

Appendix G

Marc Tucker And The NCEE Advise Hillary on Education And Labor Training

Marc Tucker is President of the National Center on Education and the Economy (NCEE), and the original letter is typed on NCEE letterhead. The letterhead includes a list of the NCEE Board of Trustees, one of whom is Hillary Clinton. The following letter was retyped from the original for clarity. Unusual punctuation and missing phrases were copied from the original, and the format, except for the addition of bold type, generally duplicates that of the original.

11 November, 1992

Hillary Clinton
The Governor's Mansion
1800 Center Street
Little Rock, AR 72206

Dear Hillary:

I still cannot believe you won. But utter delight that you did pervades all the circles in which I move. I met last Wednesday in David Rockefeller's office with him, John Scully, Dave Barram and David Haselkorn. It was a great celebration. Both John and David R. were more expansive than I have ever seen them—literally radiating happiness. My own view and theirs is that this country has seized its last chance. I am fond of quoting Winston Churchill to the effect that “America always does the right thing—after it has exhausted all the alternatives.” This election, more than anything else in my experience, proves his point.

The subject we were discussing was what you and Bill should do now about education, training and labor market policy. Following that meeting, I chaired another in Washington on the same topic. Those present at the second meeting included Tim Barnicle, Dave Barram, Mike Cohen, David Hornbeck, Hilary Pennington, Andy Plattner, Lauren Resnick, Betsy Brown Ruzzi, Bob Schwartz, Mike Smith and Bill Spring. Shirley Malcolm, Ray Marshall and Susan McGuire were also invited. Though these three were not able to be present at last week's meeting, they have all contributed by telephone to the ideas that follow. Ira Magaziner was also invited to this meeting.

Our purpose in these meetings was to propose concrete actions that the Clinton administration could take—between now and the inauguration, in the first 100 days and beyond. The result, from where I sit, was really exciting. We took a very large leap forward in terms of how to advance the agenda on which you and we have all been working—a practical plan for putting all the major components of the system in place

Appendix G

within four years, by the time Bill has to run again.

I take personal responsibility for what follows. Though I believe everyone involved in the planning effort is in broad agreement, they may not all agree on the details. You should also be aware that, although the plan comes from a group closely associated with the National Center on Education and the Economy, there was no practical way to poll our whole Board on this plan in the time available. It represents, then, not a proposal from our Center, but the best thinking of the group I have named.

We think the great opportunity you have is to remake the entire American system for human resources development, almost all of the current components of which were put in place before World War II. The danger is that each of the ideas that Bill advanced in the campaign in the area of education and training could be translated individually in the ordinary course of governing into a legislative proposal and enacted as a program. This is the path of least resistance. But it will lead to these programs being grafted onto the present system, not to a new system, and the opportunity will have been lost. If this sense of time and place is correct, it is essential that the administration's efforts be guided by a consistent vision of what it wants to accomplish in the field of human resources development with respect both to choice of key officials and the program.

What follows comes in three pieces:

First, a vision of a kind of national—not federal—human resources development system the nation could have. This is interwoven with a new approach to governing that should inform that vision. What is essential is that we create a seamless web of opportunities to develop one's skills that literally extends from cradle to grave and is the same system for everyone—young and old, poor and rich, worker and full-time student. It needs to be a system driven by client needs (not agency regulations or the needs of the organizations providing the services), guided by clear standards that define the stages of the system for the people who progress through it, and recruited on the basis of outcomes that providers produce for their clients, not inputs into the system.

Second, a proposed legislative agenda you can use to implement this vision. We propose four high priority packages that will enable you to move quickly on the campaign promises:

1. The first would use your proposal for an apprenticeship system as the keystone of a strategy for putting a whole new post secondary training system in place. That system would incorporate your proposal for reforming post secondary education finance. It contains what we think is a powerful idea for rolling out and scaling up the whole new human resources system nationwide over the next four years, using the (renamed) apprenticeship ideas as the entering wedge.
2. The second would combine initiatives on dislocated workers, a rebuilt employment service and a new system of labor market boards to offer the Clinton Administration's employment security program, built on the best practices anywhere in the world. This is the backbone of a system for assuring adult workers in our society that they need never again watch with dismay as their jobs disappear and their chances of ever getting a good job again go with them.

3. The third would concentrate on the overwhelming problems of our inner cities, combining elements of the first and second packages into a special program to greatly raise the work-related skills of the people trapped in the core of our great cities.
4. The fourth would enable you to take advantage of legislation on which Congress has already been working to advance the elementary and secondary reform agenda. The other major proposal we offer has to do with government organization for the human resources agenda. While we share your reservations about the hazards involved in bringing reorganization proposals to the Congress, we believe that the one we have come up with minimizes those drawbacks while creating an opportunity for the new administration to move like lightening to implement its human resources development proposals. We hope you can consider the merits of this idea quickly because if you decide to go with it or something like it, it will greatly affect the nature of the others you make to prospective cabinet members.

The Vision

We take the proposals Bill put before the country in the campaign to be utterly consistent with the ideas advanced in America's Choice, the school restructuring agenda first stated in A Nation Prepared and later incorporated in the work of the National Alliance for Restructuring Education, and the elaboration of this view that Ray and I tried to capture in our book Thinking for a Living. Taken together, we think these ideas constitute a consistent vision for a new human resources development system for the United States. I have tried to capture the essence of that vision below.

An Economic Strategy Based On Skill Development

The economy's strength is derived from a whole population as skilled as any in the world, working in work places organized to take maximum advantage of the skills those people have to offer

A seamless system of unending skills development that begins in the home with the very young and continues through school, post secondary education and the workplace

The Schools

Clear national standards of performance in general education (the knowledge and skills that everyone is expected to hold in common) are set to the level of the best achieving nations in the world for students of sixteen, and public schools are expected to bring all but the most severely handicapped up to that standard. Students get a certificate when they meet this standard, allowing them to go on to the next stage of their education. Though the standards are set to international benchmarks, they are distinctly American, reflecting our needs and values.

We have a national system of education in which curriculum, pedagogy, examinations and teacher education and licensure systems are all linked to the national standards, but which provides for substantial variation among states, districts and schools on these matters. This new system of linked standards curriculum and pedagogy will abandon the American tracking system, combining high academic standards with the ability to apply what one knows to real world problems and qualifying all students with a lifetime

Appendix G

of learning in the post secondary system and at work.

We have a system that rewards students who meet the national standards with further education and good jobs, providing them with a strong incentive to work hard in school. Our public school systems are reorganized to free up school professionals to make the key decision about how to use all the available resources to bring students up to the standards. Most of the federal, state, district and union rules and regulations that now restrict school professionals' ability to make decisions are swept away, though strong measures are in place to make sure that vulnerable populations get the help they need. School professionals are paid at a level comparable to that of other professionals, but they are expected to put in a full year, to spend whatever time it takes to do the job and to be fully accountable for the results of their work. The federal, state and local governments provide the time, staff development resources, technology and other support needed for them to do the job. Nothing less than a wholly restructured school system can possibly bring all of our students up to the standards only a few have been expected to meet up to now.

There is a real-aggressive-program of public choice in our schools rather than the flaccid version that is wide spread now.

All students are guaranteed that they will have a fair shot at reaching the standards: that is, that whether they make it or not now depends on the effort they are willing to make, and nothing else. School delivery standards are in place to make sure this happens. These standards have the same status in the system as the new student performance standards, assuring that the quality of instruction is high everywhere, but they are fashioned as not to constitute a new bureaucratic nightmare.

Postsecondary Education and Work Skills

All students who meet the new national standards for general education are entitled to the equivalent of three more years of free additional education. We would have the federal and state governments match funds to guarantee one free year of college education to everyone who meets the new national standards for general education. So a student who meets the standard at 16 would be entitled to two years of high school and one of college. Loans which can be forgiven for public service are available for additional education beyond that. National standards for sub-baccalaureate college-level professional and technical degrees and certificates will be established with the participation of employers, labor and higher education. These programs will include both academic study and structured on-the-job training. Eighty percent or more of American high school graduates will be expected to get some form of college degree, though most of them less than a baccalaureate. These new professional and technical certificates and degrees typically are won within three years of acquiring the general education certificate. So, for most post-secondary students, college will be free. These professional and technical degree programs will be designed to link to programs leading to the baccalaureate degree and higher degrees. There will be no dead ends in this system. Everyone who meets the general education standard will be able to go to some form of college,

being able to borrow all the money they need to do so, beyond the first free year.

This idea of postsecondary professional and technical certificates captures all of the essentials of the apprenticeship idea while offering none of its drawbacks (see below).

But it also makes it clear that those engaged in apprentice-style programs are getting more than narrow training: they are continuing their education for other purposes as well, and building a base for more education later. Clearly, this idea redefines college. Proprietary schools, employers and community-based organizations will want to offer these programs, as well as community colleges and four-year institutions, but these new entrants will have to be accredited if they are to qualify to offer the programs.

Employers are not required to provide slots for the structured on-the-job training component of the program but may do so because they get first access to the most accomplished graduates of these programs and they can use these programs to introduce the trainees to their own values and ways of doing things.

The system of skill standards for technical and professional degrees is the same for students just coming out of high school and for adults in the work force. It is progressive, in the sense that certificates and degrees for entry level jobs lead to further professional and technical education programs at higher levels. Just as in the case of the system for the schools, though the standards are the same everywhere (leading to maximum mobility for students), the curricula can vary widely and programs can be custom designed to fit the needs of full time and part time students with very different requirements. Government grant and loan programs are available on the same terms to full-time and part-time students, as long as the programs in which they are enrolled are designed to lead to certificates and degrees defined by the system of professional and technical standards.

The national system of professional and technical standards is designed much like the multi-state bar, which provides a national core around which the states can specify additional standards that meet their unique needs. There are national standards and exams for no more than twenty broad occupational areas, each of which can lead to many occupations in a number of related industries. Students who qualify in any one of these areas have the broad skills required by a whole family of occupations, and most are sufficiently skilled to enter the work force immediately, with further occupation-specific skills provided by their union or employer. Industry and occupational groups can voluntarily create standards building on these broad standards for their own needs as can the states. Students entering the system are first introduced to very broad occupational groups, narrowing over time to concentrate on acquiring the skills needed for a cluster of occupations. This modular system provides for the initiative of particular states and industries while at the same time providing for mobility across states and occupations by reducing the time and cost entailed in moving from one occupation to another. In this way, a balance is established between the kinds of organic skills needed to function effectively in high performance work organizations and the skills needed to continue learning quickly and well through a lifetime of work, on the one hand, and the specific skills needed to perform at a high level in a particular occupation on the other.

Appendix G

Institutions receiving grants and loan funds under this system are required to provide information to the public and to government agencies in a uniform format. This information covers enrollment by program costs and success rates for students of different backgrounds and characteristics, and career outcomes for those students, thereby enabling students to make informed choices among institutions based on cost and performance. Loan defaults are reduced to a level close to zero, both because programs that do not deliver what they promise are not selected by prospective students and because the new postsecondary loan system uses the IRS to collect what it is owed from salaries and wages as they are earned.

Education and Training For Employed and Unemployed Adults

The national system of skills standards establishes the basis for the development of a coherent, unified training system. That system can be accessed by students coming out of high school, employed adults who want to improve their prospects, unemployed adults who are dislocated and others who lack the basic skills required to get out of poverty. But it is all the same system. There are no longer any parts of it that are exclusively for the disadvantaged, though special measures are taken to make sure that the disadvantaged are served. It is a system for everyone, just as all the parts of the system already described are for everyone. So the people who take advantage of this system are not marked by it as damaged goods. The skills they acquire are world class, clear and defined in part by the employers who will make decisions about hiring and advancement.

The new general education standard becomes the target for all basic education programs both for school drop outs and adults. Achieving that standard is a prerequisite for enrollment in all professional and technical degree programs. A wide range of agencies and institutions offer programs leading to the general education certificate, including high schools, drop out recovery centers, adult education centers, community colleges, prisons and employers. These programs are tailored to the needs of the people who enroll in them. All the programs receiving government grant or loan funds that come with drop outs and adults for enrollment in programs preparing students to meet the general education standard must release the same kind of data required of the post secondary institutions on enrollment, program description, cost and success rates. Reports are produced for each institution and for the system as a whole showing differential success rates for each major demographic group.

The system is funded in four different ways, all providing access to the same or a similar set of services. School drop outs below the age of 21 are entitled to the same amount of funding from the same sources that they would have been entitled to had they stayed in school. Dislocated workers are funded by the federal government through the federal programs for that purpose and by state unemployment insurance funds. The chronically unemployed are funded by federal and state funds established for that purpose. Employed people can access the system through the requirement that their employers spend an amount equal to 1 1/2 percent of their salary and wage bill on training leading to national skill certification. People in prison could get reduction in their sentences by meeting the general education standard in a program provided by the

prison system. Any of these groups can also use the funds in their individual training account, if they have any, the balances in their grant entitlement or their access to the student loan fund.

Labor Market Systems

The Employment Service is greatly upgraded and separated from the unemployment insurance fund. All available front-line jobs—whether public or private—must be listed in it by law. (This provision must be carefully designed to make sure that employers will not be subject to employment suits based on the data produced by this system—if they are subject to such suits they will not participate.) All trainees in the system looking for work are entitled to be listed in it without a fee. So it is no longer a system just for the poor and unskilled, but for everyone. The system is fully computerized. It lists not only job openings and job seekers (with their qualifications) but also all the institutions in the labor market area offering programs leading to the general education certificate and those offering programs leading to the professional and technical college degrees and certificates, along with the relevant data about the costs, characteristics and performance of those programs—for everyone and for special populations. Counselors are available to any citizen to help them assess their needs, plan a program and finance it, and once they are trained, to find an opening.

A system of labor market boards is established at the local, state and federal levels to coordinate the systems for job training, postsecondary professional and technical education, adult basic education, job matching and counseling. The rebuilt Employment Service is supervised by these boards. The system's clients no longer have to go from agency to agency filling out separate applications for separate programs. It is all taken care of at the local labor market board office by one counselor accessing the integrated computer-based program, which makes it possible for the counselor to determine eligibility for all relevant programs at once, plan a program with the client and assemble the necessary funding from all the available sources. The same system will enable counselor and client to array all the relevant program providers side by side, assess their relative costs and performance records and determine which providers are best able to meet the client's needs based on performance.

Some Common Features

Throughout, the object is to have a performance and client oriented system, to encourage local creativity and responsibility by getting local people to commit to high goals and organize to achieve them, sweeping away as much of the rules, regulations, and bureaucracy that are in their way as possible, provided that they are making a real progress against their goals. For this to work, the standards at every level of the system have to be clear, every client has to know what they have to accomplish in order to get what they want out of the system. The service providers have to be supported in the task of getting their clients to the finish line and rewarded when they are making real progress toward that goal. We would sweep away means-tested programs, because they stigmatize their recipients and alienate the public, replacing them with programs that are for everyone, but also work for the disadvantaged. We would replace rules defining

Appendix G

input with rules defining outcomes and the rewards for achieving them. This means, among other things, permitting local people to combine as many federal programs as they see fit provided that the intended beneficiaries are progressing toward the right outcomes (there are 23 separate federal programs for dislocated workers.) We would make individuals, their families and whole communities the unit of service, not agencies, programs, and projects. Whenever possible, we would have service providers compete with one another for funds that come with the client, in an environment in which the client has good information about the cost and performance records of the competing providers. Dealing with public agencies—whether they are schools or the employment service—should be more like dealing with Federal Express than with the old Post Office.

This vision, as I pointed out above, is consistent with everything Bill proposed as a candidate. But it goes beyond those proposals, extending them from ideas for new programs to a comprehensive vision of how they can be used as building blocks for a whole new system. But this vision is very complex, will take a long time to sell, and will have to be revised many times along the way. The right way to think about it is as an internal working document that forms the background for a plan, not the plan itself. One would want to make sure that the specific actions of the new administration were designed in a general way, to advance this agenda as it evolved while not committing anyone to the details, which would change over time.

Everything that follows is cast in the frame of strategies for bringing the new system into being, not as a pilot program, not as a few demonstrations to be swept aside in another administration, but everywhere, as the new way of doing business.

In the sections that follow, we break these goals down into their main components and propose an action plan for each.

Major components of the program.

The preceding section presented a vision of the system we have in mind chronically from the point of view of an individual served by it. Here we reverse the order, starting with descriptions of the program components designed to serve adults, and working our way down to the very young.

HIGH SKILLS FOR ECONOMIC COMPETITIVENESS PROGRAM

Developing System Standards.

Create National Board for Professional and Technical Standards. Board is private not-for-profit chartered by Congress. Charter specifies broad membership composed of leading figures from higher education, business, labor, government and advocacy groups. Board can receive appropriated funds from Congress, private foundations, individuals and corporations. Neither Congress nor the Executive Branch can dictate the standards set by the Board. But the Board is required to report annually to the President and the Congress in order to provide for public accountability. It is also directed to work collaboratively with the states and cities involved in the Collaborative

Design and Development Program (see below) in the development of the standards.

Charter specifies that the National Board will set broad performance standards (not time-in-the-seat standards or course standards) for college-level Professional and Technical certificates and degrees in not more than 20 areas and develops performance examinations for each. The Board is required to set broad standards of the kind described in the vision statement above and is not permitted to simply _____ the narrow standards that characterize many occupations now. (More than 2,000 standards currently exist, many for licensed occupations—these are not the kinds of standards we have in mind.) It also specifies that the programs leading to these certificates and degrees will combine time in the classroom with time at the work-site in structured on-the-job training. The standards assume the existence of (high school level) general education standards set by others. The new standards and exams are meant to be supplemented by the states and by individual industries and occupations. Board is responsible for administering the exam and continually updating the standards and exams.

Legislation creating the Board is sent to Congress in the first six months of the administration, imposing a deadline for creating the standards and the exams within three years of passage of the legislation.

Commentary:

The proposal reframes the Clinton apprenticeship proposal as a college program and establishes a mechanism for setting the standards for the program. The unions are adamantly opposed to broad based apprenticeship programs by that name. Focus groups conducted by JFF and others show that parents everywhere want their kids to go to college, not to be shunted aside into a non-college apprenticeship vocational program. By requiring these programs to be a combination classroom instruction and structured OJT, and creating a standard-setting board that includes employers and labor, all the objectives of the apprenticeship program are achieved, while at the same time assuring much broader support for the idea, as well as guarantee that the program will not become too narrowly focused on particular occupations. It also ties the Clinton apprenticeship idea to the Clinton college funding proposal in a seamless web. Charging the Board with creating not more than 20 certificate or degree categories establishes a balance between the need to create one national system on the one hand with the need to avoid creating a cumbersome and rigid national bureaucracy on the other. This approach provides lots of latitude for individual industry groups, professional groups and state authorities to establish their own standards, while at the same time avoiding the chaos that would surely occur if they were the only source of standards. The bill establishing the Board should also authorize the executive branch to make grants to industry groups, professional societies, occupational groups and states to develop standards and exams. Our assumption is that the system we are proposing will be managed so as to encourage the states to combine the last two years of high school and the first two years of community college into three year programs leading to college degrees and certificates. Proprietary institutions, employers and community-based

Appendix G

organizations could also offer these programs, but they would have to be accredited to offer these college-level programs. Eventually, students getting their general education certificates might go directly to community college or to another form of college, but the new system should not require that.

Collaborative Design and Development Program.

The object is to create a single comprehensive system for professional and technical education that meets the requirements of everyone from high school students to skilled dislocated workers, from the hard core unemployed to employed adults who want to improve their prospects. Creating such a system means sweeping aside countless programs, building new ones, combining funding authorities, changing deeply embedded institutional structures, and so on. The question is how to get from where we are to where we want to be. Trying to ram it down everyone's throat would engender overwhelming opposition. Our idea is to draft legislation that would offer an opportunity for those states—and selected large cities—that are excited about this set of ideas to do the necessary design work and actually deliver the needed services on a fast track. The legislation would require the executive branch to establish a competitive grant program for these states and cities to engage a group of organizations to offer technical assistance to the expanding set of states and cities engaged in designing and implementing the new system. This is not the usual large scale experiment nor is it a demonstration program. A highly regarded precedent exists for this approach in the National Science Foundation's SSI program. As soon as the first set of states is engaged, another set would be invited to participate, until most or all of the states are involved. It is a collaborative design, roll out and scale up program. It is intended to parallel the work of the National Board for College Professional and Technical Standards, so that the states and cities (and all their partners) would be able to implement the new standards as soon as they become available, although they would be delivering services on a large scale before that happened. Thus major parts of the whole system would be in operation in a majority of the states within three years from the passage of the initial legislation. Inclusion of selected large cities in this design is not an afterthought. We believe that what we are proposing here for the cities is the necessary complement to a large scale job creation program for the cities. Skill development will not work if there are no jobs, but job development will not work without a determined effort to improve the skills of city residents. This is the skill development component.

Participants

volunteer states counterpart initiative for cities. 15 states, 15 cities selected to begin in first year, 15 more in each successive year. 5 year grants (on the order of \$20 million per year to each state, lower amounts to the cities) given to each, with specific goals to be achieved by the third year, including program elements in place (e.g. upgraded employment service), number of people enrolled in new professional and technical programs and so on.

a core set of High Performance Work Organization firms willing to participate in standard setting and to offer training slots and mentors.

Criteria for Selection

strategies for enriching existing co-op tech prep and other programs to meet the criteria
commitment to implementing new general education standard in legislation
commitment to implementing the new Technical and Professional skills standards for college
commitment to developing an outcome and performance-based system for human resources development system
commitment to join with others in national design and implementation activity

Clients.

young adults entering work force
dislocated workers
long term unemployed
employed who want to upgrade skills

Program Components.

institute own version of state and local labor market boards. Local labor market boards to involve leading employers, labor representatives, educators and advocacy group leaders in running the redesigned employment service, running intake system for all clients, counselling all clients, maintaining the information system that will make the vendor market efficient and organizing employers to provide job experience and training slots for school youth and adult trainees.

rebuild employment service as a primary function of labor market boards

develop programs to bring drop outs and illiterates up to general education certificate standard. Organize local alternative providers, firms to provide alternative education, counselling, job experience and placement services to these clients. develop programs for dislocated workers and hard core unemployed. (see below)

develop city and state wide programs to combine the last two years of high school and the first two years of colleges into three year programs after acquisition of the general education certificate to culminate in college certificates and degrees. These programs should combine academics and structured on-the-job training.

develop uniform responding system for providers, requiring them to provide information in that format on characteristics of clients, their success rates by program, and the costs of those programs. Develop computer-based system for combining this data at local labor market board offices with employment data from the state so that counselors and clients can look at programs offered by colleges and other vendors in terms of cost, client characteristics, program design, and outcomes including subsequent employment histories for graduates.

design all programs around the forthcoming general education standards and the standards to be developed by the National Board for College Professional and Technical Standards.

Appendix G

create statewide program of technical assistance to firms on high performance work organization and help them develop quality programs for participants in Technical and Professional certificate and degree programs. (it is essential that these programs be high quality, non bureaucratic and voluntary for the firms.)

participate with other states and the national technical assistance program in the national alliance effort to enhance information and assistance among all participants.

National technical assistance to participants.

executive branch authorized to compete opportunity to provide the following services (probably using a Request For Qualifications):

state of art assistance to the states and cities related to the principal program components (e.g. work reorganization, training, basic literacy, funding systems, apprenticeship systems, large scale data management systems, training systems for the HR professionals who make the whole system work, etc.) A number of organizations would be funded. Each would be expected to provide information and direct assistance to the states and cities involved, and to coordinate their efforts with one another.

it is essential that the technical assistance function include a major professional development component to make sure the key people in the states and cities upon whom success depends have the resources available to develop the high skills required. Some of the funds for this function should be provided directly to the states and cities, some to the technical assistance agency.

coordination of the design and implementation activities of the whole consortium, document results, prepare reports, etc. One organization would be funded to perform this function.

Dislocated Workers Program.

New legislation would permit combining all dislocated workers programs at redesigned employment service office. Clients would, in effect, receive vouchers for education and training in amounts determined by the benefits for which they qualify. Employment service case managers would qualify client worker for benefits and assist the client in the selection of education and training programs offered by provider institutions. Any provider institutions that receive funds derived from dislocated worker programs are required to provide information on costs and performance of programs in uniform format described above. This consolidated and voucherized dislocated workers program would operate nationwide. It would be integrated with Collaborative Design and Development Program in those states and cities in which that program functions. It would be built around the general education certificate and the Professional and Technical Certificate and Degree Program as soon as those standards were in place. In this way, programs for dislocated workers would be progressively and fully integrated with the rest of the national education and training system.

Levy-Grant System.

this is the part of the system that provides funds for currently employed people to

improve their skills. Ideally, it should specifically provide means whereby front-line workers can earn their general education credential (if they do not already have one) and acquire Professional and Technical Certificates and degrees in fields of their choosing.

everything we have heard indicates virtually universal opposition in the employer community to the proposal for a 1 1/2 percent levy on employers for training to support the costs associated with employed workers gaining these skills whatever the levy is called. We propose that Bill take a leaf out of the German book. One of the most important reasons that large German employers offer apprenticeship slots to German youngsters is that they fear, with good reason, that if they don't volunteer to do so, the law will require it. Bill could gather a group of leading executives and business organization leaders, and tell them straight out that he will hold back on submitting legislation to require a training levy, provided that they commit themselves to a drive to get employers to get their average expenditures on front-line employee training up to 2 percent of front-line employee salaries and wages within two years. If they have not done so within that time, then he will expect their support when he submits legislation requiring the training levy. He could do the same thing with respect to slots for structured on-the-job training.

College Loan Public Service Program.

we presume that this program is being designed by others and so have not attended to it. From everything we know about it, however, it is entirely compatible with the rest of what is proposed here. What is, of course, especially relevant here is that our reconceptualization of the apprenticeship proposal as a college-level education program combined with our proposal that everyone who gets the general education credential be entitled to a free year of higher education. (combined federal and state funds) will have a decided impact on the calculations of cost for the college loan public service program.

Assistance for Dropouts and the Long Term Unemployed.

The problem of upgrading the skills of high school dropouts and the adult hard core unemployed is especially difficult. It is also at the heart of the problem of our inner cities. All the evidence indicates that what is needed is something with all the important characteristics of a non-residential Job Corps like program. The problem with the Job Corps is that it is operated directly by the federal government and is therefore not embedded at all in the infrastructure of local communities. The way to solve this problem is to create a new urban program that is locally—not federally—organized and administered, but which must operate in a way that uses something like the federal standards for contracting for Job Corps services. In this way, local employers, neighborhood organizations and other local service providers could meet quality results. Programs for high school dropouts and the hard-core unemployed would probably have to be separately organized, though the services provided would be much the same. Federal funds would be offered on a matching basis with state and local funds for this purpose. These programs should be fully integrated with the revitalized employment service. The local labor market board would be the local authority responsible for

Appendix G

receiving the funds and contracting with providers for the services. It would provide diagnostic, placement and testing services. We would eliminate the targeted jobs credit and use the money now spent on that program to finance these operations. Funds can also be used from the Jobs program in the welfare reform act. This will not be sufficient, however, because there is currently no federal money available to meet the needs of hard-core unemployed males (mostly Black) and so new monies will have to be appropriated for the purpose.

Commentary:

As you know very well, the High Skills Competitive Workforce sponsored by Senators Kennedy and Hatfield and Congressmen Gephardt and Regula provides a ready made vehicle for advancing many of the ideas we have outlined. To foster a good working relationship with the Congress, we suggest that, to the extent possible, the framework of these companion bills be used to frame the President's proposals. (You may not know that we have put together a large group of representatives of Washington-based organizations to come to a consensus around the ideas in America's Choice. They are full of energy and very committed to this joint effort. If they are made part of the process of framing the legislative proposals, they can be expected to be strong support for them when they arrive on the Hill. As you think about the assembly of these ideas into specific legislative proposals, you may also want to take into account the packaging ideas that come later in this letter.

Elementary and Secondary Education Program

The situation with respect to elementary and secondary education is very different from adult education and training. In the latter case, a new vision and a whole new structure is required. In the former, there is increasing acceptance of a new vision and structure among the public at large, within the relevant professional groups and in Congress. There is also a lot of existing activity on which to build. So we confine ourselves here to describing some of those activities that can be used to launch the Clinton education program.

Standard Setting.

Legislation to accelerate the process of national standard setting in education was contained in the conference report on S2 and HR4323 that was defeated on a recent cloture vote. Solid majorities were behind the legislation in both houses of Congress. While some of us would quarrel with a few of the details, we think the new administration should support the early reintroduction of this legislation with whatever changes it thinks fit. This legislation does not establish a national body to create a national examination system. We think that is the right choice for now.

Systematic Change In Public Education.

The conference report on S2 and HR 4323 also contained a comprehensive program to support systematic change in public education. Here again, some of us would quibble with some of the particulars, but we believe that the administration's objectives would be well served by endorsing the resubmission of this legislation modified as it sees fit.

Federal Programs for the Disadvantaged.

The established federal education programs for the disadvantaged need to be thoroughly overhauled to reflect an emphasis on results for the students rather than compliance with the regulations. A national commission on Chapter 1, the largest of these programs, chaired by David Hornbeck, has designed a radically new version of this legislation, with the active participation of many of the advocacy groups. Other groups have been similarly engaged. We think the new administration should quickly endorse the work of the national commission and introduce its proposals early next year. It is unlikely that this legislation will pass before the deadline—two years away—for the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act...but early endorsement of this new approach by the administration will send a strong signal to the Congress and will greatly affect the climate in which other parts of the act will be considered.

Public Choice Technology, Integrated Health & Human Services, Curriculum Resources, High Performance Management, Professional Development and Research and Development.

The restructuring of the schools that is envisioned in S2 and HR4323 is not likely to succeed unless the schools have a lot of information about how to do it and real assistance in getting it done. The areas in which this help is needed are suggested by the heading for this section. One of the most cost-effective things the federal government could do is to provide support for research, development and technical assistance to the schools on these topics. The new Secretary of Education should be directed to propose a strategy for doing just that, on a scale sufficient to the need. Existing programs of research, development and assistance should be examined as possible sources of funds for these purposes. Professional development is a special case. To build the restructured system will require an enormous amount of professional development and the time in which professionals can take advantage of such a resource. Both cost a lot of money. One of the priorities for the new education secretary should be the development of strategies for dealing with these problems. But here, as elsewhere, there are some existing programs in the Department of Education whose funds can be redirected for this purpose, programs that are not currently informed by the goals that we have spelled out. Much of what we have in mind here can be accomplished through the reauthorization of the Office of Education, Research and Improvement. Legislation for that reauthorization was prepared for the last session of Congress, but did not pass. That legislation was informed by a deep distrust of the Republican administration, rather than the vision put forward by the Clinton campaign but that can and should be remedied on the next round.

Early Childhood Education.

The president-elect has committed himself to a great expansion in the funding of Head Start. We agree. But the design of the program should be changed to reflect several important requirements. The quality of professional preparation for the people who start these programs is very low and there are no standards that apply to their employment. The same kind of standard setting we have called for in the rest of this plan should

Appendix G

inform the approach to this program. Early childhood education should be combined with quality day care to provide wrap around programs that enable working parents to drop off their children at the beginning of the work day and pick them up at the end. Full funding for the very poor should be combined with matching funds to extend the tuition paid by middle class parents to make sure that these programs are not officially segregated by income. The growth of the program should be phased in, rather than done all at once, so that quality problems can be addressed along the way, based on developing examples of best practice. These and other related issues need to be addressed, in our judgment, before the new administration commits itself on the specific form of increased support for Head Start.

Putting the Package Together.

Here we remind you of what we said at the beginning of this letter about timing the legislative agenda. We propose that you assemble the ideas just described into four high priority packages that will enable you to move quickly on the campaign promises:

1. The first would use your proposal for an apprenticeship system as the keystone of the strategy for putting the whole new post secondary training system in place. It would consist of the proposal for post secondary standards, the Collaborative Design and Development Proposal, the technical assistance proposal and the post secondary education finance proposal.
2. The second would combine the initiatives on dislocated workers, the rebuilt employment service and the new system of labor market boards as the Clinton Administration's employment security program, built on the best practices anywhere in the world. This is the backbone of a system for assuring adult workers in our society that they need never again watch with dismay as their jobs disappear and their chances of ever getting a good job with them.
3. The third would concentrate on the overwhelming problems of our inner cities, combining most of the elements of the first and second packages into a special program to greatly raise the work related skills of the people trapped in the core of our great cities.
4. The fourth would enable you to take advantage of legislation on which Congress has already been working to advance the elementary and secondary reform agenda. It would combine the successor to HR4323 and S2, (incorporating the systemic reforms agenda and the board for student performance standards), with the proposal for revamping Chapter 1.

Organizing the Executive Branch for Human Resources Development.

The issue here is how to organize the federal government to make sure that the new system is actually built as a seamless web in the field where it counts and that program gets a fast start with a first rate team behind it.

We propose, first, that the president appoint a National Council on Human Resources Development. It would consist of the relevant key White House officials, cabinet

Marc Tucker and the NCEE Advise Hillary

members and members of Congress. It would also include a small number of governors, educators, business executives, labor leaders and advocates for minorities and the poor. It would be established in such a way as to assure continuity of membership across administrations so that the consensus it forces will outlast any one administration. It would be charged with recommending broad policy on a national system of human resources development to the president and the Congress, assessing the effectiveness and promise of current programs and proposing new ones. It would be staffed by senior officials on the Domestic Policy Council staff of the president.

Second, we propose that a new agency be created, the National Institute for Learning, Work and Service. Creation of this agency would signal instantly the new administration's commitment to putting the continuing education and training of the "forgotten half" on a par with the preparation of those who have historically been given the resources to go to college and to integrate the two systems, not with a view to dragging down the present system and those it serves, but rather to make good on the promise that everyone will have access to the kind of education that only a small minority have had access to up to now. To this agency would be assigned the functions now performed by the assistant secretary for employment and training, the assistant secretary for vocational education and the assistant secretary for higher education. The agency would be staffed by people specifically recruited from all over the country for the purpose. The staff would be small, high powered and able to move quickly to implement the policy initiatives of the new President in the field of human resources development.

The closest existing model to what we have in mind is the National Science Board and the National Science Foundation, with the Council in the place of the Board and the Institute in the place of the Foundation. But our council would be advisory, whereas the Board is governing. If you do not like the idea of a permanent Council, you might consider the idea of a temporary President's Task Force, constituted much as the Council would be.

In this scheme, the Department of Education would be free to focus on putting the new student performance standards in place and managing the programs that will take the leadership in the national restructuring of the schools. Much of the financing and disbursement functions of the higher education program would move to the Treasury Department, leaving the higher education staff in the new institute to focus on matters of substance. In any case, as you can see, we believe that some extraordinary measure well short of actually merging the departments of labor and education is required to move the new agenda with dispatch.

Getting Consensus on the Vision.

Radical changes in attitudes, values and beliefs are required to move any combination of these agendas. The federal government will have little direct leverage on many of the actors involved. For much of what must be done, a new broad consensus will be required. What role can the new administration play in forging that consensus and how should it go about doing it?

At the narrowest level, the agenda cannot be moved unless there is agreement among the governors, the President and the Congress. Bill's role at the Charlottesville summit leads naturally to a reconvening of that group, perhaps with the addition of key members of Congress and others.¹³⁹

Appendix H

School-to-Work versus Freedom-to-Choose: The Competing Visions for Education

By Robert Holland

Enormous wealth and power are arrayed on the side of systematic School-to-Work—this is a battle of David vs. Goliath—but I have faith that good everyday people are going to help ensure that common sense and liberty ultimately triumph. But it's not going to be easy.

The School-to-Work mentality is pervasive, and becoming more so as it spreads to one school system after another. You know the buzzwords (or if you don't you will before you leave today): curriculum integration—the total merger of workforce-prep with academics—as well as career clusters, career majors, labor market data and economic development plans driving local curricula, “all means all,” certificates of mastery, skill certificates, career counseling, electronic portfolios, workforce smart cards, etc, etc—all those things that the feds insist are “voluntary”...until such time as a state actually accepts the federal money—and unfortunately all states, even Virginia, have found the lure of STW money irresistible.

School-to-Work is the central piece of the national school-restructuring movement that has been force-marching us through the 1990s toward the millennium. It is being pushed by Washington, by huge corporations, many of our governors (both Democratic and Republican), the National Education Association, and the education establishment in general—a powerful collection of elitists indeed.

Let's step back and look at the big picture for a minute before examining the details. There are competing visions for education; there always has been this intellectual tension and competition, but now, with its merger of education and labor policy, the national government is attempting to end the debate by fiat. Education is to be about training to meet government economic objectives. Period. Education is not to be about preparing a well-rounded, liberally educated individual to make his or her own decisions.

What is the STW vision? It is to use government power, in collaboration with big business, to create a system and fit the individual to it: STW is the key part of Hillary Clinton's vision of a governmental village to care for us all, literally, cradle to grave. Read her book, “It Takes a Village,” and you will find STW to be at the heart of her vision. Indeed, in 1990, she and her buddy in a future, failed bid to nationalize health care, Ira Magaziner, were the movers and shakers behind the foundation-funded national report that energized the STW movement. Then would come the Labor Department's series of a dozen SCANS reports (this was still in the Bush administration, mind you) that would define the workforce competencies that all schools should

Appendix H

teach to all children from kindergarten on. And then came Goals 2000, the National Skill Standards Board, the STWOA, recently the Workforce Investment Act, and the move toward full implementation.

To point this out is not to engage in gratuitous Hillary-bashing. Long before going to Washington, Mrs. Clinton had a clear and consistent vision of how to use big government—the village, the collective—to organize child care from age zero, education K-16, and indeed lifelong learning. You might say that she is the Clinton who has been faithful—at least to her ideology. She has a vision and she's worked singlemindedly for it.

The people who disappoint me most are the politicians who claim to be Jeffersonians or conservatives—yes, many them Republicans—and also some business executives, chamber of commerce officials, and the like, who have bought uncritically into the national STW concept. These are people who say they are for limited government, and, in the case of business leaders, who say they are opposed to heavyhanded government regulation; but STW is about big government management of the economy and the future workforce, the human capital—meaning our children and grandchildren. A conservative would have to be either ignorant of what STW really is all about or duplicitous to support this pervasive statist to merge education with labor policy.

The competing vision is the freedom to choose—to choose our educational pathways, our values, and our livelihoods—to be in command of our destiny. A book that bolsters the intellectual foundation of this vision is “Free to Choose,” by Milton and Rose Friedman. Dr. Milton Friedman is, of course, a Nobel laureate in economics. The concluding section of this book states the case for this vision quite eloquently: The greatness of the U.S. is that human freedom and economic freedom work together; the greatest threat to human freedom is the concentration of power. The Friedmans expressed the hope (this was two decades ago) that we are “coming to understand that good objectives can be perverted by bad means, that reliance on the freedom of people to control their own lives in accordance with their own values is the surest way to achieve the full potential of a great society.”

“Good objectives perverted by bad means”: That's a very telling phrase, and one relevant to the STW movement. I think most of us would concede that there are certain objectives of STW that are positive. We all want students to be able to earn rewarding careers after they leave school. We want them to acquire a work ethic from having had the discipline of obeying rules and meeting deadlines at home and in schoolwork; to have a working knowledge of the new technology; and to have an awareness of the full range of job opportunities. If they don't choose to or need to go on to a four-year college, it's important that they have the kind of education that will enable them to find employment or to enter on-the-job training. But if they aspire to a college education, they should not be denied a shot at one because of some arbitrary 80/20 rule (80 percent go to some form of voc-ed, only 20 percent to college) imposed by a STW presumed efficiency expert.

These are good objectives in some cases, yes, but then there are the dubious means: There is a common misconception that STW is primarily about expanded opportunities for the often-neglected youngsters not going on to college. But it's not. Nor is it about beefing up vo-tech programs so that there are a viable alternatives to

School-to-Work versus Freedom-to-Choose

general education. The national STW rationale is that it is supposed to alter radically the very purpose of education for all. It is a monolithic system, not a program. Curriculum integration is a vital part of STW; that means a total merger of academics with vocational education, and school-based learning into work-based learning. All teaching is supposed to be relevant to the workplace. I could conduct a reading of the School-to-Work Opportunities Act—which injects the federal government deeply into school curricula (an incursion that is both illegal and unconstitutional, by the way)—but perhaps more helpful would be a review of how STW is beginning to insinuate itself in school systems from coast to coast:

ITEM: In the San Angelo, Texas, school district, one of the vanguard STW systems, according to the Fort Worth Star-Telegram, stories read to kindergartners and first-graders now are saturated with career examples. There is “The True Story of the Three Little Pigs.” The director of STW proudly notes that the revised story is told by the wolf, who hires a lawyer—claiming the destruction of the pigs’ houses was caused by its sneezing, not intentional huffing and puffing. The wolf also—no surprise—blames a journalist for staining its reputation. The three little pigs, for their part, empower themselves by calling on a police officer to arrest the wolf. They also hire a construction worker to repair their homes.

All this cutesy career revisionism in stories raises other possibilities: Like the Red Guards in China’s Cultural Revolution, STW rewrite squads could fan out to children’s reading sections in libraries and bookstores everywhere and revise classic stories to comport with the regime’s edu-labor policy. For starters, they could revise “The Wizard of Oz.” They could have government-certified bricklayers preparing the yellow brick road and of course working by union rules. They could have the cowardly lion use the services of an elementary guidance counselor to elevate his self-esteem. They could use a firefighter douse the wicked witch. Or they could just have Dorothy and her companions e-mail their requests to the wonderful wizard, who of course would reside in the Imperial City of Washington, which makes our dreams all come true.

Are we really going to revise classic children’s stories for the sake of careerism at every stage of a child’s development? Can’t we just let children be children and enjoy fantasy without government-imposed realism?

ITEM: A distinguished college testing firm, ACT, now sells tests of workforce skills, called Work Keys, which are based on the federal government’s SCANS’ workforce competencies. These place a premium on personal characteristics like working in a group and following instructions—the so-called soft social skills. Some school districts are administering these assessments to all pupils, cost of \$50 per pupil. Some even are making the tests a graduation requirement.

Work Keys is popular as a sorting mechanism with some businesses that support STW right here in Virginia. A chemical company near here uses Work Keys to determine who can get apprenticeships for the position of chemical technician. Those who don’t make the Work Keys cut-off can take PLATO, a computer-based program, and then retest. Completion of the 3 1/2 year program in cooperation with a community college leads to certification of the young person as a chemical technician. Unanswered is the question of whether all will have jobs in that particular skill when they finish, or what happens if they change career goals in mid-stream.

Appendix H

Here's a sample of Work Keys' intellectual level: An audiotape of a phone conversation is played; Students are instructed that in order to transfer a message to press flash, the extension number, then flash again. Question: After pressing flash and the extension number what button do you press? Duh.

What's wrong with this picture? Is precious student time better spent learning to push the right buttons than studying the role of The Federalist Papers in the formation of the Republic? Are we to conclude that buttons are relevant but facts are outmoded, useless?

ITEM: Career inventories are being taken of children, starting in elementary school. These are computerized assessments of career possibilities. We are beginning to hear some weird results, especially as children are steered into career pathways as early as the eighth or ninth grades.

Just the other day, Fort Worth newspaper ran a story on STW getting cranked up in San Antonio. A student, Roland Tellez, who is 16, wants to go to college, and later down the road, he wants to be an agriculture teacher. He's made his own long-range plan; he has his dreams. But the school district wants him to commit to being a pig farmer. That's the choice the STW system has made for him, no doubt acting on local labor market data. But suppose a student does not wish to stay in the local labor market? Why should his dreams be contained within local boundaries?

ITEM: Consider a Milwaukee high school's use of block scheduling for STW career clustering. The school day is divided into four 80 minute blocks. As juniors, students begin working as apprentices in local businesses, using two of their 80 minute blocks. That leaves just two blocks for compressed academics, but that's okay because not much academics are left. Students at eighth grade choose a career cluster. Health and Human Services Cluster student takes such courses as food service, fashion and fabrics, parenthood education, and human diversity. No foreign language required, and core academic subjects are supposedly integrated into the vocational training.

So here at the 8th grade a student has committed to a very specific set of career skills; and his class schedule is built around it. What about the late bloomer, who may decide at age 17 or 18 he or she really wants to be a doctor or scientist or engineer?

ITEM: In California, a feature of STW is the emergence of career academies in heavily minority schools in inner cities—i.e., hospitality academies. The unspoken rationale behind STW and the equalized outcome-based reforms is that minorities will not be able to meet rigorous academic standards, so they must be tracked into skill-specific work. Pursuing ambitions to being engineers or scientists or other professionals is out. The tracking of inner-city youths into low-wage, low-skill jobs emits a distinct whiff of racism.

ITEM: This one, again, comes from Texas, which under Republican Governor George W. Bush, presumed presidential aspirant for 2000, has one of the most advanced STW schemes. Consider who's getting the best of this school-business partnership, as described recently by *The Wall Street Journal* (July 22, 1998): By arrangement between the Clarion Hotel and Plano Senior High School north of Dallas, students go to the hotel each morning—during school hours—to “dip strawberries in chocolate and other duties.” Instead of pay, the students receive class credit. “It's a cost savings to us,” chirps the hotel's manager. At no cost to the hotel, she marvels, students can be

School-to-Work versus Freedom-to-Choose

ordered to put “400 lemon wedges on glasses for a luncheon.” Said one student: It beats taking geometry, and anyway she might want to be a chef.

Who is getting shortchanged in this arrangement? Children are working for no wage and are losing out on their opportunity for a complete education. By the way, whatever happened to child labor laws?

Is there a middle way? A good friend who agrees with, at best, about half what I write and who clearly thinks STW has something going for it, asked me that question the other day. Is there a way to combine the best of STW objectives with personal economic and educational freedom? To blend STW into an academics-first approach? This is a good question, and my answer is yes, theoretically this ought to be possible.

Indeed, when Virginia (unwisely or wisely; unwisely, I believe) accepted STW planning grants, it set out to reach this agreeable blend of STW and free choice. The nationally acclaimed academic standards would be at the heart of Virginia STW. There would be apprenticeships in participating industries but these would be after-school and entirely voluntary. There would be scholarships to help needy children pursue postsecondary occupational goals. But the curriculum would not be dumbed down for the sake of careerism. There would not be systematic elements like career counseling for grade-schoolers and career majors required for all.

Well, the National STW Office, which is at the center of national edu-labor policy, makes plain in every day in every way that it does not smile on any middle way, any moderation. (Check out its website at stw.ed.gov; you’ll find a template for implementing STW in localities, and much propaganda for marketing STW to the public). The demands it makes as Virginia is seeking a full implementation grant, with a deadline of September 30, include “alignment” of education reform, workforce development and economic development strategies...the integration of academic and vocational education...implementation of a skill certificate resulting from a student’s completion of a career major/cluster...” and so on, *ad nauseam*. In other words, in the memorable title of a workshop I attended at a national STW brainstorming session in Orlando, “It takes a village to career a child.” Education must be redefined as workforce training. And get this: National STW wants to know, “How does data obtained by [The state’s Department of] Commerce and Industry’s efforts lead to local awareness of labor market data, particularly in the selection of career offerings?” In other words, how government edulaborcrats read the tea leaves of a fast-changing job market should determine what children study in school.

Then there are the big-business boosters of STW. We should assume self-interest, always, in assessing what comes out of corporate boardrooms. But this much needs to be said: What’s good for big business is not necessarily good for America’s boys and girls.

ITEM: A CEO of a major corporation operating in Virginia, discussing STW, told me bluntly: “We want to produce workhorses, not racehorses.” He was endorsing STW for his company’s benefit. My question is, What happens to the potential racehorses? How many children do we sell short?

ITEM: In a book about the so-called New Basics—the “soft skills” like working in a TQM team—two top corporate executives (whose company also is a major economic player in Virginia) argue that facts are not important anymore; we will learn

Appendix H

what we need from the Internet. “Learning to learn” is what’s important—so-called “accessing skills.” But how difficult are they to learn, really? And don’t you need to know what you’re looking for before going Net surfing?

In his brilliant book *The Schools We Need & Why We Don’t Have Them*, Professor E. D. Hirsch, Jr., documented how this fallacious “learning to learn” notion bubbled out of the so-called progressive-education philosophy of the 1920s and has ruled leading schools of education and retarded American public education for 80 years. It is ironic that in the name of education “reform” so many corporate moguls have bought into the old Deweyite dogma of teaching social skills and applied learning.

Of course knowledge is crucial; children need a foundation, a context, before they go on to problem-solving and discovery. You would think that it would be just common sense that one builds a foundation for a home before putting on the roof. And despite the mystique of the Information Age, learning to surf the Internet is not difficult for a literate and reasonably well-informed person. Take it from an ancient newspaperman who has gone through sweeping technological changes along with his associates and managed so far to survive.

I should note that many business leaders—especially owners of small to medium businesses—do not agree with the STW careerism. They would prefer students who have a solid grounding in academics; they say they can train them in work skills on the job.

This is the heart of the debate: What is the purpose of education, Is it to empower the individual or to advance collective interests of the governmental “village”?

A STW supporter, the president of an Arlington, Texas, manufacturer said, “The only objective for education is work. Nobody gets educated for the sheer joy of being educated.” I strongly, even vehemently disagree with that. We are not defined wholly by the work we do—that is only one part of our being. Another purpose of education is to prepare us to be good citizens in a free society. But even beyond that, education helps us reach fulfillment in our private lives—it expands our choices, helps us to be constructively skeptical individuals who get the most out of life. Learning to appreciate the romantic poets may have absolutely nothing to do with preparing us for work, but helps us lead a well-rounded life, to ponder questions of truth and beauty.

F. A. Hayek, author of *The Road to Serfdom*, warned three decades ago of the danger of a system like STW that yokes education to a managed economy:

We are not educating people for a free society if we train technicians who expect to be “used,” who are incapable of finding their proper niche themselves, and who regard it as someone else’s responsibility to ensure the appropriate use of their ability or skill.

With regard to the competing vision, the free-to-choose vision, I am speaking more broadly than just about vouchers, tuition tax credits, charter schools, or education savings accounts—experiments that are promising but that are beyond the scope of this conference. There is choice in a more universal sense with regard to work. Dorothy Sayers expressed it well in her superb book, *The Mind of the Maker*: “We cannot deal with industrialism or unemployment,” Miss Sayers wrote, “unless we lift work out of the economic, political, and social spheres, and consider it also in terms of the work’s worth and the love of the work, as being in itself a sacrament and manifestation of man’s creative energy.”

No government can command such a joyous attitude or harness such energy to run its economic engines. No wonder, as Miss Sayers noted, “the fully industrialized socialist state must resort to forced labor to keep the machines at work.” Only when

Appendix I

Resources

Minnesota School-To-Work Initiative, Implementation Proposal, August 30, 1996

This is the grant application (contract) Minnesota made with the federal government to implement the federal School-to-Work system under the Federal School-to-Work Opportunities Act of 1994, in exchange for receiving federal dollars.

Copies are available from:

Minnesota Department of Children, Families and Learning
1500 Highway 36 West
Roseville, MN 55113-4266

Cost: \$5.00

Minnesota Goals 2000 Education Improvement Plan, October, 1995

This is Minnesota's grant application (contract) with the federal government to implement the federal Goals 2000: Educate America Act of 1994, in exchange for receiving federal dollars. This contract describes the Profile of Learning in detail and describes it as meeting all the federal requirements for Goals 2000.

Copies are available from:

Minnesota Educational Services
Capitol View Center
70 West Co. Rd B2
Little Canada, MN 55117-1402

651-415-5379

651-451 5508 Fax

800-652-9024

E-Mail: jsteinbr@eta.k12.mn.us

Cost: \$25.00

Appendix I

SCANS Reports

What Work Requires of Schools

This is the initial SCANS report. The report defines the five competencies and the three-part foundation that constitute SCANS know-how (61 pages).

Single copies are available from:

National Technical Information Service (NTIS)

Operations Division

Springfield, VA 22151

800/553-6847

NTIS number: PB92-146711 (*Cost: \$19.50 plus \$4.00 handling*)

Skills and Tasks for Jobs

This SCANS report is designed as a resource for educators or employers to use in developing curriculum for teaching the SCANS competencies and foundation skills, or for use by people who counsel students in schools or workplaces. The report contains all the descriptive information obtained by SCANS in its job analysis. (535 pages)

There are over 900 tasks in the volume.

Single copies are available from:

National Technical Information Service (NTIS)

Operations Division

Springfield, VA 22151

800/553-6847

NTIS number: PB92-181379 (*Cost: \$52.00 plus \$6.00 handling*)

Teaching the SCANS Competencies

This report provides expanded definitions of the five SCANS competencies as well as the key concepts involved in incorporating them into the school curriculum. Approximately 10 pages are devoted to each competency. Sample assessment items are also included (180 pages).

This report is available from:

Government Printing Office 202/512-1800 or fax 212/512-2250

Stock number: 029-000-00438-2 (*Cost: \$11.00*)

SCANS Blueprint for Action: Building Community Coalitions

This is a 64-page national roundup of schools and workplaces that put SCANS principles into practice.

This booklet is available from:

ETA Dissemination Unit

U.S. Department of Labor

Rm. N5637

200 Constitution Ave. N. W.

Washington, DC 20210

202/219-7664