have had two babies. Within five years they have had three babies, and they do not go to the parochial or private schools. They come to the public schools.

So, the bottom line is that we had better intercept the next generation. Last year we had 1,100 pregnant teens; no drop outs, one underweight baby, no repeat pregnancies. Of those, 228 graduated and they are in college. The bottom line here is we begin early.

We also have 400 of our elementary schools with State pre-K programs. In other words, pre-school for three-year-olds and four-year-olds. We have an army of 700 parent advocates that go into the homes and identify parents who are at home who have dropped out of school and are raising their children at home by themselves. These advocates teach them pre-schooling. So, there is a massive, massive up-front investment in early childhood education.

Let me point out that everyone of our State pre-K programs for three- and four-year-olds has at least a half hour to an hour of instruction and half of that instruction is computer-based instruction for those three- and four-year-olds.

During the school day, any child who is identified as academically at risk is put into an extended-day program. On any given day, 200,000 children who are at risk or children who have been retained, go to school for an additional two hours a day.

We also feed almost 180,000 children three meals a day in our school system. We call it the Lighthouse Program. 346 schools have this program; 174,000 kids have this program. When I started this program two years ago, 86 percent of those schools showed an improvement in academic performance. You cannot go to a poor neighborhood in the City of Chicago and not find the overwhelming majority, if not all of their schools, have shown improvement in the past few years.

You have all heard of the controversies in the past years. Many of you remember Dantrell Davis and the Cabrini Green, the Chicago Housing Authority. There is not a single school in the Cabrini Green community that is on probation or anywhere near probation, because they have had a doubling and tripling of their reading and math scores just in the past three years alone.

Finally, extended school year: Any student who is not meeting minimum promotion standards is put into mandatory summer school. For 180,000 of our children there school year is not 180 days; their school year is 220 to 230 days. So, there is comprehensive support for these children. There is early intervention, there is the extended school day, and there is the extended school year.

For schools that are struggling, that are not academically performing, we do not just demand more without providing them help. Schools that are put on probation -- we identify our academically weakest schools and we put them on probation. When we put schools on probation, we send in a probation manager, an external partner, and a support team to help that school.

All of our probation managers are our top principals, not external consultants. The best principals in our system, in the parochial school system, in the suburban school system are hired to do probation managing. In other words, we have the best schools, we have th best principals from the best schools in our system. We are not talking about magnate schools; we are talking about inner-city schools.

They go in and they serve as probation managers. They and their most gifted teachers go in and they help the principal get his or her school and his or her faculty back on track. The probation programs have been dramatic in their success. They are teamed up with an external partner. Sometimes they are consultants usually from the university. But the probation teams that are sent in to help every school consists of a top principal and a team of top teachers from a top-performing school.

As I mentioned, we also have probation managers from our parochial and private schools. We just recruit the finest. And just to give you a snapshot of our success, a little over three years ago there were 147 schools on the State's academic watch list. Today there are just 58.

So, in closing what we are doing here is comprehensive. It is just not accountability for accountability's sake. We have instituted a system of accountability, but we are able to reach the higher standards and expectations that we are setting for ourselves because we have the flexibility to do that, and we have control over our own resources.

We do not expect our schools to meet our high standards and expectations in a vacuum. Children are provided with additional support, they are reached earlier, they are kept at school longer during the school day. They are kept at school longer during the school year.

So, I apologize for running over. But that pretty much puts it in perspective.

GOVERNOR CARPER: Let's give this man a round of applause.

(Applause.)

GOVERNOR CARPER: What we are trying to do here is to inspire and to be inspired by those of you out in the field doing the kind of work that you just described. We want you to give our Governors a whole fistful of ideas so that we can go home and implement them. You have given us a whole lot to work with.

Jim, I am going to ask you to just to hold up. I need to recognize Frank O'Bannon over here for some comments, because he needs to leave.

Governor Ryan?

GOVERNOR RYAN: I just want to take a minute to thank Paul Vallas. You can see why we are all excited about what he has done in the City of Chicago. I want to thank him for taking his time to come out here and share it with the nation today.

Paul, thank you very much.

GOVERNOR CARPER: Governor O'Bannon?

Jim, we will come back. We will then come back to some questions with Paul, then Fred and Gene as well.

Go ahead.

GOVERNOR O'BANNON: Thank you. I hope I can be as exciting as Paul is and the way Paul excites us. But I am moving into a little different area and that is extra learning opportunities. I know that the Chicago School System reviewed what can happen before school and what can happen after school. But to motivate children to be more achievers in school has become a problem and a great challenge to come up with solutions that make children better achievers no matter how we do it.

I know we, as Governors, as we look at what we can do to raise those standards, what we can do to raise achievement to make sure that we have good assessment, we have to make sure we have good accountability. We can do it by doing those things that help those children that may have some special needs or want some special help.

What we now know is that it starts earlier and earlier. We know through brain development what we have got to do in early childhood development and readiness and how we get them to school. What can we do when we do have them in school? What can we do after school?

So, we are looking at all those programs. We are looking at extra learning opportunities. So, our task force in Philadelphia first came up with the definition. Let me just name what they have included in the definition of extra learning opportunities: Before- and after-school

programs, out-of-school-time programs, school-age care, full-day kindergarten, mentoring, tutoring, community service as part of service learning, summer camps, weekend and holiday programs.

We looked at all those programs and the National Governors' Association's Center for Best Practices has a brochure talking about extra learning opportunities. We will be sending you a survey asking what you are doing in your State and what help could you need that we could give you when you look at these look at these extra learning opportunities.

So, I am excited about this next step. I am excited about the programs in the NGA Center for Best Practices, and I am looking forward to hearing from Jane Quinn. I encourage you all as Governor Janklow and I have a seminar on extra learning opportunities to join us sometime later this year.

GOVERNOR CARPER: Thank you very much. Our thanks to you and Bill Janklow for you leadership on this one. I am going to give a real short introduction for Jane because we really want to hear from her while she is around. Jane is here as the director of the DeWitt-Wallace Reader's Digest Fund. She will tell you a little bit about what they do.

Let me just say in short this is somebody who knows a whole lot about how to raise student achievement by giving kids extra opportunities to learn. That is one of our focal points in this issue over the next six months. How do we give kids extra learning time while we are raising their ability to read, write, do math, run computers and to think. Jane is somebody who is really good at that.

We are really pleased that you are here, Jane, to share your thoughts with us.

Ladies and gentlemen, Jane Quinn.

MS. QUINN: Good afternoon, Honorable Governors and guests. I would like to start my presentation with a question. What makes popcorn pop?

Now, before you think you have wandered into the wrong room, let me tell you how that relates to extra learning time. What makes popcorn pop appeared in a science Q&A column in The New York Times several years ago. I found this question so intriguing that my colleagues and I used it as the title for a program guide that we developed when I was the national program director at Girls Clubs of America.

We were trying to make the case to our own affiliates and to other youth workers around the country that you can take the programs that you do in the Girls Club or in the 4-H or in the Y or in Scouts and you can integrate math and science and reading into those programs, into the programs you do everyday like cooking and woodworking, sports, visual and performing arts, chess and computer clubs.

We demonstrated in this guide that a cooking class for ten-year-olds can be about making delicious brownies, sure. But it can also be about reading a recipe, planning ahead, using fractions, practicing teamwork, and understanding how the chemical properties of baking powder keep brownies from becoming doorstops.

So, to me this example illustrates both a need and an opportunity that we face as we consider how to extend children's learning time. The need, of course, as we have been discussing, is to engage young people in meaningful educational activities that will help them develop the skills that they need in adulthood. There is a huge opportunity though to be creative about the way that we do this. So, one such opportunity is to

make sure that we integrate academic learning into the ongoing programs in community-based organizations.

A second strategy that we know about to integrate learning and after-school programs is to offer programs that are explicitly about academic content as a way to enhance what children learn during the regular school day. For example, at Girls Clubs where I worked for nine years, we had a program called Operation Smart, that stood for "science, math and relevant technology."

We were trying to address the well-documented learning gap between boys and girls on the important issues of math and science. We started when the girls were six and we added advanced components for girls when they were pre-teens and then teenagers.

We were working to build their motivation and skills in these areas. We were engaging them in hands-on activities and we were also introducing them to women who use science and math in their jobs as health technicians, as architects, as physicists. Also, these women could become mentors and role-models for girls and young women.

Content-rich programs like this can be found in many places in my community and probably in your communities as well; places like public libraries, youth museums, science centers, hospitals, and other work places. These efforts challenged some long-held notions of where learning occurs and how children learn.

Young people, I am happy to report, love programs like these. When we ask young people, they say such activities certainly help them succeed in school. But they like these programs because they are not, in their words, too much like school.

As we think about ways to provide extended learning opportunities for young people, I think we should listen to young people and I think we should listen to their teachers. I think we should also listen to labor economists. For example, Richard Rename of Harvard and Frank Levy of M.I.T. tell us that in order to succeed in the contemporary economy, young people will need what they call the new basic skills.

These skills certainly include the ability to read and write, they say, at a minimum ninth-grade level. But they also include the ability to solve problems; to work in diverse teams as we all do in the work place; to communicate well both orally and in writing; and to know how to use technology.

Where are young people to learn these skills? Well, they can learn them in school and many do. But developing these new basics requires more diverse challenges and experiences than many young people have an opportunity to practice in school.

Rename and Levy's national data show that approximately 50 percent of our nation's 17-year-olds are not well-enough prepared to get a decent job or to pursue post-secondary education. To me this is a very startling estimate. It suggests to me that we need to deploy all of our community's resources if we are to prepare our young people for productive adulthood.

One critically important and under-utilized resource is time. In a recent Carnegie study entitled "A Matter of Time," and we have put an abridged version of this at your places, my colleagues and I argue that American youth have large amounts of discretionary time that can and should be directed to positive developmental experiences.

We cite, for example, the work of Reginald Clark who found that economically disadvantaged youth engaging in 20- to 35 hours per week of

constructive learning activities did better in school than their more passive peers. You can imagine that their more passive peers were watching television and doing things that really were not constructive.

This is important knowledge. The Reginald Clark study is important knowledge that Governors and other policy-makers can apply immediately. One way to apply this knowledge is to turn our public schools into community learning centers as many of you are doing. We need to make sure that the schools buildings in our communities are open before and after school, during the summer and on weekends. We have to make sure that our schools are working in partnership with the kinds of community resources that I was just talking about.

There are many promising models for these kinds of community schools or full-service schools as they are sometimes called. And the most powerful of these models work deliberately to integrate what happens during the school day with what happens in the extended day.

Another thing we can do is to expand informal learning opportunities in the community by making more and better use of our public libraries, youth and science museums, art programs, youth agencies, universities and other work places. As we do that; as we extend learning opportunities in both school-based programs and community-based programs, I think we need to pay attention to a few basic issues, and I think you have dealt with them very well in the monograph coming out today.

The points that I am going to make really come from our grantees at the DeWitt-Wallace Reader's Digest Fund and the experiences they have had in expanding children's learning time. First we need to make sure that we are offering enrichment, not just remediation, the kinds of programs I was talking about earlier.

Secondly, we need to make sure we are targeting low-income youth who have considerably less access to these kinds of programs than do their more affluent peers. The reality in many communities right now is that you have to be rich to get enrichment. That is not smart and it isn't fair.

We need to combine public and private resources, both financial and human. We need to urge communities to assess not only the needs in their communities, but also their existing resources so that they are building out from what works. We need to encourage, and perhaps even require, partnerships and new institutional arrangements on behalf of children.

Although we keep hearing that schools cannot do this work by themselves, the reality is that in many communities, schools are trying to do this by themselves without the benefit of the rich experience of community-based organizations.

Finally, I think we need to recognize that community-wide staff training, transportation and program assessment are legitimate costs of doing business. We won't achieve quality or access if we don't pay attention to these issues.

So, what can Governors do to facilitate this? Well, I have three ideas. First of all you can, as many of you are already doing, increase State funding for school-based and community-based educational enrichment and youth-development programs. In the past our society has treated these programs as if they were nice, but not really necessary.

We now know that programs like the ones I have described are crucial and effective. State legislation can support a range of learning efforts from after-school programs to comprehensive full-service schools.

The recent tobacco settlement may present an unparalleled opportunity to direct new funding to needed services for children.

A second step that you can take is to integrate State-level categorical funding streams on behalf of children, thus removing one of the real barriers that program operators experience. Some States are experimenting with things like combining their education departments with their child care or youth services divisions as a way to plan and support learning throughout childhood and adolescence, during and outside the regular school day.

Third and finally you can exert State leadership by documenting and publicizing the need to extend children's learning time. While there is heartening evidence of strong public support for such efforts, many people underestimate the extent of the need or the potential of the opportunity. What is needed are not just a few more programs and in a few more places. What is needed is a national effort to weave what I think of as a web of support around young people. That is, we need to surround our young people with the protection, the guidance, and the opportunity that they need if they are going to succeed in later life.

I like this notion of the web of support because it keeps young people right at the center of our attention as we work to change the odds in their favor. By keeping our eyes on that prize and by building on the best available knowledge, we stand a good chance of helping all young people make a safe passage to responsible, fulfilling and productive adulthood.

Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

GOVERNOR CARPER: Jane, thank you very, very much too.

What I want to do is to take some time and do just a short Q&A that lets other Governors have a chance to jump in here and ask some questions and make some point that you think are relevant. You have given us a whole lot to think about.

I am going to go to Jim Hunt of North Carolina for the first point.

Jim?

GOVERNOR HUNT: All of you are wonderful. I want to ask a question of Mr. Vallas. First I want to say that I think what you are doing in Chicago schools is the most amazing thing happening in America today. That is whole lot for somebody in North Carolina to say about somebody else's schools. But I think it is true. You are real heros.

Tell us, though -- maybe you probably laid this out at the beginning before I got fully into what you were saying. How did you reorganize? You turned it over to the mayor. But in terms of the CEO and the school boards, that whole thing that was failing; how did you organize it so you could make it work, if you could tell us again briefly, please?

MR. VALLAS: Very quickly. The first step was to have a corporate board, not a traditional school board. The corporate board is really governed by business people. There are no educators on the corporate board. I am not saying that is a positive or a negative, but the bottom line is it is a very small managing board, and it is there to support the superintendent.

I am the CEO, superintendent or whatever you want to call me, and we have a corporate management structure. You have a CEO who has overall responsibility. He is almost like a senior administrator accountability officer. He is there to oversee the day-to-day management of the system.

Now, I have teams and we have a $3-billion budget. We are a huge school system, despite the fact that we probably have one of the smallest central offices among large school systems in terms of ratios of administrators to schools and to students. So, I don't want you to think we have a large bureaucracy. Basically we do have teams.

Our operations have been mostly privatized. We have a team of experts who manage the operations side. We have a team of contract and procurement experts who manage our contracting side. I have an education team who manages my education programs. My team is all home-grown. Every single educator that I put into a position of responsibility in terms of the management of the specific education initiatives is a top principal from within the system. So, we have not brought anybody from outside the system.

If you look at the structure, however, it very much looks like a corporate structure. There are performance indicators and performance goals that are set for every single department. We not only set performance goals for the schools, we also set performance goals for the departments. So, whether they are in operations, procurement, or managing the day-to-day education programs, whether you are managing the truancy programs, whether you are on safety and security, you all have a set of performance goals that you are expected to reach or basically suffer the consequences.

GOVERNOR HUNT: To what extent could this be done in regular school districts around America, do you think?

MR. VALLAS: Clearly this model is more ideal for much larger school districts, but I think there is something to be said for getting the type of management help in moderate-to-large school systems that they currently appear to be lacking. Now, you know I am not a CEO. In the '70s I was an educator at all levels. In the '80s I worked for the legislature. When Governor Ryan was Speaker Ryan, I used to run around doing staff analyses. I staffed the education committees and later on the finance and revenue committees. In the '90s I worked through municipal governments. So, you know, bringing a general in or bringing a CEO from some corporation will not always solve the problems.

You still need an education team articulating good, effective education policy. But you do need a professional management team to come in so that you can clear the field and let the educators do what they do best. So, even if you are a small district, some of the best-run schools in the suburbs have business managers who manage the campus, they manage the facilities, they help with the preparations of the budgets. Then, of course, the principals are able to focus on the educational leadership in that local school. So, it really becomes a management issue and an accountability issue.

GOVERNOR CARPER: Other questions?

Governor Taft?

GOVERNOR TAFT: Mr. Vallas, I would be interested if you could just outline maybe once more how Chicago would be different from other school districts in Illinois with respect to the State's collective bargaining law and the extent to which this has been important in your success.

MR. VALLAS: First of all, what the legislature did was, in Illinois -- besides, forget about tenure for a second, because a lot of people focus on tenure and they say, Oh, the problem is tenure. The problem is everything that is included with tenure. You could get rid of tenure tomorrow as long as the school districts do not have the authority

to negotiate their class size and as long as the school district does not have the authority basically over work rules.

You see, in the past we were governed; everything was governed by the State statutes. Our class size, whether or not we privatized, you know, we did not have control over work rules like seniority. One of the things that the board did after the 1995 Reform Act was to get rid of the infamous reserve-teacher policy, which basically said if you lost your job in one school, you could be paid up to 20 months until you found a job in another school. If that school had a less-senior position or if it had a teaching position that was filled by a temporary teacher or a full-time substitute teacher, you could bounce that teacher and get that job.

That was literally protected by State law. Teachers were allowed by State law to bounce from school to school. Well, that was all eliminated. Basically what the legislature said is work rules are the board's responsibility. The board sets policies governing work rules. Now, there are all these things in the State legislature that govern Chicago that did not necessarily govern the rest of the State.

We are a large district. The rest of the districts in the State of Illinois have three or four schools. We have 591 schools. But the bottom line is our hands were tied. We not only had to wrestle with the problem of tenure, but we also had to wrestle with the problem of everything from class size to work rules to seniority being dictated by State statute. That was removed.

It was not open season on the teachers. Within three weeks of us taking over, we had negotiated a four-year teachers' contract, and we did not use all the powers that we were given under the board. For example, we were given by the State legislature the power to basically prevent strikes. We just never did that; we never exercised that power.

So, the point is clearly many legislatures -- and it depends from State to State -- there are just so many protections that the school boards are handcuffed just beyond tenure. There is the teacher certification process, the teacher evaluation process, the process for removing incompetent teachers. It is all governed very specifically by State statute. By relieving local school districts of those mandates and those protections, it gave us the flexibility to negotiate in good faith with our teachers and to streamline the system so that we could get greater accountability.

That's a long answer to a short question. I apologize.

GOVERNOR CARPER: Good question; good answer.

Two more; one of them is from Governor John Roland.

GOVERNOR ROLAND: Paul, I think you have turned out to be my case study on how you can have accountability by local empowerment. I think there is a general feeling that to have accountability, it has got to go the opposite direction. But frankly, I think it works better in your direction toward local control.

Just two quick questions: One is when you reconstituted the seven schools, with regard to them did you get specific authority from or waivers or whatever from the State legislature to do that? Was it specific to those areas? Was general authority given?

MR. VALLAS: General authority.

GOVERNOR ROLAND: General authority had been passed to your board already?

MR. VALLAS: That's correct. That was not new authority; that was just authority that we were given in 1995 that allowed us to reconstitute schools. It was a power that the previous board just never had exercised.

GOVERNOR ROLAND: That's amazing. I guess the other question then is was the Chicago School System at that time when the board came and all these waivers and new local controls came into place, was it just so bad that the legislature was pretty much willing to let you do anything or whatever it took to make it happen? It sounds like they basically said, Hey, just start over again and have your corporate board.

MR. VALLAS: Pretty much so.

GOVERNOR ROLAND: The follow-up is how much resistance did you get from the unions? Was it almost insurmountable?

MR. VALLAS: Well, you know very quickly in 1989 the legislature radically decentralized control over the school system, set up 591 local school councils that decided budgets, selected principals; not a real effective reform. Because the system was performing so poorly, the system continued to go down hill.

I think in 1995, this was a system that had financial crises every year. Every year our issues dominated the State legislature. We were the biggest excuse for people not supporting public education. We were always used as the whipping boy for those who would criticize public education. What happened was the legislature just got fed up and they basically just said, "Here, Mayor, you want it? You've got it."

Some thought that they were trying to give him -- this was going to be his political Waterloo. But the mayor said, "If I am going to get blamed for it, you might as well give me the responsibility." Then he turned it around.

I think what happened with the teachers' union was this. We worked with the Chicago Teachers' Union as a member of the American Federation of Teachers. I must tell you they have been extraordinarily progressive.

If you will remember Albert Shanker and the current president -- very progressive and very open to change. Certainly the legislature gave us a sort of Damocles, because they gave us powers, some very, very strong powers to exercise over the union. That certainly made the union serious when we came to the collective bargaining table.

But, you know, many of the powers that they gave the board were only of six months duration, like the ability to basically prevent a strike. We have been negotiating and working ever since. Let me also point out, however, as to the technique we used with collecting bargaining is that we have continual collective bargaining. We meet with the unions monthly; no lawyers present. What we do is we resolve issues.

So, then what happens is that I make changes during the year. I don't wait for the next collective bargaining session to begin. Just last year it was brought to my attention that the death benefits had not been raised in like 20 years. So, I increased them by 400 percent. I did not say that we would have to wait and put that on the table in the next collective bargaining process. So, we have taken a whole new approach towards collective bargaining.

Teachers are involved in every aspect of what we do. When we developed our standards, they were teacher-driven. When we developed our technology programs, they were teacher-driven. Our best teachers go to schools and they do mentoring. They teach schools how to integrate technology into the classroom. Our standards-based assessment system

that we are developing is teacher-driven. Our curriculum models I developed are used by teachers. The probation managers and the probation teams that go into the schools consist of principals and teams of teachers.

So, it is all in the family, so to speak. That helps to make a difference in attitude.

GOVERNOR CARPER: I have Governor King over here and then we will give the last question to the Governor of American Samoa.

Governor King?

GOVERNOR KING: Thank you for your presentation; very helpful, very interesting.

The observation is that I could not help but look at this -- I'm afraid I have lost my voice; sorry.

GOVERNOR CARPER: While Governor King regains his voice, we will go to the Governor of American Samoa.

A lot of us get choked up on this stuff, Angus.

(Laughter.)

GOVERNOR SUNIA: When you said that yours is a standards-based system, what was your best source for the national and international standards? Did you just take those as the ones we were given?

MR. VALLAS: First of all we benefitted from the fact that the State at the same time was developing a new set of standards. They had consulted with a set of national experts and a set of local experts, as well as some of the top-performing individual schools to develop their standards.

What we did was we formed a partnership with the State assessment team, the State's Standards Project. So, we began to work on developing our standards at the same time that the State was playing with theirs. We then went beyond and worked with a number of national groups like Dr. Tucker's group from the National Education Center and others who have really been blazing the trail in these areas.

We also did some comparing. We brought in -- in other words, just going to national experts, or for that matter, State experts and developing a system of standards is fine and dandy. But one of the things that we did was we put a team together of administrators and superintendents from some of the top-performing schools in Illinois. We then basically sat down and we had them review our standards, because we wanted our standards to be competitive with some of the best standards in the suburban schools and the down-State schools. That is the approach that we took basically.

GOVERNOR CARPER: Thank you.

Angus, last question.

GOVERNOR KING: I will try it again. An observation; your chart in this book about how students use their time, I thought, was a stunning insight. It is always a danger to let a lawyer loose with a calculator, but I did some calculations. Essentially our students in their free time, according to your data, are spending 30 percent of that free time watching television and 5 percent studying.

I don't have a solution, particularly with a camera from my home State pointed at me.

(Laughter.)

GOVERNOR KING: But I would just observe that as long as in this country we are doing literally six times as much TV-watching as studying, we are in trouble. I think we have to figure out how to address that

one, because we are just never going to get out of this if that is our priority as a society.

So, I commend you for doing that study. I think it is important work. And I want to thank the panel for some real insight.

GOVERNOR CARPER: Jane, do you want to make a quick comment?

MS. QUINN: I would like to make just a couple of comments. This study that we cited in here is from the University of Michigan. It was not original research that we did at Carnegie. But when we came upon this set of data, we got very alarmed and came to the same conclusion that you did. So, we subtitled this report, "Risk and Opportunity in the Non-School Hours."

We saw some data that suggested that young people who are alone during the after-school hours can get into all kinds of mischief and beyond. There is a lot of lost opportunity in these non-school hours. The average 12-year-old boy watches 26 hours of television a week.

If you have a 12-year-old boy in your household, I would encourage you to pay attention and to enroll him in the Boys and Girls Club or in a chess club or in a computer club, because we know that television viewing is passive, that kids are exposed to a lot of gratuitous violence and no-consequence sexuality, I guess we would call it. So, we know that television-watching or that much television-watching does not promote the achievement of high academic standards.

That is really why we got into this whole time analysis. We were trying to look at the contribution of these community programs to young people's learning. We saw that there was a great deal of untapped potential. So, I appreciate your comment about that.

Thanks.

GOVERNOR CARPER: Thank you, Jane.

Let me say in conclusion before we move off to our next part of our program. We are coming to a close here today and I want to say to Fred Carrigg that I have some questions for you, but unfortunately time just does not permit.

My hope in looking out across the country and reaching out across the country over the next six months that we will end up in New Jersey and maybe in your school district, in your city so that we can have the chance to see first-hand what is going on and how you are using technology and then we can ask you a whole lot of questions.

Paul, we had not been planning to come to Chicago or asking to come to Chicago. In sitting here and talking to Governor Roland a little bit earlier with respect to your doing everything from soup to nuts on accountability, we are contemplating maybe having forums in Washington State and perhaps in Texas. I think we have sort of made a decision right here. We want to come to Chicago to see first-hand and to get some of your energy and even better insights into the great stuff that you folks are doing.

There are three documents that I will just be holding up that have been left at our seats. These documents focus on results toward education and the accountability system and also on expanded learning time. These are the products that are coming out of our efforts. We are getting a fair amount of requests from around the country from Governors, school districts, legislators, businesses, and so forth for some of the information that is being compiled. We want to make sure that people know that is available.

I also want to make sure that we express our thanks to the W.K. Kellogg Foundation in partnership with several national educational organizations. They have announced a $413-million initiative to promote service and learning as an integral part of our K-to-12 education. I know the State of Maryland and some other States are doing some good work on that. We want to say a special thanks to the Kellogg Foundation for their generous support of service-learning initiatives in the United States. There is more information about that at our tables as well.

We have two things left to do. One of those is a presentation from our vice chairman, a brief presentation. He will be introducing Michael Armstrong to make a short presentation as well. Finally I am going to ask Governor Leavitt to join me in making a presentation to the Governors of four States for excellence in education. Then we will break for today and go on to other things, Governor Romer, and see what awaits us this evening.

That having been said, we will just say that Governor Leavitt is going to provide us with an update about the online university that he and former Governor Romer have been involved in creating the Western Governors University. And as I said earlier, Governor Leavitt will also introduce our special guest, Michael Armstrong.

Governor?

GOVERNOR LEAVITT: Thank you, Governor Carper.

I will direct your attention to the screen. I am going to move very quickly so as to provide our guest time.

I would also like to acknowledge former Governor Romer here. He has been very much a partner in this whole process.

(Slide.)

GOVERNOR LEAVITT: Yesterday we heard Michael E. Porter talk about the New Economy and say that the New Economy is going to be driven by true innovative capacity.

(Slide.)

GOVERNOR LEAVITT: I told a story upon hearing that to this group about a CEO from a large, high-tech company who said, "If I miss one product cycle, I'm dead."

He went on to say the problem was not innovative ideas; it was the capacity to bring an entire work force along rapidly and repeatedly.

(Slide.)

GOVERNOR LEAVITT: Three reasons why 18 Governors have formed the Western Governors University is to provide access to an expanding number of our citizens who need it regularly because the cost of education is too high and because the market is not responding to these changes quickly enough.

(Slide.)

GOVERNOR LEAVITT: The model for the change is simple. It does not replace the existing system of higher education; it is a new element. It is to create a low-cost, high-quality alternative that is convenient and will let market forces then drive change.

(Slide.)

GOVERNOR LEAVITT: These are the 18 States that are currently involved. We invite all of you to be involved.

(Slide.)

GOVERNOR LEAVITT: Currently there are 363 courses that are online; 28 educational providers, both traditional and non-traditional. The most important element of this entire institution is that the degrees are

based on competency, not on credit. Students have been admitted from 26 different States, Territories and countries.

(Slide.)

GOVERNOR LEAVITT: The students can get financial aid. We are in the process of getting accreditation.

(Slide.)

GOVERNOR LEAVITT: We have 11 different degrees. This is a series of them, and probably the third one is the most interesting. I am not saying the most interesting; it is one of the more interesting ones. The Society of Manufacturing Engineers came to us and said, "Our graduate engineers from our traditional institutions have 14 areas where they lack competency. We would like you to help us develop a degree that matches our competency."

That is what Western Governors University will do.

(Slide.)

GOVERNOR LEAVITT: We are currently collaborating with The Open University to create what will be known as The Governors Open University System.

(Slide.)

GOVERNOR LEAVITT: They have 200,000 students in 90 countries. This will clearly be an international institution.

(Slide.)

GOVERNOR LEAVITT: You can see the list of partners. This is driven entirely by the States and the private sector.

It is my privilege today to introduce Mike Armstrong who is the chairman of AT&T and a remarkable supporter, not just of this institution, but of education in general.

Mr. Armstrong, thank you very much for both your patience and your support.

(Applause.)

MR. ARMSTRONG: Thank you, ladies and gentlemen.

Governor Leavitt, it is a real privilege to appear before the National Governors' Association two days in a row. In honor of that and to show my appreciation, I want to get right down to business. Today it is my pleasure to announce a $500,000 grant to The Western Governors University from The AT&T Foundation.

(Applause.)

MR. ARMSTRONG: This brings our total support to over $1,250,000. We are very proud to be the first corporate sponsor of WGU. Of course, the list of corporate sponsors has grown since then. That is really not surprising.

State governments provided the creativity and the courage to get this program started. Then business recognized the value of what the Governors were doing, and the result is one of the strongest public-private partnerships in America. With the creation of this university, the Western Governors were saying that education is just too important to be held hostage to economics or geography.

We really applaud that sentiment at AT&T. Life's choices and education should not be limited by money or commuting distance. Technology can bring educational opportunity to anyone anywhere who has the will to learn and to grow. That is what distance learning is all about. It is not really a new concept. Distance learning has been around since Charles Atlas started selling body-building courses through the mail. In fact, a few of us might remember on the back of comic books

where they offered to take that 97-pound weakling and transform him into a powerful specimen.

For many years distance learning was the 97-pound weakling of the education world. But about 30 years ago, colleges began to experiment with distance learning over computer connections. It was a big jump ahead. But the systems tended to be proprietary and options were limited. Then in the '90s, along came point-and-click access to the Internet. It inspired a flood of new ideas that really shows no signs of stopping.

One of the most creative new ideas was Western Governors University. Fortunately that idea had the backing of two of the best salesmen education ever had, Governor Mike Leavitt of Utah and former Governor Roy Romer of Colorado. The WGU went from a view and a concept in 1995 to incorporated in 1997 to the first online classes just last September.

As of right now The Western Governors University provides access to 35 participating schools and the number is going to hit 50 very soon. It has really grown from a regional initiative to an international resource. This is a pioneering effort, very much in the tradition of the American West.

The students who began in September are really homesteading some new territory. In fact, I did some browsing through it in preparation for coming here in its catalog last week. The first thing I saw was a very reassuring warning. It said, quote, "More courses are being added daily. So, check back often. No need to wait for the spring bulletin. This university runs on Internet time."

It was kind of fun to look through this catalog. I was imagining years back if I had been putting together my own curriculum or if, in fact, I was a teacher interested in sharpening my skills, what could I have done? Well, I could have enrolled in a course teaching science at Utah State or signed for Introduction to Internet Resources at the University of Hawaii. Geography is no barrier. So, I could have taken them both.

If I was really feeling ambitious, I could have signed up for a graduate course in telecommunication systems at Oklahoma State University and rounded out my schedule of courses with the narrative, Art of the Alaskan Native Peoples offered by the Alaska Learning Cooperative. The bottom line is I could have taken four excellent courses from four different institutions in four different States without ever having to leave home.

Now, I know what WGU means when they say they are really not out to replace existing schools; they want to dramatically increase access to those schools.

At the same time, corporate America has learned that we have to be involved in the education of our employees long before they become our employees. Like the National Governors' Association, we are vitally interested in the quality of public education in this country. That translates into a shared interest in teacher training.

AT&T's commitment to teacher training dovetails with the work of WGU. We have a program we are very proud of called AT&T Learning Network. Its main focus is to link teachers with the training they need to use the Internet and other information technology. Getting access to the net is just the first step. The next challenge is to put all that

information to work for our kids. The WGU understands that challenge, and they are just a gold mine of help in your curriculum.

Now, we have combined AT&T's Learning Network's Virtual Academy Program to be directly linked to the WGU. We are using The Western Governors University as a premier course provider to the teachers we have reached through our AT&T Learning Network. You know, applications like The Western Governors University are the big ideas that fit the communications revolution and inspired Congress to pass the Telecommunications Act of 1996.

Those big ideas have encouraged AT&T to make some fundamental changes in what we are up to as well. Last week our shareholders and the FCC approved the merger of TCI and AT&T. For starters, we will offer Internet access that is about 100 times faster than the rate you can get with the standard modem today. The implications for online learning in that kind of environment are just immense.

I would like to close by thanking all the Governors for the help we have had in your States with the regulatory approvals and the other requirements for getting this merger done. We look forward to working closely with you as we put this technology to work in your States. I know that where there are these new technologies, public policy issues are never far away like universal phone service, reduction of access charges, and ensuring real local phone competition.

Of course, we look forward to a long, productive future with Western Governors University. We are very proud to be a part of it. And now to end on a practical note, "Show me the money." I would like to present the Governor with the $500,000 check.

(Applause.)

GOVERNOR LEAVITT: Once again, thank you very much to AT&T, and to all the corporate citizens who have made this possible.

Recognizing the limitations in time, Mr. Chairman, I will yield back to you.

GOVERNOR CARPER: Governor Romer, you are a fellow who is really at a loss for words. Do you want to just add 30 seconds to this?

GOVERNOR ROMER: No, sir.

GOVERNOR CARPER: We are just delighted to welcome you back.

GOVERNOR ROMER: On a day I refuse to talk.

(Laughter.)

GOVERNOR CARPER: That is something few of us as Governors are able to do and that is to reject the opportunity to chat.

Let me just say to Mike Armstrong, to you and everyone at AT&T, thank you.

Thank you, Roy, and thank you, Mike, for the great leadership you have provided for everyone in the Western Governors Association who have just really driven this. We are grateful to you for your leadership and for you inspiration and for your money. So, thank you so much.

The last item for us to conclude on today is something that really grew out of the education summit in Charlottesville about nine years ago. There the nation's Governors agreed and the President agreed to a set of six national education goals hopefully to be made progress toward by the year 2000. They created the National Education Goals Panel, with that in mind, to produce a national report on progress toward those education goals.

In addition to a national progress report, the President and Governors agreed that each State should produce its own individual report

to show progress that is being made by States toward achieving those goals. That commitment was reaffirmed, I think, in 1996 at the National Education Summit convened by former National Governors' Association chair, Tommy Thompson, and Lou Gerstner of IBM.

Each year the chair of our National Governors' Association recognizes four States for outstanding State progress reports. I want to thank the staff of the National Education Goals Panel. I want to thank the staff of the Council of Chief State School Officers for serving as the review committee that selected the outstanding reports for this year.

Now, I want to make the presentations to four States. The Governors of two of those States are here at this moment. I will also be presenting to them, as well as to a representative of Governor Bush who had to go off to a meeting on Capitol Hill. I also think that Governor Underwood is not feeling well. He has slipped out of the room for a while. If he is not able to return in a timely way, if there is someone from West Virginia who would like to accept on behalf of Governor Underwood of West Virginia, that would be much appreciated.

Let me start off by going to the home State of my wife's birth, and that is North Carolina. The former Martha Stacy grew up in that wonderful State that we are now going to honor here. That State is represented by a terrific Governor, somebody whom we have all admired and for whom we all have respect, and that is Governor Jim Hunt.

I am going to ask Jim to join me at the podium to accept the bell which we are going to present as a token of our esteem for the great regard that you and your State's efforts are held in by us. I would like for you to say a word or two about the North Carolina State Progress Report, which, I believe, is called Achieving Excellence in Schools.

Now please, a round of applause for Governor Jim Hunt.

(Applause.)

GOVERNOR HUNT: Mr. Chairman, I am proud to accept this on behalf of all the people in North Carolina who have worked so hard and worked together to achieve it. We are focusing on getting kids to school, healthy and ready to learn; on having excellent teachers for all of them; on making our schools safe and orderly; and also for having high and challenging standards. Together we can do it.

We have heard examples of how it is being done today that we admire so much. I am thrilled that our organization, under the leadership of our fine leaders is keeping us focused on it. Thank you all very much.

(Applause.)

GOVERNOR CARPER: Keep the bell, Governor Hunt. You have earned it and you and your team deserve it.

Since we have run a bit longer today on today's program and since we still have a couple of more Governors who are recipients but have had to leave, what I would like to do now is to present these.

Is Governor Dean still here?

(Pause.)

GOVERNOR CARPER: While Governor Dean is coming up, I will just mention that tomorrow morning after we convene, and since Governor Bush of Texas and Governor Underwood of West Virginia are not here to be able to receive these awards in person, what we will do probably tomorrow morning just before our Congressional leaders arrive, we will then make those presentations to Governor Bush and to Governor Underwood on behalf of there States.

Am I to understand that Governor Dean is returning? Let me just make sure that is the case. While we are awaiting him, I just want to ask one other question of Fred Carrigg.

(Pause.)

GOVERNOR CARPER: No, the Governor is not coming? Then we will present to Governor Dean tomorrow as well as to Governor Underwood and to Governor Bush.

Ray, is there any business that we need to bring before us today?

(No response.)

GOVERNOR CARPER: I especially appreciate each of you who have stayed here as we have finished out today's program and agenda. In closing let me just say to Fred Carrigg, to Paul Vallas, and to Jane Quinn, we deeply appreciate your spending this time with us today. We deeply appreciate what you are doing with your lives and the insights and inspiration that you provided for us as Governors in the States. We look forward to working with you again later this year. Thank you all.

Let's give them all one more round of applause, shall we.

(Applause.)

GOVERNOR CARPER: With that we are adjourned for today. We will be back here tomorrow at 9:30 tomorrow morning.

Thank you all very much.

(Whereupon, at 5:10 p.m., the proceedings were recessed, to reconvene at 9:30 a.m. the following day.)

ÜÜÜ
ÜÜÜÜÜÜÜÜÜÜÜÜÜÜÜÜÜÜÜÜÜÜÜÜ€ ʻ x ¦ x ¡Ï t

└ →

┐ └€ ¡ 4 ¶ 4 ½ 4 Õ 4 F< - ð
ð└ À─ `

ϴ⛭ ↕ Ð¶ ┤ p→ @ ┼
┘Õ × 4 ò 4 ↑ 4 . 4 H 4 J 4 k 4 | 4 F<└- ð
ð└ À⁻ `

ϴ✡ ↕ Ð¶ ┤ p→ @ ┼
◘| ~ 4 € 4 , 4 „ 4 † 4 ˆ 4 Š 4 Œ 4 F<└- ð
ð└ À–

ϴ✡ ↕ Ð¶ ┤ p→ @ ┼
◘Œ Ž 4 · 4 ‘ 4 ˝ 4 † 4 ˆ 4 Š 4 Œ 4 F<└- ð
ð└ À–

Θ✡ ↕ Ð¶ ┤ p→ @ ┼ └’ š H ¦ ’ 4 „ 4 † 4*<└- ┼

ð

ð└ À– @┼ ├ 2<└- │ │ ð

ð└ À– @┼ ├ €% (┐¦ ½ T .┐ - 9┐ - #└ - ž┘ - s• -
9 - &<└- X┐ à– @┼ @-
&< - X┐ à– @┼ @ •9 ³ T ¦
T K

T 2 T 6

T ³☼ T u◀ T À‼ T 1⊥ T K┬ T I↑ T 3├ T I├ T @-
&<└- X┐ à¯ @┼ @ I├ ❝→ T ← T k T 9 T

```
!  T Â"  T ÷#  T °$  T 5%  T Î'  T —(  T  )  T +)  T  @-
  &<└-       X┐          à¯  @┼      @-
   +)  b+  T m+  T ã,  T F.  T v/  T  0  T '0  T Ì1  T Z3  T Ú4  T ‼6  T
»6  T £7  T  @  &<└-       X┐          à¯  @┼      @-
   £7  ├8  T $8  T N9  T .;  T M<  T X<  T ">  T Ô?  T 1A  T œB  T §B  T
íD  T │F  T  @  &<└-       X┐          à¯  @┼      @-
   │F  ┼F  T LG  T µH  T ]I  T hI  T
```

K T)M T 4M T ÈN T ÂO T ÍO T →Q T %R T @-
&<└- X┐ à– @┼ @-
%R rR T }R T ÇT T ©U T ÀU T ÎU T ¢V T ºV T ãW T kY T &[T
Œ\ T ;^ T @ &<└- X┐ à– @┼ @-
;^ [^ T ^ T =_ T j` T åa T yb T æb T d T ¸d T ⊥f T)g T
(h T ;h T @ &<└- X┐ à– @┼ @-
;h Œh T Þi T $k T ¬n T òo T
q T r T 0t T øu T Zw T uw T ⛭x T Æy T @-
&<└- X┐ à– @┼ @-
Æy ‹{ T ©| T ƒ~ T :€ T K, T fƒ T Ýƒ T åƒ T l… T C‡ T $‰ T
žŠ T VŒ T @ &<└- X┐ à– @┼ @-
VŒ • T L T A‘ T t“ T %• T «– T R˜ T ý™ T 3› T J› T -
œ T ƒœ T k T @ &<└- X┐ à– @┼ @-
k íž T ¢Ÿ T C¡ T 1¢ T À£ T j¥ T ‘§ T #ª T « T È- T m¯ T
Y° T ″± T @ &<└- X┐ à– @┼ @-
″± Ì³ T jµ T å¶ T o· T ¸ T s¸ T «¸ T ä¹ T ¤» T ½ T ¨¿ T
œÁ T ªÁ T @ &<└- X┐ à– @┼ @ ªÁ ùÂ T

Ã T 1Ã T ›Ã T ©Ã T Ä T ┐Æ T üÆ T È T ÔÉ T ÷Ë T)Í T QÎ T
@ &<└- X┐ à¯ @┼ @-
QÎ [Ð T ‰Ñ T ÃÒ T Ô T ‹Ö T ÁØ T pÚ T ÐÛ T ×Ý T Zß T êà T
nâ T [ä T @ &<└- X┐ à¯ @┼ @-
[ä ;å T •ç T Ãè T §ê T ýì T Êî T @ð T Aò T 6ô T hõ T Œ÷ T
↕ù T ˜ú T @ &<└- X┐ à¯ @┼ @-
˜ú ¡û T fý T Tþ T Nÿ T * T £┐ T *┘ T ▪│ T 4• T & T A
T ž
T °

T @ &<└ - X┐ à─ @┼ @ °

┐ T ? T M T …

T ↕☼ T #☼ T ├┼ T 6┼ T]┼ T È┼ T Ô┼ T ¼↕ T ◘¶ T @-
&<└- X┐ à¯ @┼ @-
◘¶ ┬┴ T ð┬ T Q↑ T y├ T Ø→ T f T · T Û T j T └ T •
T Ò! T ë# T @ &<└- X┐ à¯ @┼ @-
ë# f% T c& T ²' T ì(T á) T + T «, T ¡-
T ┼/ T c0 T ¿1 T Ö3 T ã4 T @ &<└- X┐ à¯ @┼
@-
ã4 É6 T •8 T +9 T ‘: T ~; T i< T Ä= T ┴? T Ï@ T GC T ³D T
ÊD T ØD T @ &<└- X┐ à¯ @┼ @-
ØD ◄E T F T GF T NF T §G T
I T J T óL T ôN T :Q T ¨Q T `T T ´V T @-
&<└- X┐ à¯ @┼ @-
´V ÙV T êV T ¯X T ÝY T g\ T ^ T _ T Ý` T $c T ^c T Žc T
Äc T ÿd T @ &<└- X┐ à¯ @┼ @-
ÿd ┐f T $f T qf T Kg T íh T

```
i  T  i  T ¹j  T Zl  T ?m  T ┤n  T lo  T ┤q  T   @-
  &<└-       X┐          à¯  @┼      @-
   ┤q  Ür  T ◀u  T ku  T éu  T úu  T Mv  T ´v  T  w  T Ow  T ]w  T "x  T
Gy  T Ûz  T   @  &<└-       X┐          à¯  @┼      @-
   Ûz  $}  T C}  T [}  T ê~  T B   T P   T  €  T  ·  T ?·  T ¶,  T Èƒ  T
Ÿ…  T ¦†  T   @  &<└-       X┐          à¯  @┼      @-
   ¦†  °†  T Õ†  T ¼‡  T
```

‰ T
‹ T ◄· T D· T þ· T F’ T R’ T ƒ’ T ó’ T j“ T @-
&<└- X┐ à─ @┼ @-
j“ u“ T →” T %” T È” T R• T]• T „– T – T ”— T Ÿ—
T ☼˜ T →˜ T e™ T @ &<└- X┐ à─ @┼ @-
e™ p™ T Ú™ T å™ T ¤› T Ù› T ä› T wœ T ‚œ T ÷œ T ┐· T x· T
"ž T pž T @ &<└- X┐ à─ @┼ @-
pž ~ž T ±ž T íŸ T ûŸ T Ý T g¢ T «¤ T V¦ T ¶§ T á¨ T kª T
→¬ T Ê- T @ &<└- X┐ à─ @┼ @-
Ê- f® T ³¯ T ’± T F³ T Ò´ T ©¶ T -
· T ¦· T ´· T 1¸ T €¸ T │¹ T !¹ T @-
&<└- X┐ à─ @┼ @-
!¹ `¹ T Ž¹ T œ¹ T ↑º T eº T {» T 4½ T ¿¾ T !À T DÂ T –
Ã T óÄ T ‚Å T @ &<└- X┐ à─ @┼ @-
‚Å :Å T ÇÆ T œÇ T ªÇ T ↕È T ÚÈ T ùÈ T ┘É T ¾Ê T pË T {Ë T
┬Ì T ZÌ T @ &<└- X┐ à─ @┼ @-
ZÌ kÌ T SÎ T Î T Î T ┼Ï T +Ï T ”Ï T –
Ï T ˜Ï T šÏ T œÏ T žÏ T Ï T @ &<└- X┐ à─ @┼
@ Ï ¡Ï T SÎ T Î T Î T ┼Ï T +Ï T ”Ï T –
Ï T ˜Ï T šÏ T œÏ T žÏ T Ï T @ &<└- X┐ à─ @┼
@ ┬Ò┐à=Ð/ @
- À! │@8┬Ò┐à=Ð/┐ p◘Ð/`
! │@8ÜÜ
ÜÜÜÜÜÜÜÜÜÜÜÜÜÜÜÜÜÜw
◄ ê┘ ß◘ Ú

õ┼ ┴ "├ ┬ ! ↕% Ó(Á, l0 Z4 ¦8 < ¤@ âC ÄG ‡K MO 1S
ÊV [½^ ‘b ©f Žj Œn {r §v -z É~ æ, ²† ®Š ÅŽ °’ ³–
³š ”ž §¢ Ø¦ Åª Ê® Ø² ¿¶ ‡° ×¾ ±Â IÆ JÊ cÎ kÒ eÖ }Ú µÞ
´â ãæ #ë qï wó š÷ °û Èÿ Õ└ ß•

¶⛭ ˆ‼ ›┤ æ← --
Ç# ¼' Ä+ ã/ 4 ├8 ↕< *@ 3D ¹G áK │P ┐T ßW ¶\ %` ¡c _g
,k ¶o ├s v ‡z j~
, ⛭† é‰ à· Ò‘ Ý″)˜ d› [ž I¢ i¦ ®ª §® Æ² Þ¶ å¹ ÷½ ëÁ àÅ
KÉ èÌ !Ï

L
L