



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20202

1.4C-4
Library

ASSISTANT SECRETARY
FOR EDUCATION RESEARCH AND IMPROVEMENT

JUN 28 1983

Archives

Dr. John E. Anderson
President
Christopher Newport College
50 Shoe Lane
Newport News, VA 23606

Dear Dr. Anderson:

Recently Congressman Herbert Bateman published in the Congressional Record my speech given at Christopher Newport College in March of this year. I thought you would enjoy seeing a copy of it. I have also forwarded copies to Drs. Robert Hermann and James Morris.

I enjoyed very much my visit to your campus. I am pleased and encouraged by the progress made by urban institutes of education, and CNC seems particularly adept at meeting the unique challenges presented to the students, professors, and administrators. It would be appreciated if you could bring this recognition of Christopher Newport College in the Congressional Record to the attention of your faculty.

Thank you again for the opportunity to visit Christopher Newport College. I regret we didn't have the chance to meet.

Sincerely,

Donald J. Senese

member of the minority staff who will retire on June 3 after 31 years of distinguished service on the committee staff. She has served this House for a total of 38 years when her work for several Members of Congress is counted.

A graduate of Blackstone Junior College and Virginia Commercial College, Mrs. Layton first came to the Hill in 1945 and to the committee in 1947. At that time there were only four staff members, including Mary Layton, but an enormous amount of work was done by a staff which was tiny by today's standards.

Mary brought several unique qualities to the committee staff, which have been admired by countless people whose dealings with the committee have given them the opportunity to gain the friendship of Mary Layton. Foremost among these qualities is the southern charm of her native Lynchburg, Va. Mary has a sense of style and good taste which is unequalled in Washington.

Another unique quality which Mary will take with her when she leaves is her recollection of the history and lore of the committee going back to the end of World War II. This is more than an ability to tell entertaining stories. It is the institutional history which is relied upon daily and which cannot be replaced. During her tenure Mary has seen every Member of the present Banking committee take his or her place in the lower row among the incoming freshmen.

It gives me great pleasure to honor Mary today and to tell my colleagues and Mary's loving friends some good news to temper the sadness with which we anticipate her departure. Mary is blessed with good health and is looking forward to an active retirement, with extensive travel, vigorous gardening, and the opportunity to spend more time with her family and friends.●

MX MISSILE

HON. MIKE SYNAR

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 25, 1983

● Mr. SYNAR. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the House voted on the President's proposal to base the MX missile in existing Minuteman silos. It is important to point out that this was not a vote on the original concept of the MX. That is, it was not a vote to build a survivable, land-based missile that could accurately retaliate against any Soviet attack. Rather, it was a vote on whether or not to place the MX in highly vulnerable Minuteman silos that could be eliminated in a Soviet first strike.

The fundamental question I asked myself before this vote was this: Will the MX, based in Minuteman silos, add to our national security? The

answer was unequivocally "no." The MX will be just as vulnerable to Soviet attack as our existing land-based missiles. As my friend Senator DALE BUMPERS of Arkansas said the other day, "The Soviet Union won't even have to retarget their missiles." We will be just as vulnerable to a Soviet first strike as ever, and the "window of vulnerability" will still be wide open.

I support weapons that do improve our deterrent capabilities. I support the B-1B, the cruise missile, the Pershing II, the Trident, and many, many others that have a well-defined and important role in our national defense. I also support the President's recommendation that we begin moving away from MX-like weapons, and begin developing smaller, single-warhead missiles. I wholeheartedly support the development of the proposed Midgetman missile.

I do not, and will not, vote to give the President a blank check to buy every weapons system that comes down the pike regardless of its effectiveness. The Scowcroft Commission says the MX will cost \$15 billion—others say over \$20 billion. Either way, we should be spending that money on weapons that improve our deterrence, and improve our national security.●

EDUCATING FOR EXCELLENCE

HON. HERBERT H. BATEMAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1983

● Mr. BATEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the opportunity to appear on "Crossroads: Decision for the Eighties," a program produced by the Center for Excellence, an educational television network, and hosted by Dr. James Morris, professor of history at Christopher Newport College. I am proud that both the center and the college are in the First Congressional District of Virginia, which I represent.

When I appeared, Dr. Morris had just completed a program discussing the requirements placed on our educational system by the current revolution in information processing technology. Mr. John Curtis, founder and president of the center, and Dr. Donald J. Senese, Assistant Secretary for Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education, were guests on that program.

Dr. Senese earlier delivered a statement, "Education for Excellence in a Technological Age," to a group of faculty and students of Christopher Newport College. Given the timeliness and importance of this topic, I want to share Dr. Senese's comments with my colleagues.

Good Afternoon. It is a real pleasure to be here with all of you today in the beautiful and historic Newport News area and at one of the outstanding educational institutions in the Commonwealth of Virginia—Christopher Newport College.

When we look at the defense of the United States, we must look to this area

which has such a critical role—a key area protecting our Atlantic coast, and the home of the ship building industry on which we depend for such vital construction as our aircraft carriers.

Within the midst of this strategic location, I must also express my pleasure at the invitation from Christopher Newport College. While the Commonwealth of Virginia has many old and venerable and excellent institutions of higher education, Christopher Newport College has come to the forefront of educational excellence within two decades. Yours is an urban institution not only serving the traditional student but providing great services to the non-traditional student. Your institution represents the view that education has no career or age boundaries; you cater to all those who wish to learn.

I am especially pleased to see my former colleague from my teaching days, Dr. Bob Hermann, head of your Psychology Department. Bob is an excellent educator and you are fortunate to have him as a member of your faculty.

I would like to discuss with you today some of the work and important initiatives which represent the current focus within the U.S. Department of Education, especially the Office of Educational Research and Improvement. Of major impact to all aspects and on all levels of education are the new developments in technology.

Our country, indeed, all developed nations of the world, are undergoing a shift from operating as an industrial economy to becoming an information-service economy. The technological revolution is not in the future—it is now. From videogames to the microcomputer to additional uses of the silicon chip, technology is changing our way of life.

Technology and its applications to education are a major policy concern of the U.S. Department of Education. On June 22, 1982, at a national teleconference held in Washington, D.C., U.S. Secretary of Education Terrel H. Bell said:

"The growing computer industry has been a major cause of the increased demand for individuals with basic and higher level skills, particularly in the related fields of math and science. We should assist school districts to explore uses of technology to improve skill instruction, to prepare for employment, and to increase the productivity of teaching."

Dealing with technology is one of the most significant challenges educators have faced in modern times. It is important for those of us who are in the field of education to at least look at the technology available to use today, and to consider the even more sophisticated technology that is rapidly becoming available.

We must deal with the impact that technology will have upon the generation of students now in school. These children and young people will be the first generation to live out their adult lives in what is now being referred to as "the information age." How we act upon this knowledge, and prepare today's students for this inevitability, will determine their ability to cope with the world at hand as well as our nation's ability to maintain its status among nations.

Education is the key to dealing with technology. We cannot ignore the developments we see around us. As educators we can not allow the complexity of the situation to overwhelm us into indifference.

The Office of Educational Research and Improvement has been given the lead role in implementing Secretary Bell's initiative in educational technology; we have been working with other offices in the U.S. Edu-

cation Department to identify uses and the potential of technology to improve education.

OERI sponsored a conference in Pittsburgh this past November bringing together over forty experts whose task was to identify the key research issues for computers in the fields of math, science, reading, and writing. I believe the final report will be of tremendous help to educators.

Several of OERI's components have been very active in a variety of projects and programs directly related to work with educational technology. Among them the Office of Libraries and Learning Technologies, the National Center for Education Statistics, and the National Diffusion Network.

The Office of Libraries and Learning Technologies is working with state and local educators to assist them in identifying the issues and opportunities in instructional technology. Our Office of Libraries and Learning Technologies is also working with the U.S. Education Department's Regional Offices to assist dissemination projects in technology and to provide opportunities for teacher training in computer literacy.

Presently, the National Center for Education Statistics, is holding meetings of experts to examine the whole question of computer literacy.

The National Diffusion Network has been active in identifying outstanding programs in technology which would be beneficial to school districts throughout our country. They have established "Lighthouse Schools" in an attempt to focus on outstanding applications of technology to classroom and educational needs. The Lighthouses are hosting visitors from all over the country and providing material on their adaptations of technology to individual school use. We have received a great response from these programs. I have had the opportunity to personally visit four of the five Lighthouses currently in operation and I have been impressed with the effectiveness each has displayed with its particular use of technology. Some of the applications include:

A computer assisted instruction program developed to assist in the improvement of basic skills instruction for compensatory education populations;

A regional alternative occupation education program in high technology for secondary school age youth, some of whom were previous school dropouts;

Computer assisted instruction for secondary mathematics courses.

Indeed, education for a technology era is an important priority, however, it is not our only focus. In fact, we cannot look at technology alone. We must consider it in relation to other problems and facts of education, particularly the quality and excellence of education.

A few years back, critics viewing problems in education posed the question "Why Can't Johnny Read?" Professor Eric Zorn updated the education crisis in an article in the Chicago Tribune (August 12, 1981) when he related this problem to the technology age. His article entitled "If Johnny Can't Read, How Will He Plug In To The Electronic World?" He said:

"You can call him Johnny: long-suffering mascot of national illiteracy; standard bearer of our collective disgrace; blot on Western culture.

"He still can't read very well, his writing is getting worse, and he's about to be victimized by one of the most dramatic undertakings in the history of civilization: the Information Revolution, a watershed in human development to compare with the Industrial Revolution 150 years ago and the invention of the printing press in 1440.

"During the projected Information Revolution of the next 20 years, Johnny will be overrun by those marching to the muted, staccato drumbeats of clicking electronic keyboards.

"The common person supposedly will have access to the equivalent of 10,000 mental slaves. Money will be made and business conducted by buying, selling, and trafficking in information and its complicated delivery systems.

"The already evident truth will become more obvious: Power, for individuals and nations, is knowledge.

"Where will that leave Johnny, the person who does not have a functional ability to read or write any language?

"He will find that there are fewer jobs for unskilled workers. His world will be highly complex and interconnected, and daily life will demand control of sophisticated cable and computer technology; he will be unable to take advantage of this vast technology with his so-so-skills.

"Self-styled experts will speculate endlessly "Why Johnny Can't Log On."

His prognosis is an apt one. No matter what other programs or initiatives we might attempt to implement in the educational arena we must not ignore basic education. Without a concern for a conscious attempt to have excellence in education, other efforts will be futile.

U.S. schools are doing an impressive job of educating many students from a variety of economic and ethnic backgrounds; we are doing great in quantity but not very well in quality. As that great scholar of the American educational system Dr. Russell Kirk has noted: "A great many are schooled; very few are educated."

In his State of the Union address this year, President Ronald Reagan focused on this very issue. In urging a widening of our education horizons, the President stated:

"We Americans are still the world's technological leader in most fields. We must keep that edge, and to do so we need to begin renewing the basics—starting with our educational system. While we grew complacent, others have acted. Japan, with a population only about half the size of ours, graduates from its universities more engineers than we do. If a child does not receive adequate math and science teaching by the age of 16, he or she has lost the chance to be a scientist or engineer.

"We must join together—parents, teachers, grassroots groups, organized labor, and the business community—to revitalize American education by sitting a standard of excellence."

In examining the question of excellence, one might ask just what comprises excellence in education. And, to be sure, that is not an easy question to answer. The phrase itself is simple enough. But the implications which it holds for educators who are attempting to deal with modern day problems of education indicate a highly complex problem.

Over the past decade or two, many people, both within and outside the educational community, have come to question the quality of the education being provided by most of our schools. And, their concerns are not without foundation. Unfortunately, certain factors indicate that the education being offered to most young people is not what it should be.

Employers are expressing disappointment with the secondary school and even college graduates who are not or have recently entered the workforce. A high percentage of these recent graduates have not mastered even the basic skills. Many have difficulty with spelling, use of correct grammar, and simple mathematical computations. Many

could be defined as functional illiterates. Whatever title we might designate for these unfortunate individuals is unimportant, the fact is that individuals who lack the basic competencies do not form the basis of a trainable, appropriate workforce needed by business and industry to meet our nation's goals.

The problems experienced by such persons are tragic for them on a human level to say nothing of the dangerous position in which it places our nation.

The success of our educational system is intimately tied to our national security. For the past decade, Scholastic Aptitude Test scores have shown a decline. Last year for the first time since the decline began, there was a very slight upturn. A number of individuals would like to believe that the scores have bottomed out, that improvement is already here. Hopefully, such an assessment is correct. But whether or not the upturn is just a one time improvement or the beginning of a definite turn around that will show increases in future years as well, the low level which these scores have reached nationwide indicate a long uphill battle to really signify any real improvement in the schools.

It has taken some courage to acknowledge and confront the fact that something is wrong with our schools. Most of us have always accepted, without question, that our nation's schools were engaged in the business of education. We assumed that students were being taught, in a superior fashion, reading, writing, and arithmetic with proper doses of history and other academic disciplines part of a rigorous curriculum.

Given the opportunity, most young people want to learn, their education should be a rewarding experience. Every single student enrolled in school should have the opportunity to receive an excellent education, one which provides them further education, gainful employment, and a fulfilling life-style.

Recognizing the importance of education, and concerned about its current direction, the Reagan Administration has given a return to excellence a high priority.

A major difficulty in attempting to remedy current problems in the schools is that of understanding just what it is that the schools aren't doing. Why are they failing? What is wrong with the educational programs that they offer?

In order to do this, and consequently improve the educational atmosphere within such schools, we need to identify what it is that constitutes an effective school. There are such schools. There are schools which go beyond the average in motivating and academically preparing their students.

The National Institute of Education, a component of OERI, has been engaged in looking at what is needed in order to improve the instructional effectiveness of schools. While there are many and varied characteristics of schools which display a consistent degree of instructional effectiveness there appear to be some bottomline characteristics which run as a common thread throughout these schools: For example:

Strong administrative leadership by the school principal;

Teacher expectations that students can reach high levels of achievement, regardless of pupil background;

School-wide emphasis on basic skills.

One would think that all schools should possess such characteristics. Apparently some, in fact many, don't. Perhaps, also, there are other ingredients or combinations of ingredients which make a school "work"—a school that is able to provide the

type of educational atmosphere in which students succeed year after year.

Perhaps by identifying these schools and by giving some exposure to their programs, other schools could benefit. Effective schools seem to be the exception rather than the standard. This needs to be changed. School officials need to be exposed to successful schools, the programs that they offer, and the way in which they offer them. This would enable other schools and school districts to replicate successful programs if they met a particular school system's needs. It could also enable colleges and universities to better adapt their coursework and programs for the secondary graduates who will be attending their institutions of higher learning. With better prepared secondary students, college coursework can be improved.

As part of a program to identify schools which have programs that could be identified as excellent, Secretary of Education Bell is implementing a program to acknowledge outstanding public secondary schools throughout the country. A separate program will be initiated for recognition of outstanding private schools.

Fifteen-member panels of experts in the field of education, made up of individuals not affiliated with the Federal government, will review nominees for recognition of their school programs. Public high schools, as well as middle and junior high schools, will be nominated by each state's chief school officer.

The attributes for an effective school which will be judged by the panel include: clear academic and behavior goals; order and discipline; high expectations for students; teacher efficacy; rewards and incentives for teachers and students; positive school environment; administrative leadership; community support; extent of concentration on academic learning time; frequent and monitored homework; regular and frequent monitoring of student progress; well-coordinated curriculum; variety of teaching strategies; and opportunities for student responsibility.

Those selected by the panel will receive public recognition. They will be awarded a plaque in honor of their outstanding achievement or achievements.

It is hoped that national attention will be focused on some of the good qualities of some of the public schools throughout the nation. While it is understood that not everyone will agree on the qualities that cause one school to be better than another, attempting to look at the question is a step in the right direction.

If we can focus attention on what is right with American education, perhaps it will have positive ramifications. In introducing this program, Secretary Bell said:

"... if we also spark a little debate or controversy over the qualities that make a school stand out above the others, so much the better..."

Also very much concerned with the issue of what makes a good school is the Secretary's National Commission on Excellence in Education. Hard at work for over a year, their work will be completed by the end of March. The Commission is providing what is probably one of the most comprehensive, intensive looks at education, throughout the country, that has ever been done.

It would be against the policies of the Reagan administration which strongly supports each state's authority to operate and administer its own school system, for the Commission to attempt to set any type of National standards. It will not. What it will do, as charged by Secretary Bell, is to make "practical recommendations for action" to

public officials, educators, parents, and others who set school policies.

Usually it is the students in the schools who take the tests—today, I believe that we, the educators, are also being tested. Can we turn things around? Can our schools once again provide an outstanding example to the rest of the world of the highest standards of educational principles and practices? With our shift in emphasis to excellence, I believe that we have started down the road to achieving that goal. Let us not get stuck along the way but more full speed ahead. We will all benefit from the results.

There is an important role for institutions like Christopher Newport College. We need to go beyond the stage where elementary and secondary schools blame colleges for lowering admission standards and the college claim that has only done so in response to the poor academic products being turned out by our elementary and secondary schools.

We all have an interest in a strong educational system. This Administration has continued student aid programs seeking only to target them more carefully to the students who need funds. Yet, there is also an emphasis on an important American trait and quality—self-help. The Administration's Education Savings Account plan is designed to help parents save for the college education of their child or children. It will also have the effect of assisting our economy by adding to the pool of savings for our nation. We need to increase this pool if we are to meet the economic challenges of investment for future prosperity.

While we encourage students to attend college, we must guarantee that this education must be worth something. As I mentioned earlier, we have entered an age of technology. We must be willing to use this important tool at all levels to improve student learning, increase teacher productivity, and develop more effective schools. We must be able to reach out to the traditional and non-traditional student to prepare them for the great challenges of tomorrow.

We are entering a period in our history—especially through the block grant proposals of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act—which gives State and local educators a greater voice in decision-making. Colleges and universities can play a crucial role in assisting and preparing educators to make the correct decisions and exercise new responsibilities.

It has been a pleasure to be with you today and I wish Christopher Newport College well as it pursues the goals of educational excellence and quality.●

U.S. POLICY ON APARTHEID

HON. STEPHEN J. SOLARZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1983

● Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, today the New York Times published an editorial eloquently asserting the pressing need for the United States to make clear its opposition to South Africa's apartheid system. Since many of us are deeply concerned about the horrendous results of this systematic, institutionalized system of racial discrimination, I ask that this timely editorial be reprinted in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Congress is currently considering a number of bills relating to South

Africa. They include legislation introduced by Representative DIXON, H.R. 1083, requiring the United States to oppose IMF assistance to South Africa; Representative GRAY, H.R. 1392, prohibiting new investment in South Africa; and Representative RANGEL, H.R. 1020, prohibiting the export to South Africa of nuclear material and technology. In addition, I recently introduced H.R. 1693, which places certain restrictions on or economic relationship with South Africa.

I would like to urge my colleagues to give careful consideration to all of these bills, and to join me in working for the passage of legislation in this House that would indicate to South Africa and the world that the United States is willing to act against the day-to-day horrors of the apartheid system.

[Editorial from the New York Times, May 26, 1983]

South Africa can segregate its races, but it cannot segregate itself from the violence its policies breed. This is the meaning of last weekend's terror bombing in Pretoria, which claimed 17 lives, white and black, and left 217 wounded. Bombs beget bombs, and South Africa has compounded a gruesome deed by losing its warplanes against Mozambique, insisting that its targets are guerrilla installations.

One can mourn all the victims without indulging the injured innocence of South Africa's white rulers. To the challenge of racial violence they offer a single explanation: It's a Communist plot, backed by the Soviet Union and carried out by the outlawed African National Congress. And they propose a single remedy: an eye for an eye.

But the true, and truly evil, explanation is homegrown. It is the system of apartheid, which has the appalling effect of making 21 million blacks strangers in their own land. For all the years of talk of power-sharing or conciliation, in every vital respect power in South Africa remains the monopoly of 4.5 million whites. The huge black majority is left with "citizenship" rights in patchwork homelands that Pretoria pretends are sovereign states.

Apartheid—apartness—means that, theoretically, blacks must carry passbooks and are forbidden to spend more than 72 hours in white urban areas. But if apartheid were literally enforced, it would bankrupt a white economy grown prosperous on cheap black labor. And yet for a black to question this system is to risk jail, torture or death.

Reflecting on the French Revolution, Burke warned: "A state without the means of some change is without the means of its own conservation." But in the name of conservatism, South Africa's rulers have imposed a radical system that denies the majority the hope of real and peaceful change. Then Communists are blamed for the explosive result.

These truths are apparent to the Reagan Administration, which has applied the soft nudge of "constructive engagement" to the hard rulers in Pretoria. The State Department evenhandedly deplores all violence, putting the desperation of victims on the same plane as the brutality of masters. But for all this restraint, Washington has yet to wrest a single tangible benefit in the form of change from the South Africans or in Namibia, which they illegally occupy.

If the latest bloodletting fails to sober Pretoria, it ought to impress Washington. "I weep for my country," said Bishop Desmond