

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 057 000

SP 005 405

AUTHOR Marland, S. P., Jr.
TITLE An Interim Accounting.
INSTITUTION Department of Health, Education, and Welfare,
Washington, D.C. Office of the Commissioner of
Education.
PUB DATE Nov 71
NOTE 14p.; Speech presented before the Annual Meeting of
the Chief State School Officers, Louisville,
Kentucky, November 16, 1971

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.65 HC-\$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Agency Role; Disadvantaged Youth; *Educational
Improvement; *Educational Programs; *Federal Aid;
*Federal Programs; State Departments of Education;
Statistical Data

ABSTRACT

The new approach to educational renewal in the Office of Education involves the key element of concentration. Instead of giving piecemeal grants, all discretionary funds within OE have been concentrated in one division in order to assist a limited number of school systems to install totally new programs involving all aspects of the school. Each site will be funded for a 5-year period, after which it should be able to continue with combined state and local assistance. Each site will have about 10 schools, all of them in areas where there are large concentrations of disadvantaged children. A locally-developed needs assessment will be the basis for the package of programs funded by OE. Proposals must conform to three criteria: 1) evidence of state and local commitment, 2) comprehensiveness, 3) program objectives stated in precise measurable terms. Initially the renewal sites will probably be identified by the states with final selection by OE. The state department will also house at least half the total number of "educational renewal extension agents." The agents would tie practitioners to federal, state, and local researchers. Another new program being planned at OE is called Common Core of Data for the 70's. Eventually it will provide an integrated system of educational statistics for federal, state, local, and institutional planning and management. (RT)

AN INTERIM ACCOUNTING*

By S. P. Marland, Jr.
U.S. Commissioner of Education
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

H. M. Tomlinson, the English novelist, authored a comment on the pitfalls of oratory that every public speaker should paste in his hat. "How many grave speeches," Tomlinson wrote, "which have surprised, shocked, and directed the Nation, have been made by Great Men too soon after a noble dinner, words winged by the press without an accompanying and explanatory wine list."

A sobering thought, to be sure, and one that compels me to spend my time with you this morning not in grave oratory about future achievements, but in discussing promises I have already made as Commissioner, and accounting for such progress in their fulfillment as I can claim. It is, after all, rather early in the day for futuristic scenarios. As Tomlinson suggests, they tend to go down better in a convivial, postprandial atmosphere. In specific terms, I would like to offer you this morning an interim accounting on progress to date in reaching a goal of considerable significance to us in the O.E. and to you in the States chap. 51 developing and implementing a truly effective program of educational research and development in our time, and our accompanying concept for an educational renewal strategy.

I use the work interim because our plans cannot be considered as cast in bronze. Certainly, we are still deeply engaged in the complex business of winning approval for the scheme we have proposed for reordering and

*Before the Annual Meeting of the Chief State School Officers, Executive Motor Hotel, Louisville, Kentucky, Tuesday, November 16, 1971, 9:00 a.m.

redirecting a good share of our discretionary funds, a plan that could, over time, amount to probably the most significant change in the style and character of O.E. since its beginnings. We have found ourselves doing a lot of explaining to the White House, to HEW, to education officials, and organizations, and most particularly to the men and women on Capitol Hill. The Congress is naturally concerned that we in the Bureaucracy carry out rather than skirt the intent of educational research and development legislation. As I shall explain in a moment, our plan, I am personally convinced, would carry out that intent with far greater precision and effectiveness in serving you and the schools than the present arrangement under which the Office has been dispensing developmental funds, an arrangement which has left a clear field for improvement.

But whatever organizational headaches are involved for us in the Office of Education in putting the renewal program together are a small price to pay for the results we envision. During the time --- nearly a year now --- that I have been in Washington, I have found that assuming certain institutional disorder and pain at our level may result in a relief of disorder and pain at yours --- and correspondingly favorable results for the school children of this country. Avoiding simple expediency and administrative calm and reaching out for good ideas, informed veteran opinions --- indeed, every piece of intelligent advice that we can lay our hands on --- tends to keep our Washington pot boiling. It is in this context that I have listened closely to wise and able old --- and young --- hands in assessing our research and development history.

If you seek to pinpoint the reason for the generally disappointing results of the Federal R&D effort in education to date, if you search for explanations

as to why more than \$1 billion in Federal research and development expenditures have produced so little in the way of tangible results in our schools, then I believe you will begin to understand the nature of our quest and to begin to catch the spirit of our present thrust for change.

Up to now we have not been willing to go fast enough or far enough in introducing validated new processes in our educational system. Nor have we had a sufficiently respectable or dependable or systematic resource for performing research and development and then, following its validation, delivering its products to you for installation and advancement. We have sprinkled our R&D dollars like seeds, hopefully but thinly, enthusiastically but improvidently, not so much working systematically for a new order of educational efficiency as wishing one might suddenly burst into luxuriant blossom from the seed we've scattered. And, as you might expect, it hasn't happened.

Virtually all of our research and development activities fall, in one way or another, in our modest discretionary budget, whether specifically in the National Center for Educational Research and Development, or less directly in the Bureau of Educational Personnel Development, Experimental Schools, the Right To Read, Bilingual Education, our 15-percent setaside under Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, or whatever. As I said to you at the AASA meeting in Atlantic City last February, our intention at that time was to stop short, to clamp down on expenditure of

all such discretionary funds not already firmly committed, to think through the reasons for the failure of generalized innovation in the 1960's. Above all, our intention was to commit no more dollars to nontargeted R&D no matter how appealing the proposals and to spend only when convinced that such expenditures would produce effective change in the classroom.

In the days since Atlantic City we have developed a renewal strategy to accomplish that broad objective. We have responded to the President's call for educational reform through a strategy that reflects not simply the experience and convictions of those of us within O.E. or within HEW, but that embodies the wisdom and interests of the States and localities, of public officials and private persons, of individuals and groups such as yours. And I would acknowledge at this point our profound indebtedness to the advice and counsel provided by a task force from the Chiefs chaired by Superintendent John Porter of Michigan, individuals who have been close to this issue. The quality and the volume of the assistance we have received from this group in this extremely important undertaking are to me the most persuasive guarantors of its success. We cannot in our field of work brew schemes in dark secrecy and then spring them upon 16,000 school systems and two million teachers and expect anything good to happen. It simply will not. Indeed, as I said moments ago, we will continue to solicit your reactions to our plans as I discuss them and as Don Davies and his staff explain them to you in still greater detail. And we gratefully intend to go on meeting with Superintendent Porter and his committee as the development of this strategy moves forward.

The essence of our approach to educational renewal is best stated in one word --- concentration. We are taking our many discretionary parts, as distinct from formula programs, and putting them together in what I hope will be a critical mass of intelligent power. Efforts at innovation in the past have been isolated, noncomprehensive, aimed at improving only one aspect of a school, such as teacher-training, curriculum, or class organization. Though such experiments often had a temporary success, the greater weight of traditional practice snuffed out piecemeal change as time went on. Our intention now is to assist a limited number of school systems in installing total new programs involving all aspects of the school, its staff, and its clientele, employing the most responsive and the most effective techniques that can be devised for each individual system. We will fund each of these sites for a five-year period, assuring the experiments a solid chance to become successfully launched and, after the initial five-year period, to fly on their own with combined State and local assistance. As each site is established and begins to function, we hope its evident success will prompt you as the chief education executive in each State to spread its effect quickly to other sites.

The renewal effort will impact directly on the lives of five and one-half million of the most deprived --- and therefore the most educationally resistant --- children in the United States over the next 14 years, with built-in performance goals for each child. The national objective of serving the educationally disadvantaged remains the overriding goal of this action. The success that we hope to achieve with the five and one-half million can

then be extended throughout the country, generating a body of knowledge and understanding that can be applied to an infinitely broader number of youngsters for an infinite number of days and years to come.

In addition to sharpening our focus through concentration on fewer school systems and fewer children, we are also concentrating our discretionary funds, which have been spread all over the Office of Education's operating bureaus, into a single operating division under the direction of the Deputy Commissioner for Development, Don Davies. With a few deliberate exceptions, the other divisions of O.E. have assigned their discretionary dollars to Don's office. Consequently we have a comparatively impressive war chest which --- presuming we win the approval of Congress for our strategy --- we can now focus in a unified, comprehensive attack on major educational problems.

No longer will it be necessary for the State or local school superintendent to deal with the infinite array of documents and the numerous individual program managers in each area of interest in O.E. -- whether dropout prevention, Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Act, education professions development, bilingual education, or other concerns. No longer will it be necessary to fill out individual forms for each program, work out complicated relationships with unrelated and randomly located staff, attempt to coordinate differing funding cycles, and be responsible for an endless series of separate evaluative reports, year after year.

No longer, in sum, will it be necessary to do what the school superintendent of this very city, Louisville, Kentucky --- Dr. Newman Walker --- was forced to do early in 1970 as he and his assistants sought help from Washington

in solving school problems as severe as those of almost any city in the Nation. But it was the very success of Dr. Walker and his chairman of school operations, Dr. Frank Yeager, in overcoming our seemingly necessary bureaucratic obstacles that brought us to the point of doing away with them altogether. Louisville's achievement in establishing a prototype site-concentration technique convinced us in the Office of Education that the renewal strategy we were contemplating could work as well as we expected and that it could work for all State education agencies and local education agencies. In Louisville it is working and I recommend that any of you interested in obtaining first-hand information on the method confer with Dr. Walker and visit his target schools.

Dr. Walker came back from Washington with a coordinated package of no less than 18 separate Federal education programs with which he has begun to turn his entire school system around. Funds made available through the package totaled \$4.6 million for last year and \$5.3 million this year. With the exception of Title I formula grant funds under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, all are discretionary programs. Louisville thereby became the Nation's first city to tap so many separately funded and administered Federal education programs and to use the grants in a consolidated attack on its educational problems. The remarkable story of Dr. Walker's journey through the labyrinth of grantsmanship at 400 Maryland Avenue is published in the December issue of the very excellent magazine of the Office of Education, American Education. I recommend it as an account of a very enterprising team of individuals in what is generally and

wrongly regarded as the stodgy learning industry, and also a brilliant example of what we believe our renewal strategy can accomplish in approximately 200 renewal sites in 1973-74, the initial year of operation. I think it is important to add that, contrary to the unflattering stereotype, lively and imaginative bureaucrats at 400 Maryland Avenue have had a large hand in putting this package together. It is to their everlasting credit that they are ready to sweep aside the comfortable and familiar routines of program management in its numerous and job-secure parts, and grow with the task themselves.

Each site will have an average of 10 schools, all of them in areas where there are large concentrations of disadvantaged children. About two-thirds of these schools will be in urban areas, the other third in rural. A needs assessment --- developed not by us in Washington, but by the education officials, teachers, students, parents, and residents in the communities themselves --- will be the basis for the package of programs funded by O.E. In other words, we will ask the communities to tell us what they need, rather than us telling them, the usual configuration up till now. Further, the States and the communities will have selected themselves for this action. We will share in the final determination of what shall be a site, but first the site community will have invited our engagement.

We will be open to any proposal that makes sound educational sense and ask only that proposals conform to three criteria: First, evidence of State and local commitment, such as a willingness to undertake sweeping renewal or change and to increase or at least maintain levels of current spending in the target schools; second, comprehensiveness, involving all aspects of the

affected schools; third, program objectives stated in precise measurable terms --- such as raising average student achievement by a definite percentage over that to be expected in a normal schoolyear, or decreasing the gap in achievement between disadvantaged and middle-class in the same district by a stated percentage.

Presuming that a community's needs assessment and its proposed solutions meet these broad requirements, the proposal can be submitted in a single application, no matter how many components it includes. Local research, teacher-training, development of paraprofessional aides, audio-visual materials, medical and dental examinations, family involvement, curriculum and organizational change --- all can be lumped together in one document.

I want particularly to point to the substantial part that your State departments will play in this renewal plan, a marked departure from the present procedure in which the principal exchange is between Washington and the grantee, with the State having a very peripheral involvement. The States, to begin with, will identify the renewal sites. While the procedure isn't as yet wholly worked out, I would guess that we will invite each of the Chiefs to nominate districts within their jurisdictions that seem to combine both need and strong willingness and potential for solving their problems. We could, I would guess, count on receiving 500 or 600 nominees for the initial 200 awards, with the final selections a matter of close examination and negotiation between your offices and mine. While the extremely deprived areas that we are aiming at are obviously not distributed equally throughout the country, each State will be assured of at least one renewal site in the first year and very likely several more before the program closes out in 1986.

The State department will also house at least half the total number of "educational renewal extension agents." The function of these persons, who will be key figures in the renewal strategy, is based on a borrowed concept, the very successful system of agricultural extension agents who carried to the farmers information on government-developed agricultural research and development, those techniques that helped to revolutionize farming in this country starting early in this century. The educational extension agents, operating either from the State Department or from Teacher Centers located at each renewal site, would tie practitioners to Federal, State, and local researchers in what we hope will be a most productive partnership. The agents would not be there to tell the teachers what to do, but to ask them what help they need, what sorts of ideas do they want to explore, what kinds of problems they are running into, what we have in our Federal resources that they might not know about.

This information would be channeled back to Washington where it could be determined what resources were available to help each individual case and how the experience could tie in with target tasks in research and development in the newly created National Institute of Education. Just as his agricultural counterpart showed the American farmer of a half-century ago how to rotate crops, contour-plow, and employ proper fertilizers to achieve greater yields, the educational agents will work with the teachers to help them achieve greater classroom yield --- how to break through the reading problem, how to overcome learning difficulties of racial and ethnic minorities, how to start a boy or girl on a course leading to personal fulfillment and career success. These are the everyday, down-to-earth problems that any

program of educational reform worthy of the name must address and solve.

What I have attempted to describe to you this morning is a new structure for the Office of Education, growing out of the vast new powers of the National Institute of Education, the implicit prestige of the kind of quality work that will be done there, and from a new determination within the Office of Education itself to get the new products of educational research to the teachers. This is not merely a passing project of the Federal Government --- it is a new dimension of educational leadership and service --- on call to all who need help.

That, in roughest outline, is our plan for educational renewal. You cannot call it revolutionary, and perhaps that is just as well. I would prefer calling it systematic myself, for I would guess that in the long history of man, sound systems have accomplished far more than revolutions. This will not be hit-or-miss, and it will not be scattershot, but a careful, concentrated, and responsive approach to devising reasonable, workable, permanent solutions to the toughest educational problems we face today. It responds to the President's mandate, as noted earlier; it responds to the Secretary's insistence that all HEW research and development be translated into action --- or else; and I hope that it responds to the compact between each of you and me that we increase swiftly the effective teaching and learning of the poor and the minorities.

One more modest accounting of progress before I close. You will recall that at our meeting in June I laid out in a very preliminary way our concept of an integrated system of educational statistics for Federal, State, local, and institutional planning and management. We called the proposed system

Common Core of Data for the 70's. The idea was to provide current, reliable data for the entire educational structure, whether local, State, or Federal, (including our very important client, Congress), with the cost to be shared by all three.

I am happy to report that the concept is moving ahead. CCD-70 has begun to take shape, having, I can predict with some optimism, successfully negotiated the Fiscal Year 1973 budget review in the Office of Education and in HEW and, hopefully, in the Office of Management and Budget. While we can anticipate only modest amounts of money for planning purposes in the current fiscal year, we look to significant funding in FY '73. At the very least we expect to be able to fund three States on a demonstration basis, and hopefully a number more. The purpose would be to build within each demonstration State an information-collection system that would be completely responsive to the needs at the State level as well as totally articulated with a national system.

A number of the Chiefs have written me or Dorothy Gilford expressing their interest in becoming an early part of CCD-70. We appreciate that expression of faith and we look forward as you do to the creation of an information system that will finally link all States and the O.E. in a constructive partnership in the unification, production, and employment of relevant educational statistics. I believe that in the decades ahead the crucial substance of education will stand so high among our public values and concerns that this instrument will be at least as significant a force for public policy decisions as the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

These are small benchmarks of advancement that I have come to tell you about this morning, these efforts to strengthen and redirect our research and development effort and our data gathering procedures. Our renewal program is estimated to entail expenditures of a little more than \$150 million in the first year of operation, a trifle more than three percent of the total O.E. budget. Obviously this is nothing upon which to mount grandiose rhetoric, the sort of overpromising that has produced a boomerang of public disenchantment too often in our profession. I get the impression that the public is not as tired of the rising cost of education as of the rising rhetoric.

And yet I am pleased to be able to report to you that we have made these steps forward. Because when you consider the others that we are taking, I believe that substantial forward movement is evident. I am speaking of the National Institute of Education which has been approved by both houses of Congress, and the career education theme which has received enthusiastic acceptance nationally, following your reassuring endorsement six months ago, and from many individuals and groups both in and out of the education profession. And I would say that there is much more activity underway --- at all levels of governmental and private endeavor --- that argues impressively for progress and accomplishment.

I believe that my perhaps naively optimistic statements, made early in the game, have turned out to be as on-target as I could have hoped.

In those statements I expressed total faith that the leaders --- the good men and women of education --- particularly the professionals who are working in the Office of Education and in the State departments of education --- can advance our profession swiftly in a nondefensive spirit of reform and regain the high faith of the people. Naively optimistic? Perhaps, but it's beginning to happen.

###