Richard W. Riley

Former U.S. Secretary of Education
Former Governor of South Carolina

Nominated by
Cynthia Rudrud

Richard W. Riley
Former U.S. Secretary of Education
Former Governor of South Carolina

Wherever he goes, Richard Wilson Riley – former U. S. Secretary of Education and former Governor of South Carolina – wins respect for his integrity, principled leadership, commitment to children and passion for education.

After winning national recognition for his successful education improvements in South Carolina during the 1980s, Riley was chosen by President Clinton in December 1992 to serve in his Cabinet as the nation's chief education officer. During the President's first term, Secretary Riley helped launch historic initiatives to raise academic standards; improve instruction for the poor and disadvantaged; expand grant and loan programs to help more Americans go to college; prepare young people for the world of work; and improve teaching. He also created the Partnership for Family Involvement in Education, which today includes more than 8,000 groups.

Riley was so successful that, after the 1996 election, President Clinton asked him to continue leading his national crusade for excellence in education. During the second term, Secretary Riley helped win a historic F.C.C. ruling to give schools and libraries deep discounts for Internet access and telecommunications services (the E-rate) and major improvements in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. He gained increased Federal support to help all children master the basics of reading and math; make schools safer; reduce class size in grades 1-3 by hiring 100,000 more quality teachers; modernize and build new schools to meet record-breaking student enrollments; help students learn to use computers; expand after-school programs; foster college preparation and access for underprivileged students; make post-secondary education more affordable; and promote lifelong learning. Riley also focused national attention on the need for people of all ages in America to learn more than one language and for increased international education exchanges in the United States and abroad in order to take advantage of the opportunities presented in the global society of the 21st Century.

Dick Riley also has been appointed Distinguished Professor and Trustee at his alma mater, Furman University, and serves as Advisory Board Chair of the Richard W. Riley Institute of Government, Politics and Public Leadership there. Additionally, Riley serves on the boards of South Carolina's University Center in Greenville and Winthrop University, where the School of Education is named in his honor. He has been named Distinguished Professor at the University of South Carolina and Distinguished Senior Fellow at NAFSA: Association of International Educators. He also speaks, provides leadership and serves in an advisory and collaborative capacity with many other entities to promote education improvement in the United States and abroad.

Dick Riley was born in Greenville County, South Carolina. He graduated *cum laude* from Furman University in 1954 and then served as an officer aboard a U. S. Navy minesweeper. In 1959, Riley received a law degree from the University of South Carolina. He served as a South Carolina state representative and state senator from 1963-1977, was elected Governor in 1978 and reelected in 1982. Riley is married to the former Ann Osteen Yarborough. They have four children and thirteen grandchildren.

Submitted by: Cynthia Rudrud

RAYMOND S. KELLIS HIGH SCHOOL
8990 W. ORANGEWOOD
GLENDALE, ARIZONA 85305
(623) 412-5425 FAX (623) 412-5447

June 8, 2005

Dear Distinguished Jurors for the Brock International Prize in Education:

This portfolio is a collection of biographical information, a description of accomplishments in international education diplomacy and speeches of the Honorable Richard W. Riley, former U. S. Secretary of Education and former Governor of South Carolina, and my nominee for the Brock International Prize in Education. As Governor, Riley won national recognition for his efforts to improve education in South Carolina. As Secretary, he moved American education towards high academic standards, improved instruction for the disadvantaged, helped more Americans go to college with expanded loan programs and better prepared young people for the world of work. He also created the Partnership for Family Involvement in Education, which today includes more than 8,000 groups. Riley is noted for supporting reduced class size in grades one through three by hiring more quality teachers and for modernizing and building new schools to meet increasing student enrollments.

Secretary Riley was the first Secretary of Education to emphasize the importance of International Education, coordinating international partnerships around the world. He is a distinguished senior fellow at NAFSA and was honorary co-chair of the NAFSA Strategic Task Force on Study Abroad in 2003. He is passionate in his belief that today's generation must receive an international education in order to lead our country in the future.

In addition to his many contributions to education over the past half decade, Richard Riley is a supporter and cheerleader of teachers, principals, students and parents. He has forged a connection to the world of teaching and learning that few with his global view and elevated positions manage to attain. He is a stellar candidate for the Brock International Prize in Education.

I look forward to meeting with all of you in September.

Sincerely,

Cynthia Rudrud

Cynthia Rudrud

RICHARD W. RILEY
Former U. S. Secretary of Education
Former Governor of South Carolina

The *Christian Science Monitor* said that many Americans regard Dick Riley as "one of the great statesmen of education in this (20th) century." David Broder, columnist for *The Washington Post*, called him one of the "most decent and honorable people in public life." And when Riley was Governor, he was so popular that the people amended the South Carolina Constitution to enable him to run for a second term.

Wherever he goes, Richard Wilson Riley – former U. S. Secretary of Education and former Governor of South Carolina – wins respect for his integrity, principled leadership, commitment to children and passion for education.

After winning national recognition for his successful education improvements in South Carolina during the 1980s, Riley was chosen by President Clinton in December 1992 to serve in his Cabinet as the nation's chief education officer. During the President's first term, Secretary Riley helped launch historic initiatives to raise academic standards; improve instruction for the poor and disadvantaged; expand grant and loan programs to help more Americans go to college; prepare young people for the world of work; and improve teaching. He also created the Partnership for Family Involvement in Education, which today includes more than 8,000 groups.

Riley gets things done by reaching out to all citizens. He prefers partnership to partisanship. Of his quiet, self-effacing style, the *National Journal* wrote, "He doesn't grab headlines or clamor for credit . . . But, inevitably, Riley reaches his goal."

Riley was so successful that, after the 1996 election, President Clinton asked him to continue leading his national crusade for excellence in education. During the second term, Secretary Riley helped win a historic F.C.C. ruling to give schools and libraries deep discounts for Internet access and telecommunications services (the E-rate) and major improvements in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. He gained increased Federal support to help all children master the basics of reading and math; make schools safer; reduce class size in grades 1-3 by hiring 100,000 more quality teachers; modernize and build new schools to meet record-breaking student enrollments; help students learn to use computers; expand after-school programs; foster college preparation and access for underprivileged students; make post-secondary education more affordable; and promote lifelong learning. Riley also focused national attention on the need for people of all ages in America to learn more than one language and for increased international education exchanges in the United States and abroad in order to take advantage of the opportunities presented in the global society of the 21st Century.

Since leaving his national post in January 2001, Riley has rejoined the law firm of Nelson Mullins Riley & Scarborough with more than 300 attorneys in offices throughout South Carolina and North Carolina, as well as in Atlanta and Washington, D.C.

Dick Riley also has been appointed Distinguished Professor and Trustee at his alma mater, Furman University, and serves as Advisory Board Chair of the Richard W. Riley Institute of Government, Politics and Public Leadership there. Additionally, Riley serves on the boards of South Carolina's University Center in Greenville and Winthrop University, where the School of Education is named in his honor. He has been named Distinguished Professor at the University of South Carolina and Distinguished Senior Fellow at NAFSA: Association of International Educators. He also speaks, provides leadership and serves in an advisory and collaborative capacity with many other entities to promote education improvement in the United States and abroad.

Dick Riley was born in Greenville County, South Carolina. He graduated *cum laude* from Furman University in 1954 and then served as an officer aboard a U. S. Navy minesweeper. In 1959, Riley received a law degree from the University of South Carolina. He served as a South Carolina state representative and state senator from 1963-1977, was elected Governor in 1978 and reelected in 1982. Riley is married to the former Ann Osteen Yarborough. They have four children and thirteen grandchildren.

(as of Feb, 2005)

Richard W. Riley

Boards, Commissions, other service

Beginning January, 2001

ACT, Board of Directors, 2002-
Carnegie Corporation of New York, Board of Trustees, 2004-
Coca-Cola Education Advisory Council, Founding Member, 2001-
Council for School & Business Partnerships, Chair, 2003-
Furman University, Distinguished Professor and Board of Trustees, 2001-
Chair, Academic Standards Committee
Gates Foundation Education Advisory Council, 2001-
Horry County (Myrtle Beach, SC) Early College Laboratory High School, Bd of Adv Chair, 2005-
KnowledgeWorks Foundation, Board of Trustees, 2001-
Laureate, Inc. (corporate), Board of Directors, 2001-
Chair, Nominating and Governance Committee
Leeds Weld & Co. (private), Board of Advisors, 2001-
NAFSA: Association of International Educators, Distinguished Senior Fellow, 2001-
National Commission on Accountability in Higher Education (SHEEO), Co-chair - 2004
National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, Co-chair, 2005-
National Forum on Public Responsibility in Education (PEN), Co-chair - 2004
Public Broadcasting Service (PBS), Board of Directors, 2001-2005
Chair, Nominating and Governance Committee
Richard W. Riley Institute of Government, Politics and Public Leadership
Advisory Board Chair, 1999-
SC High School Commission, 2005-
Southern Institute on Children and Families, Board of Directors, 2001-
The Teaching Commission, Commissioner, 2003-; Co-chair, 2005
University Center, SC, Board of Visitors, 2002-
University of South Carolina, Distinguished Professor, 2001-
Winthrop University, SC, Board of Visitors, 2002-

Afterschool Alliance, Founding Chair, 2002-
Alliance for Excellent Education, National Advisory Board, 2002-
Asia and International Studies in the Schools Nat Coalition, Honorary Co-chair, 2002-
Blue Ridge Council, Boy Scouts of America, Advisory Council, 2001-
Broad Prize for Urban Education, Selection Jury, 2002-
Center for National Policy, National Advisory Board, 2004-
Character Education Foundation, NC, Honorary Board of Directors, 2003-
Character Education Partnership, Advisory Council, 2002-
Cisco Learning Institute, Advisory Commission, Feb 2001-Aug 2003
Co-operation Ireland, USA, Board of Directors, 2001-
FitKids for Life, NC, Advisory Council, 2003-
Friday Institute for Educational Innovation, NC, National Advisory Board, 2003-
Futures for Kids, NC, Advisor, 2002-
Grammy Foundation, Advisory Board, 2002-2004
Goldman Sachs Foundation Prizes for Excellence in International Education, Jury, 2003-
iEARN, Advisory Board, 2004-
Institute for Education and the Arts, Advisory Council, 2003-
Irish-American Higher Ed Research Organization, Advisory Board Chair, 2005-
Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, Trustee Emeritus, 2001-
National Center for Education Accountability, Board of Directors, 2001-

Richard W. Riley
Former U.S. Secretary of Education

Clemson University
Calhoun Lecture Series
International Awareness Week

April 2, 2003

International Education and Homeland Security

Thank you, Nell, for that wonderful introduction. Nell and I have been friends for many, many years. She was a great State Senator, as was her beloved husband, Harris Page Smith. I was so honored to give a eulogy at his funeral. Given Nell's gracious comments in my behalf, I would be pleased to have her give my eulogy or introduce me any time, anywhere.

During my lifetime, I suppose I have been introduced hundreds or perhaps even thousands of times. One of the best was the introduction that I received last year from a very bright and personable fifth grader named Pierce Smith . . . who just happens to be my grandson. As he introduced me to his fifth-grade class in Roswell, Georgia, here is what Pierce said.

"This is my grandpop. He has been lots of places and met lots of people, like Michael Jordan and Big Bird. And he's done lots of education stuff."

One area of education "stuff" that I have been especially interested in and very passionate about is international education – and and never more so than now.

I have had the great pleasure for the past several years to be, as Nell noted, a Senior Fellow at NAFSA: the Association of International Educators. You can be proud of Clemson's Director of International Student Affairs, Louis Bregger, who is a long-time, active and valued NAFSA member. And in my eight years as the U.S.

Secretary of Education, I had many opportunities to meet my foreign counterparts and to gain a strong appreciation for the importance of and need for international education.

So I extend my congratulations to Louis Bregger, his colleagues, and the many, many international students here at Clemson who have organized this International Awareness Week. I understand that Clemson's foreign students come from 74 different counties, and it is clear to me that they have a very active presence here on the lovely Clemson campus.

I also congratulate the many community co-sponsors, including the City of Clemson and Pendleton and Daniel High Schools, that have participated in this cultural and intellectual exchange. And thanks to the many local residents who have acted as patrons, family and friends to so many international students over the years.

You are helping to expand the frontiers of scholarship and the frontiers of friendship across national borders. These frontiers begin in a classroom, during a coffee break or perhaps over a dinner – they can begin anywhere and at any time.

These friendships take root and are nurtured when people of different cultures take the time to try to understand the values of their foreign counterparts. The skills, the friendships and the cultural understanding that students gain here at Clemson will surely enrich their lives and may even be critical to their success in the years ahead.

From my own perspective, I can tell you that I gained a great deal from meeting my foreign counterparts during my tenure as Secretary of Education. I remember one occasion when I had the opportunity to travel to Santiago, Chile, with President Clinton and Secretary of State Madeleine Albright to participate in

the Summit of the Americas. This conference included 34 Presidents and Ministers of Education from North and South America, and it put a sharp focus on education.

I was in several meetings during the Summit, and I talked about the importance of what I called "educational diplomacy" – meaning that education should be seen as a vital and important way for our nation to expand its diplomatic initiatives. I remember asking Secretary Albright if I could use that term, since diplomacy was considered to be within the jurisdiction of the State Department rather than the Department of Education. Needless to say, she was delighted and we both have used the term ever since.

I also remember that, despite the best efforts to improve mutual understanding, the result can also be mutual confusion.

It was American Arts Night during that same Summit, with about 10,000 people in attendance, including the Education Ministers from all of the countries of this Hemisphere. Herbie Hancock, an American entertainer, announced to the audience how proud he was to have in attendance the Secretary of Education from his own country, the United States of America. *She* has been a great supporter of connecting up music and the arts with education, he said. Then Herbie asked *Mrs.* Riley to stand – which she did, to thunderous applause, and then turned and waved to the crowd. Not knowing quite what to do, I stood up with her, at which point Herbie said, "And doesn't the Secretary have great support."

As we all know, we live in challenging times. If ever there was a time to talk about the connections between international education, homeland security and how America is perceived in the world, it is now.

We are at war and many other nations are questioning America's leadership. At the same time, many Americans are wondering why so many people around the globe, including long-time allies, oppose our policies, question our motives, and even

consider the United States a serious threat to peace in the world. So this is a serious time for our nation and the world on many levels.

At one level, all of us are concerned about the brave young men and women in our military who are in harm's way. We all pray that this war will end soon. We all pray for the speedy and safe return of our troops. And we all pray for the families of the deceased. We support our beloved country in a time of war in whatever ways we can – and ponder what we can do and how we can help.

Those of us who believe in the importance of international education and mutual understanding need to be thinking hard about why the rest of the world is so at odds with the United States at this critical moment.

Yes, we are the world's great superpower. But we ignore the rest of the world at our own peril. Being patriotic and praying for the safe return of our troops does not mean that we stop thinking about what we must do to build new connections with the international community.

Many young people around the world have a love-hate relationship with the United States. They envy our wealth and admire the many freedoms of our democracy and our creative culture, yet they distrust our power. Young people around the world are tuned in to America. They speak English, listen to our music, wear American clothes, go to our movies, and watch our television programs, including MTV.

A recent foreign minister for Mexico put it this way. "Most officials in Latin American countries today," he said, "are not anti-American types. We have studied in the United States or worked there. We like and understand America. But we find it extremely irritating to be treated with utter contempt."

These are strong words and yet they are the words of a friend and a scholar – one who honestly believes we don't listen to our friends ... that we don't understand their concerns.

These young people and young foreign leaders have a point of view about America. Can we say the same about our own students?

I worry that we are coming up short in preparing our young people for their place in the world ... that we do not give them a full appreciation for other languages and cultures.

At another level, another set of issues demands our attention. Even as the war continues, we need to recognize that a great deal of work will have to be done in the years ahead to build peace in Iraq after the war is over, to resolve long-standing tensions in the Middle East, and to overcome the many divisions in the international community.

This is the work of our political leaders, diplomats and, yes, the work of the American people. Maria Montessori, the great educator, once stated that "Averting war is the work of politics, establishing peace is the work of education."

This is particularly important in the Middle East. At present, there are only about 125 colleges and universities in the United States that have a program of Middle East studies. In my opinion, there should be many more.

Only about six percent (6%) of the foreign students in the United States come from the Arab Middle East. Fewer than one percent (1%) of American students abroad are studying in those nations. We need to intensify our efforts to diversify access to American higher education, as well as to diversify the American study-abroad experience. Scholarly links are a first step toward understanding.

We also need to see the importance of international education and mutual understanding in historical terms. The United States has been a world leader for well over 50 years. And since the end of the Cold War, just a little over a decade ago, we have been the dominant military and economic power in the world. From a historical perspective, that is not a very long time.

As Americans, we assume that this great power will be used to promote freedom, democracy, justice and human rights around the world, even as we protect our national security and economic interests.

There are, however, many people in the world who have a completely different perspective, and the events of 9/11 have put a focus on this "disconnection."

Yes, we know what we must do to respond to terrorism, and we will prevail. But the larger question is how do we read history and take measure of the economic, political, scientific, cultural and religious forces that are now reshaping the world and defining our future.

The truth of the matter is that the plates of the earth are moving, while more than a few of us are standing still. Consider these four questions.

Do we fully appreciate the assertion being made by some experts that Europe and the United States have fundamentally diverged in their strategic outlook. In his recent book, *Of Paradise and Power: America and Europe in the New World Order,* which was issued prior to the war in Iraq, foreign policy expert Robert Kagan noted: "It is time to stop pretending that Europeans and Americans share a common view of the world, or that they even occupy the same world." He writes of our military superiority – while Europe seeks to supplant it with international cooperation.

Do we fully appreciate why Pope John Paul worries that the current conflict with Iraq could lead to a "religious catastrophe" between Christians and Muslims? Given the very long history of the Catholic Church, an institution that thinks in terms of hundreds of year, what does he see that we do not?

Do we fully appreciate the narratives that shape the current Arab worldview? An Arab media expert, Georgetown University Professor Mamoun Fandy, recently wrote in a Washington Post op-ed article that this worldview spans "historical events from the Crusades to the Mongol invasions of Baghdad to the colonial experience and the recent Arab-Israeli wars."

Do we fully appreciate the effort that China, a nation of one billion people, is now making to gain a strong leadership position in the global community?

I have been to China on a number of occasions, and I have seen first hand the energy and the resources that the people of China are investing in international education.

Our dilemma, of course, is that modern media gives us a small slice of the here and now 24 hours a day. What we don't get from the media is the broad perspective needed to see the world more clearly so that we might understand where the world will be going in 10, 20, 50 or even 100 years.

This is exactly the perspective we need to be imparting to the young people attending this wonderful institution of higher learning. This is why international education and mutual understanding are so important.

The young Americans being educated here at Clemson today will be tomorrow's diplomats, business leaders, and generals. They also will join the Peace Corps, run nonprofit organizations and work with colleagues around the world on the frontiers of science and engineering.

The many international students studying here at Clemson – and across the United States – also will rise to leadership positions in their respective countries in a few short years.

Those of us who are educators need to be thinking hard about what we can do to help all of these young people prepare for the coming times. This is why I am such a strong advocate of international education and of helping young people gain a better appreciation of other cultures and other languages.

It is important to recognize, though. that even the smallest encounters between Americans and international students also can result in confusion and mutual misunderstanding.

A few years ago, Louis Bregger – as I noted previously, Louis is the very fine director of Clemson's international student affairs program and an active NAFSA member – was asked by NAFSA to do a survey of international students studying at Clemson. Here are a few things he discovered from that survey.

- **International students expected much more from friendships and did not understand the fleeting nature of friendship among American students.**

- **International students were perplexed by the seeming lack of family connections among American students.**

- **International students came to Clemson expecting much more interaction and connection in the classroom with their American counterparts. They were surprised by what they perceived as a lack of respect for professors and educators.**

Now, this was a very small survey on one college campus. Yet, these examples illustrate how sharp the differences and misunderstandings can be between people because they come from a completely different frame of reference.

Just imagine, then, the level of misunderstanding that can take place at the highest levels of government when nations are trying to overcome differences. These misunderstandings become even more pronounced during times of tension and conflict.

In most cases, we come at the same situation from a different frame of reference, a different sense of history, and a different perspective based on language and cultural differences.

And just imagine the misunderstandings that can develop because we Americans fail to understand a foreign language. At a briefing in Washington last year on language and national security, Dr. Robert Slater, Director of the National Security Education program, cited "America's lack of language readiness as a threat to our national security."

Recently the American Council on Education (ACE) issued a report calling upon schools to teach a broader array of languages – and teach them as early as kindergarten. ACE said, "our future success or failure in international endeavors will rest almost entirely on the global competence of our people."

That's a phrase worth remembering – "global competence." Every American ought to recognize that globalization is not an agenda – it's a fact. Interdependence brings both great opportunity and great vulnerability.

Former President Bill Clinton addressed that point when he spoke at Harvard last November. "The great question of our time," he said, "is whether this

interdependence is going to be good or bad" for us, for our children, and for the world.

"Since we cannot escape it," he said, "we must do everything we can to strengthen the positive forces of interdependence and to diminish the negative ones."

President Clinton pointed to three ways to accomplish this: first, by spreading the benefits and shrinking the burdens of the 21st century; second, by creating "conditions in poor countries that make progress possible and give people a sense that they've got some control over their lives;" and, third, by developing "a higher level of consciousness about how we all can cherish our faiths and our identities and still live and work together."

I say to you that international education is indispensable to meeting all three of those challenges. If we believe that the great question of our time is whether interdependence is going to be a positive or a negative force, then surely your role in promoting international education is pivotal.

I believe that international programs like the one here at Clemson are absolutely vital to the education of young American college students.

I also like to think that, as the rest of the world looks to the United States for leadership, we will have something to offer in terms of education. We cannot retreat into what some have called "education isolationism" and try to seal off our country and our campuses from the rest of the world. That would be precisely the wrong message to draw from 9/11.

I believe that international education can be an important way to address and undercut the efforts of terrorists to spread their false ideas. But, in our efforts to improve homeland security – which is of utmost importance, of course – I'm

concerned that the United States is beginning, unintentionally, to lose sight of the value of international education.

In the process, we are diminishing America's 50-year effort to encourage international exchange programs. This is unwise and does not serve our long-term national interests.

Let's remember why the United States has supported educational exchanges ever since World War II.

First, foreign students bring important educational benefits to U.S. colleges and universities – benefits that have only increased over time. They add diversity to the student body and, for many Americans, they provide the first opportunity for close and extensive contacts with people from other nations.

Second, foreign students bring many economic benefits. In the last academic year, for example, foreign students and their dependents spent $12 billion in the U.S. economy. Many foreign students teach at the graduate level, and more than a few put down roots in America and become contributing citizens.

Most importantly, and this is my third point, the United States gains a great deal from educating generations of future foreign leaders. Their residual affection and respect for the idea that is America – and for the American people – is a priceless asset for this country.

Indeed, some of our toughest critics at the moment are foreign leaders who have been educated in the United States. These leaders have a deep appreciation for our democratic values and insist that we live up to them. We may not like what they say at times, but the fact that they are willing to engage America and maintain a friendship with America, despite policy differences, is an important foreign policy asset.

Their desire that the United States uphold and stay true to its principles has been nurtured through foreign exchanges – through programs that bring people into contact with America and Americans, including those that have brought millions of foreign students and exchange visitors to this country.

That is why U.S. foreign policy leaders have consistently upheld the value of international education, and do so to this day. Just a few weeks ago, the State Department released the following statement by President Bush.

"I have encouraged all Americans to join together with our students, teachers, schools, professional associations, and volunteer organizations in reaffirming our commitment to educational exchange worldwide. As we help to strengthen the global community, we build tolerance and improve global prospects for peace."

In August 2002, Secretary Powell said, "As Secretary of State I see the benefits of international education every day ... In my daily activities I encounter world leaders – from Kofi Annan to Hamid Karzai – who participated in an exchange program or studied here or abroad ... People-to-people diplomacy, created through international education and exchanges, is critical to our national interests."

Unfortunately, the positive and encouraging support for international education from both the President and the Secretary of State has not influenced the day-to-day management of key federal programs. In their zeal to improve homeland security, federal agencies are making some mistakes.

Three things are happening under post-September 11 pressures which, taken together, threaten the capacity of our country to continue to attract foreign students and scholars to U.S. institutions of higher education: (1) the breakdown of the visa process; (2) the breakdown of the foreign student-monitoring process; and (3) overzealous enforcement.

Visa screening, for example, has fallen victim to the enormous pressure self-imposed by State Department consular officials to prevent on their own watch another erroneous issuance of a visa to a dangerous person.

As a result, to take one example, colleges and universities across the country are increasingly worried about their inability to get foreign scientists to their scientific conferences and foreign science professors and students into their classrooms.

U.S. scientific leadership rests on its openness to foreign scientific talent. Making it difficult for such talent to come to the United States may have the perverse effect of degrading the very scientific leadership that the controls are ostensibly designed to protect.

We also need to find more balance in the federal efforts to monitor foreign students who are here on exchanges and to make sure that federal officials enforce the law fairly. Overzealous enforcement is a sure way to alienate international students, who then return to their home country with a bad taste in their mouth.

Yes, we must be vigilant and guard against terrorism. But let me assure you, international education is part of the solution to terrorism, not part of the problem.

As we look to the future, I believe there many things that can be done in American education to encourage international education and mutual understanding. Let me suggest a few.

- **We should support any effort in our nation's public schools to encourage the instruction of foreign languages. I see great merit in dual-language schools, where young children are instructed in two languages. They are a great success.**

- **International exchange programs need to be sustained and expanded on every college and university campus.**

- **I encourage our many colleges and universities to seek out new links in Eastern Europe, Africa, Latin America and – yes, when the time is right – the Middle East.**

- **I encourage many more American students to spend a year abroad. Sometimes doing something different is the spark that changes your life.**

- **I strongly support President Bush's decision to double the size of the Peace Corps by 2007, and I encourage every student here at Clemson and all across the country to consider joining.**

- **And if you cannot make a two-year commitment to the Peace Corps, please recognize that there are many short-term alternatives available.**

I make those suggestions because these are very challenging times for the United States and the rest of the world. If the United States is to remain a global leader, we must engage the world and create new links and partnerships. The United States cannot turn its back on the world, fall back on isolation tendencies, or come to see itself as a new Roman Empire – something that is already being promoted by a few foreign policy wags. This is not the American way to success.

Please remember that the United States became a great power and remains a great power – not just because of our economic might or our military might, but because we have remained committed to the ideals that define our democracy.

Sometimes we slip and fail to do justice to those ideals in defining our economic and foreign policy interests. But over time, we right ourselves and head in the

proper direction. We are a generous nation, an open nation, and a nation that has taken the lead in upholding human rights around the world.

In these challenging days ahead, we need to remember and stay true to our democratic ideals and continue our many efforts to build bridges of dialogue and understanding and respect.

Finally, I have a few words especially for the students here tonight.

My generation has spent a lifetime creating the economic strength and military might that has allowed the United States to be safe and to prosper. But your generation will have a different task – determining how to *use* that economic and military power wisely in an inter-connected and inter-dependent world ... and determining how to be a world leader knowledgeable of the world we lead ... and connected to other people in a positive and caring way.

That is a formidable challenge, one that will require this generation of young people to gain a deep appreciation and awareness of other people and other cultures.

My prayers and best wishes are with you for every success in this endeavor. Thank you very much.

Richard W. Riley
Former Secretary of Education

NAFSA Strategic Task Force on Study Abroad
Press Conference
Washington, D.C.
November 18, 2003

Good morning. My name is Dick Riley, and I'm pleased to welcome you to this event marking the release of NAFSA's Task Force on Study Abroad report, entitled "Securing America's Future: Global Education for a Global Age."

I'm particularly pleased that we are meeting during the fourth annual International Education Week. Upon my recommendation and that of Secretary of State Madeleine Albright, President Clinton proclaimed the first-ever International Education Week in 2000. I'm very pleased that the Bush Administration has continued to observe International Education Week.

When the Clinton administration was ending and I was considering what I wanted to do next, I knew I wanted one affiliation that would enable me to continue to pursue my strong belief in the value of international education. So I looked around, and I asked myself: Who is doing effective work in this area? Who are the movers and shakers?

It became evident to me that NAFSA's clear vision, activist agenda, and strong leadership made it a natural place for me to hang

one of my hats. I've been a distinguished senior fellow at NAFSA for the past three years, during which time my respect for the organization – as the driver of the international education policy debate in this country – has deepened.

It has been my honor to serve as honorary co-chair of this impressive task force consisting of university presidents and provosts, foreign policy and national security specialists, senior corporate managers, and people with long experience in managing study abroad programs. The task force has produced a compelling set of recommendations for promoting study abroad, which I hope will be taken very seriously by our national and state leaders in government, business and academia.

Since 9/11, it has become more and more clear that our country simply cannot afford to remain ignorant of the rest of the world. The stakes are too high.

The generation that will lead our country tomorrow *must* receive an international education today. They must have opportunities to learn about other countries, other cultures and other points of view ... from direct experience, as an integral part of their higher education.

They must have opportunities to learn the world's languages by living in the countries where those languages are spoken. The study and practice of the language must be part of the study abroad experience.

There is a fallacy in this country that we don't have to learn other languages because everyone else is learning English. That view profoundly misunderstands the value of foreign language learning. The fact that you can find a McDonald's anywhere in the world and order a burger in English is beside the point.

In today's world, we must be able to understand other people, their countries, their cultures, their aspirations. We do that through language. If we cannot communicate with people in their own language, our understanding of them will always be limited. We are, in many ways, blind to what is really going on in countries where we cannot communicate in their language.

We have to get this right. By virtue of our power, the United States is the world's leader. But we can't lead a world that we don't understand.

If we are to have any hope of living in safety and security – any hope of exercising our world leadership in the constructive manner to which we all aspire – then we have to take steps to understand the rest of the world better than we do.

This understanding must begin in college – if not before – through study abroad programs that are available to all who want them.

The Task Force report makes this case in a compelling way, and it sets forth an action plan for making study abroad what it must become – a routine part of U. S. higher education.

We have a distinguished panel for you this morning, which will close with my co-chair, former Senator Paul Simon, who will announce a major study abroad scholarship proposal.

It is now my pleasure to introduce Marlene Johnson, executive director and CEO of NAFSA, who will introduce and moderate the panel.

The International Vision and Accomplishments of Secretary Of Education Riley

- Secretary Riley was the first Secretary of Education to elevate the importance of International Education and he initiated significant actions to strengthen the Education Agency's role in this field. He recognized that in a digital world that has created a global economy, students from different nations will mutually benefit by learning about each other and that education systems will mutually benefit by learning from each other. To describe these activities, Secretary Riley coined the phrase "Education Diplomacy" as a kind of international engagement in which all participants stand to win.

- At the start of Secretary Riley's tenure the International Affairs office was composed of about three professional staff buried deep within the office of Information and Intergovernmental Affairs. By the close of his administration, it was an office elevated to within the Office of the Under Secretary, had tripled in size, and was coordinating strategic international partnerships around the world.

- In the short span of 18 months at the end of his Administration, the Secretary of Education had met with 34 education leaders of the Americas, the Group of 8 industrialized leaders from OECD nations, and the 21 members of the Organization for Asian-Pacific Economic Cooperation. He also participated in the Second Summit of the Americas (1998 Santiago) with the President. Education was the featured topic at this meeting of Western Hemisphere leaders.

- His legacy from these multilateral meetings and bi-lateral negotiations include:

  - Launching of International Education Week in cooperation with the U.S. State Department as an annual reminder of the importance of the principles of international cooperation in education.

  - Taking leadership as one of the first in the federal government to urge the U.S. to rejoin UNESCO as the "broadest world forum for action on making education for all a reality."

  - Signing bilateral education Memorandum of Understandings (MOU) with Ministries of Education from around the world. The 2000 MOU with the Chinese Ministry of Education launched a new era of international education cooperation, including the idea for developing web-based language instruction in English and Chinese to enable Chinese students to learn about America and American students to learn about China. Also noteworthy were the agreements with Ireland and Northern Ireland to cooperate in a number of areas, including special education. These agreements were especially significant given the peace process that the Clinton Administration was actively engaged in.

  - Formulating the initial development of the 21 country, Asian-Pacific Knowledge Bank for Policy and Practice. Through the content of the Knowledge Bank,

Eastern and Western educators and researchers learn promising practices from some of the highest achieving countries in mathematics and science and from educational systems that produce some of the most creative students in the world.

- Promoting bi-literacy education programs in which native U.S. English-speaking and non- English-speaking immigrant students learn together in the same class and learn each others language. As part of his biliteracy initiative, the Secretary worked out an agreement with Spain that recognized and gave impetus to over 30 agreements that Spain has with U.S. states or districts to exchange language teachers. Spending to support instruction in foreign languages grew significantly during the Secretary's tenure. For example, the U.S.-Brazil Higher Education Consortia supports language acquisition, faculty exchanges, and portability of credits between the two most populated countries in the Americas.

- During his tenure civic education cooperation and exchange was greatly strengthened, expanding from just the areas of the former Soviet Union to include other developing and transition economies (including Ireland and Northern Ireland).

- Increasing involvement in bi-national cooperation with South Africa and Egypt. Education hosted a retreat in Williamsburg focused on strategic planning for education reform. The Egyptian Minister of Education and top Ministry officials and NGO representatives from Egypt, with counterparts from the US, participated. It was said by USAID to have been instrumental in bringing the Ministry to begin decentralizing educational administration and other reforms.

- Hosting top-ranking foreign officials from education Ministries, on average, about once a month.

Richard W. Riley
Ohio University Lecture
Athens, Ohio
October 6, 2004

Challenges and Opportunities in American Education

Good evening . . . and thank you, Dean Heap, for that kind introduction, as well as for organizing this fine lecture series.

I also want to thank the generous sponsors of the series -- Daniel DeLawder, the CEO of Park National Corporation, as well as an active Board member of this, his alma mater; Thomas Lyall, the President and CEO of Century National Bank; Steven Wells, President and CEO of Fairfield National Bank; and the College of Education here at Ohio University.

I congratulate President McDavis on his recent appointment as the new President of Ohio University. Being the President of any major university is a challenging task. Among other things, you must raise funds constantly and work diligently to engage your faculty . . . or they will soon engage you. Cathy Krendl, your fine Provost is here and I am so pleased that my friend, Rod Chu, your Chancellor, is here, too.

I am a strong believer that university presidents can make things happen and that, in this new education era, they must add some new responsibilities to their portfolios. More on that later, Mr. President.

Before I begin my remarks, I want say a few words on the passing of Wayne White, who died unexpectedly last week. Services were held just two days ago at the OU campus in Ironton. Wayne was the inspired and inspiring executive director of the Ohio Appalachian Center for Higher Education.

Wayne worked closely with me and my Department of Education staff in starting our "Think College Early" program in 1996. Wayne made a point of driving one of my senior staff members, Diana Phillips, all through Appalachia. He did this because he wanted her to get a personal understanding of just how remote some rural areas can be and the difficulties many rural students face in getting the education they need to survive in today's world. Wayne knew what could be accomplished if we were to link colleges like OU to high schools, and his work inspired many more young people to go to college.

It is a great pleasure to be back in Ohio this evening. I get to your good state several times a year because, since 2001, I have had the good fortune to sit on the Board of Directors of the KnowledgeWorks Foundation based in Cincinnati.

The KnowledgeWorks Foundation is the largest foundation in Ohio committed to improving public education and it places a strong emphasis on high school reform and college access.

So I have become a frequent visitor to the Buckeye State. In fact, just last week I was in Columbus for the Foundation's 4th Statewide School Conference on planning and designing new schools.

I have found that, as the former Secretary of Education, I have a bit more freedom to do such things. And I also have the liberty to say things without worrying about the political repercussions of every paragraph, sentence, and even each word.

Having this freedom is refreshing. But at the same time, you learn very quickly that once you are out of political power, you are indeed out of political power.

For instance, after I had just completed my eight years as Governor of South Carolina, a lady came up to me in the grocery store there and asked, "Aren't you the late Governor of South Carolina?"

"Not yet," I replied.

"Well, you sure have a common face," she muttered as she walked away to continue her shopping.

Given the tradeoff of my "new" freedom of speech, since I no longer have any political power, I am pleased to take this opportunity tonight to talk about the challenges and opportunities in American education.

A Time of Challenge for Our Country

As we all know, this is a very serious and challenging time for our great country. We have a war in Iraq, a war on terror, a struggling economy, and a growing national deficit. For the first time in my memory, many of our friends and allies around the world are questioning our moral and political leadership.

President Bush and Senator Kerry are locked in a very tight presidential campaign, and in a few short weeks the American people will have to make a choice. Much of the focus of this election naturally centers on Iraq and the conduct of the war. Regardless of where you stand on the war itself, we all hope and pray for the safety of the members of our armed forces who are in harm's way.

Given the challenges we face in Iraq and in the fight against terrorism, domestic issues like education are not as high on our national agenda as they were in 1996 and 2000.

Nevertheless, improving education remains paramount to the long-term success of this nation. We have 55 million children in school and, in a few short years, many of these young people will be entering the work force -- precisely at a time when the great wave of baby boomers will begin to retire. This generational transition has enormous implications for our society.

And as a nation, we must do more to give our young people a broader view of the new global realities that confront the United States. I assure you, our nation cannot be an effective world leader without understanding other cultures of the world in which we live. The fact that most American students speak only one language is a reflection of our continuing insularity.

So, tonight, I want to speak to you about our many challenges, both here at home and abroad, and the important role that we can play in preparing our young people for the coming times.

Three Stages of Education Reform

As I look at the state of American education today and the challenges we face, it seems to me that we have gone through three distinct phases in our national effort to improve education and to create a new culture of learning.

The first phase was launched 50 years ago, when the Supreme Court made its landmark ruling in Brown vs. Board of Education. In response to this great ruling, our nation put a new focus on equity and access in order to give every child a quality education.

The second stage began in 1983 with the release of the seminal report, A Nation at Risk, which alerted us to the woefully inadequate state of American education.

Ten years later, in 1993 when I became the Secretary of Education, the idea of higher standards for all children was emerging, but really only in fits and starts.

Many people simply did not believe or accept the fundamental principle that is the very foundation of the standards movement -- that is, that we should have the same high expectations for all children . . . whether they live in Appalachia or suburbia, whether they are middle class or poor, whether they are African American, Hispanic or a newly-arrived immigrant from a foreign land.

People found it difficult then -- and some people find it difficult even now -- to give up the idea of using our schools as sorting machines. This is the old idea that one-third of our children should be prepared for college, one-third should get a

high school education so they can work in the factories, with the bottom one-third left to drift through school or drop out, with little hope for the future.

The extended economic recession of the early 1990s did have an impact on people's thinking in that regard. Some in the United States began to get the message that the status quo in American education was no longer acceptable. But how to change and who was going to lead that change was very much in doubt.

How to Change . . . Who Would Lead that Change?

We have spent the last decade answering those two questions – how should we change and who would lead that change.

We sought to answer the first question -- how to change -- by creating a new framework based on three connected and defining principles -- high standards for all children; new accountability measures linked to those high standards; and, equally important, new investments to improve learning to meet those high standards.

If you demand more, you need to invest more. You can't have one without the other.

We sought to answer the second question – who would lead the change – by making education a national priority. This was something that had never been done before in our nation's history, and it was not easily achieved. It involved a very intense and, at times, partisan debate about the Federal role in education.

Some of you may remember the "Contract for America" during the Newt Gingrich era. And if you do, you will recall that the one of the goals of that Contract was the elimination of the federal Department of Education.

Those were not the easiest of times to be the Secretary of Education. Quite often, I found myself humming an old country tune, "I don't know whether to kill myself or go bowling."

Well, we won that debate and the U.S. Department of Education still exists.

But, clearly, we still are sorting out the federal role in education. In the last few years, there has been an intense and ongoing debate over the federal role that centers on the "No Child Left Behind Act."

This new law creates a whole new set of accountability measures for local school districts and puts a premium on testing. Like all new laws, it has some good points, as well as some that already need reform.

Equity and Adequacy

Now, let me turn to the third aspect of this great reform effort -- the challenges we confront in terms of equity and adequacy -- before outlining some very specific ideas about how to improve the future of American education.

In the last 50 years we have made significant progress in addressing the issues of equity and access, both in elementary and secondary education and higher education, to create a new framework for improving American education. Our progress has come in fits and starts, and we still have a long way to go. But we are moving in the right direction.

We are now engaged in trying to answer the next great challenge of our time – what is an "adequate" education that will prepare young people for the 21st Century, and who will pay for it.

Like so many great issues in our society, this question has found its way to the courts, and in state after state -- including here in Ohio -- the courts have mandated major reforms in our public education system.

For the last ten years, my law firm -- Nelson Mullins Riley & Scarborough -- has worked, on a pro bono basis, on such a case in South Carolina. We have spent more than 16,000 hours of lawyers' time representing 36 poor rural school districts in South Carolina, largely minority, that are demanding a minimally adequate education for their children. The lawsuit is focusing on eight of those school districts, and -- after many years -- we are only just now finishing up the trial phase.

These school districts face the same problems that public schools in rural Appalachia face – high teacher turnover, teachers teaching out of field, low expectations, high dropout rates and lack of basic facilities – just to name a few. These are some of the very same issues that defined Brown v. Board more than 50 years ago.

Indeed, the current South Carolina case is being argued in the Clarendon County Courthouse -- the very same Clarendon County involved in Briggs v. Elliott, the case that eventually became part of the Brown v. Board lawsuit.

These are not easy cases to get your arms around, and they take a great deal of time to move through our legal system. Nevertheless, they challenge us to be true to our principles and to come to terms with what is best for all of our children.

As we look to the future of American education and try to define what we mean by an "adequate education," let me bring to your attention some challenges and opportunities we must address.

<u>Standards not Standardization</u>

The first challenge is this – how do you raise achievement levels and at the same time avoid standardization.

I am a strong believer in standards, but the movement to raise achievement levels cannot be driven by standardization. If we create an accountability system that is more punitive than diagnostic, more about fear than achieving success, then we will have missed the mark entirely about how to raise standards.

Our national commitment to raising achievement levels isn't just about testing and accountability. It is about raising our expectations and the achievement of children all across the board.

This means more quality teachers, smaller classrooms, and greater community involvement. It means building smaller high schools and providing greater after-school opportunities and creating new pathways to college. It also means that we can't drive the romance and creativity out of the learning process.

Many years ago, the British philosopher, Alfred North Whitehead, in his book, The Aims of Education, wrote, "the rhythms of education are in three stages: romance, precision and generalization. Romance," he says, "makes precision palatable. Without romance, precision dulls the mind and causes the student to focus on inert dead knowledge." We must not take the romance out of teaching and learning. Education must never be reduced to a single standardized test.

We need to recognize, for example, that cutting back on music and the other arts in an effort to increase test scores is going down the wrong road for achieving educational excellence. Young people get excited about learning in so many different ways, and music and the other arts can really engage young people.

Another important aspect of national leadership is to recognize that teachers and principals and superintendents in the field know a lot more about teaching and learning than most people in Washington. When teachers and administrators tell you something isn't working, or that a law has some unintended consequences, you need to listen hard to what they are telling you.

This is why I believe we need some mid-course corrections to improve the No Child Left Behind Act. The law also needs to be fully funded. You cannot demand that schools reach high standards and then <u>not</u> give them the help they need to get there. Also, you need some flexibility with the top-down, compliance-driven NCLB. High standards, yes; challenging education experience, yes; but not so much of a regulated, punitive program from Washington -- teaching and learning are what really matter.

<u>Improving Teaching and Learning</u>

I also believe that we must keep a sharp focus on how to improve the teaching profession. John Stanford, the late superintendent of schools in Seattle, used to say, "The victory is in the classroom." We should never lose sight of that important fact.

Right now some people are so caught up with testing and accountability issues that they sometimes forget that teachers are the heart and soul of education.

Improving academic achievement in our rural and high-poverty schools, for example, will happen only if we encourage good teachers to work there and insist on high standards and high expectations.

To achieve this important end, we must create a set of positive inducements – higher pay, real and continuing professional development, better and safe working conditions, student discipline, smaller schools and smaller classes.

The Role of Universities

We also need a dramatic overhaul of how we recruit, prepare and retain good teachers. This can begin to happen only if our nation's colleges and universities make teacher preparation central to the mission of higher education.

Having a good football team is important and always a delight when your team is winning. I believe OU had something to cheer about last week in beating Kentucky for the first time since 1971.

But having a university make a sustained commitment to improving its college of education is much more important to this nation in the long run.

Here is where university presidents, provosts and deans can make a powerful difference. One of the fundamental problems we face in American education is the continuing disconnection between higher education and our nation's system of public elementary and secondary education.

America is fortunate to have the finest system of higher education in the world -- a model of quality, diversity and opportunity. Ohio University is one of our nation's premier examples of what it means to be a great university.

But too many university communities, unfortunately, see themselves apart from the rest of public education. They are islands of excellence, committed to sustaining their own culture of learning but unwilling to go the next step. They make no connection between the quality of the teachers they educate and the quality of our public schools.

In 1998 I asked a large number of college presidents to come to Washington to address this issue. I told them then that if they did not act, the Congress would

eventually step in. Some of these presidents and chancellors took my message to heart.

But on the whole, higher education community did not respond quickly enough. As a result, Congress is now much more demanding in terms of accountability.

I firmly believe that we cannot give all of our children an excellent education if our universities continue to marginalize their colleges of education and fail to play a larger role in reforming public education.

Those of us working in public education need help from our colleagues in the higher education community. We cannot do it alone.

Disconnections in Public Education

By the same token, public education has its own set of disconnections. As I travel around the country, I continue to urge local school leaders to stop assigning teachers to teach courses outside their field. We are never going to raise standards if we continue the practice of throwing a warm body into the classroom, closing the door and hoping for the best.

Even today, almost half of all middle schools teachers are teaching out of field. Our willingness to allow this practice to continue completely bewilders foreign educators.

During a visit with a Minister of Education from another country, I was trying to explain this unusual aspect of American education. The foreign translator looked bewildered and finally explained that they had nothing in their language that explained the term "teaching out of field" . . . and, furthermore, the Minister would never allow it!

Most importantly, we no longer can assume that we can get good teachers on the cheap. If we value good education, we need to pay for it. This is why I believe that the future of American education depends on making teaching a better-paid, year-round profession.

One of my recommendations, as Secretary and since then, is to make teaching a year-round profession, with pay levels adjusted accordingly.

This additional paid time would enable teachers to engage in professional development, to teach summer school, and provide tutoring to the students who need extra help. Teaching in America today is a full-time profession and should be respected and paid as such.

The Early Years

Another challenge. One of the smartest things we can do to improve education is to give our children more learning time, whether in pre-school, after-school or in the use of technology. This is why I have always been a very strong supporter of early childhood education, including all-day kindergarten for all children, and especially those in high-poverty school districts.

All of the research of the last ten years tells us that the better the start, the stronger the finish. We now know with absolute certainty that children have an amazing capacity to learn, even when they are infants. Every conversation we have with a baby can spark his or her brain to grow some more.

We also know, for example, that the achievement gap already exists for many children by the time they start kindergarten, and actually widens for some disadvantaged children by the time they finish kindergarten.

Unfortunately, our current system of early childhood education is still a patchwork defined by high turnover, little training and minimal compensation. This must change, given the opportunities that now exist to help children grow and learn in their early years.

Reading to Children

Here I would like to make one salient point. The most revolutionary thing we can do to improve American education is to get parents and other caregivers to spend more time reading to their children.

When you read to young children, it does so much good in their brain development . . . and sometimes unusual conversations can occur.

Several years ago, I was promoting a new summer reading initiative called Read, Write, Now. As part of the announcement – complete with press and all – I read a book to a large group at an elementary school in Arlington, Virginia. A small child picked out the book, entitled Animals Eating Ice Cream. I was on a stool and this kindergarten child stood beside me. After reading about 15 to 20 animals, I wanted to liven up the group.

In my effort to engage these kindergartners, I held up the book so they could see the pictures and I asked, "Whoever heard of a spider eating ice cream? Do you see that spider eating that ice cream?"

The 5-year-old student looked up at me and immediately responded, "Mr. Riley, this book is <u>fiction</u>."

After School and Summer School

Americans also are increasingly tuned in to the importance of after-school activities and keeping children out of harm's way. This is one result of the changing dynamics in the American workplace.

But parents also see after-school activities as a way to expose their children to enriched educational opportunities, from learning chess to picking up a paintbrush, for instance.

I also believe that we have to be much more creative in finding ways to keep children learning through the summer. This is something that many well-off parents instinctively understand. But during the summer months, children from disadvantaged homes often lose many of the gains they made in the school year.

Here again, changing how we use time may be something to think about. So that children don't fall too far behind, some schools may want to consider changing the school year and spreading vacations throughout the year – so-called year-round schooling.

Just as we have magnet schools, Montessori schools, career academies, charter schools and schools devoted to the arts or technology, it seems to me that year-round schooling may be another creative option for some school districts to consider.

Boys are struggling and need our help

Another challenge is a new and emerging gender gap. Put simply, boys are struggling.

We have had great success in the last 30 years in giving young women access to a quality education and all that goes with it. From the classroom to the playing field, we have been successful.

Title IX, obviously, has played an enormous role in the athletic achievement of girls.

But in the process, we have overlooked the increasing struggle of boys and young men with regard to staying in school, going on to college and graduating. The numbers speak for themselves.

Two-thirds of all students in special education are boys.

Only 64 percent of all boys are graduating from high school -- and that number is a dismal 42.8% for African-American boys, according to a new report by the Urban Institute

There are now about 2 million more women than men in college. By 2010, according to the U.S. Department of Education, the gender gap will grow to 138 women for every 100 men on a college campus.

My point here is not to detract from our success in ensuring that young women have equal access to the finest education possible. There is no turning back when it comes to equality for women.

My point is that we simply do not know why boys and young men are struggling with education. There is little in the way of research that gives us a framework for addressing this issue – an issue, I might add, that has significant long-term social and economic consequences for our nation.

Caught in the Transition: the High School Years

Another emerging challenge is how to reform America's high schools. According to the well-respected and nonpartisan Urban Institute, approximately 1.2 million students did not graduate from high school this year. These are the young people who are being left behind.

Nearly one-third of all high school students in America are failing to graduate. Here in Ohio, close to 47,000 young people fall into that category. These are disturbing statistics.

So we need to do a much better job of getting our middle school students ready for high school and a much better job of helping our young people stay in school until they graduate.

Many of our high schools are much too big, and too many young people fall through the cracks.

Researchers at Johns Hopkins University recently reported that there are 2,000 high schools in the United States that are essentially "dropout factories." More than 40 percent of their students do not graduate. More than a few of these dropout factories are here in Ohio.

This is one reason that the KnowledgeWorks Foundation has spent the last two years working to create schools within schools in eight (8) major urban areas here in Ohio. A total of 53 small schools have opened in Ohio in just the last month.

Smaller high schools also give us the opportunity to change expectations. The reality is that in urban America and rural America, including Appalachia, many young people have no idea that college is within their reach. This is why I am so pleased that OU is part of the "Roadmap 2005" GEAR UP initiative.

The other problem we face in reforming high schools is finding the money to pay for the reforms. The lack of full funding for the No Child Left Behind Act, for example, forces local school districts to make hard choices about how to spend their limited federal dollars.

Nationwide about 6 million older students are at risk. For the most part, though, school districts choose to invest their limited federal dollars in the early years. So, to save one generation of students, we essentially are giving up on another. Forcing school districts to make a choice between generations, it seems to me, is not a workable or fair strategy.

According to a report written a few years ago by Anthony Carnavale, a very well-respected education researcher, "our college campuses will be missing 250,000 African-American and 550,000 Hispanic undergraduates" by the year 2015 because we haven't prepared them to do college-level work.

That's a huge loss! Instead of being in the workforce and helping to grow the economy -- not to mention providing for the Social Security and Medicare needs of the wave of retiring baby boomers that I mentioned earlier -- these young people will be struggling to make their own way in life.

I also want to put a special spotlight on the senior year of high school. We cannot afford to ignore "senioritis" when more than one-third of high school graduates, who actually do go on to college, immediately find themselves assigned to remedial courses.

Mike Kirst from Stanford University has written extensively on this issue. According to Kirst, the senior slowdown is the rational response of high school seniors to the mixed signals from colleges and universities and the confusing babble of standards and assessments. Those are his words.

Education is more than Academics

I also believe that we need to be much more creative as a society in developing rites of passage for our modern times that help young people on their way. The senior prom is a happy moment for many high school students. But if that is our definition of a rite of passage, then we need to go back to the drawing board.

Of course, education is all about academics -- but it is not just about books and testing. It also is ultimately about helping young people to mature, to make good choices, to have a sense of ethics and values. Helping young people achieve responsible adulthood is an important aspect of education.

This is why I think we can be much more creative in giving students a richer sense of adulthood and citizenship. Young people are intensely idealistic and want more responsibility and new learning experiences. Service learning, Americorps, and other volunteer opportunities should be an integral part of every young person's education.

I would suggest, too, that some form of national service is something to consider in the years ahead. This seems to me to be a smart way to help young people mature, build character and gain a richer sense of obligation and appreciation for the privileges they enjoy as citizens of our great nation.

Getting a College Education

I also believe that every young person needs some education after graduating from high school. This leads me to suggest that, if we accept the premise that K-12 education is a free public good, then in the future we should commit this nation to providing two years of tuition-free education after high school.

How we finance higher education in America seems wanting, as well. Tuition and fees for four-year public colleges increased by 49 percent in the last decade, and students are increasingly burdened with debt. This is particularly difficult for people who choose to go into traditionally low-paying public service careers, like teaching.

This is why I believe that it would be in the national interest to guarantee a free education to college graduates who are qualified and willing to teach in critical areas like math and science. We do provide some loan forgiveness, but we should do much more.

Giving our Young People a Broad Worldview

Finally, I offer a last word about the role that our nation's higher education community must play in these challenging times.

More than most people in this global society in which we now live, we in the United States have the responsibility to imagine a new future for humanity as a whole. This future can only hope to emerge if we in America also fully engage the world.

For America to be its best and to give its best, we must win the war against terrorism. But we must do much, much more. Recent events have shown us that America turns away from the world at our own peril.

Even as the war in Iraq continues, we need to recognize that a great deal of work will have to be done in the years ahead to rebuild Iraq, to resolve long-

standing tensions in the Middle East, and to overcome the many divisions in the international community.

This is the work of our political leaders, diplomats and, yes, the work of the American people. Maria Montessori, the great educator, once stated, "Averting war is the work of politics, establishing peace is the work of education."

Please remember that the 50-year struggle to defeat communism was not just a struggle of two great military powers. The Western alliance defeated communism, in large part, because we won the war of ideas – because we marshaled our intellectual, our artistic and scientific communities to meet this challenge to democracy and freedom.

We must do so again in engaging the Islamic world, and America's university community must take a leadership position.

Yes, we must do everything we can to respond to terrorism, and we will prevail. But the larger question is how do we read history and take measure of the economic, political, cultural and religious forces that even now are reshaping the world and defining our future.

The truth of the matter is that the plates of the earth are moving, and more than a few of us are standing still. Consider just these two questions.

Do we fully appreciate the narratives that shape the current Arab worldview? As one Arab media expert noted, this world-view spans "historical events from the Crusades to the Mongol invasions of Baghdad to the colonial experience and the recent Arab-Israeli wars."

Do we fully appreciate the effort that China, a nation of one billion people, is now making to gain a strong leadership position in the global community? I have been to China on a number of occasions and I have seen first hand the energy and the resources that the people of China are investing in international education.

China is already challenging our role as the pre-eminent Pacific power. In the Middle East, we are engaged in a long-term struggle to support modernism and democracy against the forces of nihilism and reaction. And in so many other parts of the world, from Latin America to Africa, we confront the challenge of poverty and AIDS.

This is why I am a very strong advocate of international education and cross-cultural studies. The United States should not take our position as a world leader for granted. To retain our global leadership, we must understand our changing world.

Ohio University has a very good track record in sending its students overseas to study -- 751 students in 2003, I believe -- but I encourage you to do even more. Send your students to China and India. Send your students abroad for longer periods of time. Make sure your students can speak a foreign language.

The students now attending this wonderful university will be tomorrow's diplomats, business leaders, and generals. They will also run NGOs, join the Peace Corps, and work with colleagues around the world on the frontiers of science and engineering.

I want to congratulate Ohio University for its many international students -- more than 1,100, I understand. Providing these young men and women the opportunity to study here in the United States and to engage your students can pay long-term dividends in terms of mutual understanding.

Conclusion

I conclude now in the hope that I have conveyed to you some sense of the challenges and opportunities we face in improving American education. There is much to do. And to my way of thinking, what we do in the classroom to educate the rising generation is vitally important to helping our great country in these difficult times.

Every time a high school teacher inspires a young person to stay in school, a patriotic duty is being performed. Every time a college professor opens the mind of a smart young person to the world around us, our great nation becomes a little stronger.

Please remember that the freedom to learn, the freedom of religion, the freedom to live in a civil society, even the freedom to be respected as an individual are basic human rights that are still in question in so many parts of the world. Those of us who have been well educated and cherish freedom have the serious obligation to speak up for those who have neither.

If we offer our young people a future of hope and an education of excellence, they will respond. They will fulfill the great promise of this nation to achieve equality in freedom. And they will continue to sustain America as a democracy of learning.

Thank you.

Richard W. Riley
Former U.S. Secretary of Education

The 1989 Education Summit: A Reevaluation

The Miller Center of Public Affairs
and the Curry School of Education
University of Virginia

November 4, 2004

Fifteen Years of Education Reform: What We Have Learned

Thank you, David (Breneman, Dean, Curry School of Ed). I'm so proud of you and The Curry School of Education as you celebrate your centennial anniversary. It is an honor for me to be here with my friends, Gerry Baliles and Lamar Alexander and Rod Paige, at this significant event of The Miller Center being held at this great University.

Giving a speech so soon after Election Day -- after President Bush won Ohio and the election and the Republicans kept control of the House and Senate -- I don't know if my voice can carry much weight. That reminds me of a story about my attempt to help one of my grandchildren gain perspective about life.

A few years ago, one summer down in South Carolina, I had taken my grandson, Wilson, fishing. Like most teenagers, he did not feel compelled to communicate with his grandfather in any way. And like most grandparents, I felt compelled to impart some wisdom to Wilson . . . whether he liked it or not.

For years, as Secretary of Education, I had been telling parents about the importance of staying engaged with their teenagers. So I decided to practice what I preached. We were heading home after a day of fishing and I attempted to start a conversation. This is not always easy with a 14-year old. He was listening to sounds he called music -- it sounded more like noise to me.

It was a glorious but blustery day as we started across a long bridge near the ocean. I began to point out to Wilson how the sun shined on the right, sparkling on the waves, but on the left there was no sun and it was dark. How could that be, I mused aloud, when it was the same sun and the same water. Hoping to engage Wilson, I went on about this unusual natural phenomena.

Wilson looked to his right and left following my conversation. He seemed very engaged. After a pause to consider what I had been saying to him, Wilson turned to me. And in a clear and distinct voice, he said, "Who cares?"

Well, after yesterday, I'm not sure many people will care too much about what Dick Riley says today.

I am sure, however, that people in all of the battleground states are just thankful that the election ads are off the air, that their phones are no longer ringing and that canvassers are have stopped knocking on their doors.

But these types of conversations are important and this is a very good time to be reflective. In the next two months, the country will quiet down a bit and catch its breath. So this is a good time to look back at the last 15 years of education reform and to consider, as well, the future of American education.

Election will not alter direction of federal education policy

I want to begin my remarks by suggesting that the outcome of the election, regardless of who won, would not fundamentally alter the direction of our nation's education policy.

Despite the fact that this election was very divisive and offered a stark contrast in leadership on a wide range of issues -- Iraq, taxes, health care, so-called moral values, and the economy, to name a few – education never became a major point of contention between the candidates.

Even during the campaign, commentators noted that President Bush and Senator Kerry agreed more than they disagreed when it came to national education policy.

So, what is not at issue is the general direction of our nation's education policy. What is at issue today is how we go about doing the hard work of implementing that policy. The changes will be at the margin in terms of funding, implementing the No Child Left Behind Act and which federal programs will get more money and which will get less -- particularly as we deal with ever-greater deficits, which will cause serious problems for education in the future.

The fact that the changes will be at the margin is a direct result of the history of the last fifteen years of school reform, the subject of our conversation today.

The Early Years of Education Reform

As I look at the state of American education today and the challenges we face, it seems to me that we have gone through several distinct phases in our national effort to improve education and to create a new culture of learning.

The first phase was launched 50 years ago, when the Supreme Court made its landmark ruling in Brown vs. Board of Education. In response to this great ruling, our nation put a new focus on equity and access in order to give every child a quality education.

This led to the passage in the mid-1960s of Great Society programs, like the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The focus then was very specific – how do we inject a greater degree of equity into our public education system through the establishment of a series of categorical and targeted programs -- Title I for the disadvantaged, IDEA for the disabled, Title IX for women, bilingual education and so forth.

As a nation, we still accepted the idea that state and local governments controlled education policy. The Supreme Court made it clear that equity in funding for education was a State issue.

The second stage of reform began in 1983 with the release of the seminal report, A Nation at Risk, which alerted us to the woefully inadequate state of American education.

When this report came out, I was in the middle of our major school reform effort in South Carolina. Then-Secretary of Education Ted Bell became one of my strong allies -- he, a Republican; I, a Democrat. But we both believed in the importance of quality public schools. Education policy works best when it is bipartisan. (I was very proud to be invited by Ted Bell's family to deliver a eulogy at his funeral in Salt Lake City.)

The very next year, the children of the baby boomers -- called the "baby-boom echo" -- began flooding into our nation's schools. Between 1985 and 2000, an additional 7.6 million children entered our nation's public school system. This new and, in many ways, unexpected enrollment increase -- coupled with the fact that American education was struggling to re-define itself upward -- would help drive education to the top of our national agenda in the 1990s.

Another factor that helped to spur education reform in the mid-1980s was the emergence of a bipartisan group of Southern governors who recognized the important link between economic growth and improving education. Bill Winter, Lamar Alexander, Bob Graham, Jim Hunt, Bill Clinton, Chuck Robb and later Gerry Baliles all had a role in spurring education reform.

I was very fortunate to work with all of these young and energetic Southern governors. I had been elected Governor of South Carolina in 1978 and I made education improvement the central focus of my two terms as Governor. We passed the Education Improvement Act in 1983, increased funding, and put a new emphasis on early childhood issues. The Rand Corporation called it the most comprehensive education reform measure of that era.

Like many of my colleagues in State Houses across the South, I also came to the conclusion that the only way to make education reform a continuous process was to measure it -- to establish benchmarks in order to make education reform be reborn every year. Education reform would go through peaks and valleys. But if we measured it and

informed the public of our findings, we could make it a permanent part of the Southern political landscape.

The National Governors Association responded with its Time for Results report in 1985. Lamar Alexander and others were involved in that effort.

In 1988, I was the co-chair of a Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) Commission for Educational Quality that published a report, entitled Goals for Education: Challenge 2000.

We set out a list of 12 state and regional education goals -- school readiness, raising student achievement to the national average, reducing the drop-out rate, improving teacher quality and salaries, access to college and completion rates, to name just a few. To its credit, the SREB has continued to measure the benchmarks for these goals year in and year out ever since.

These were State initiatives for education reform, and it was spreading nationwide . . . but it started in the South.

The 1989 National Education Summit

So in 1989 when President Bush I, as we now seem to call him, called for the national summit here in Charlottesville, there were more than a few Governors who were receptive to the ideas of setting goals. Bill Clinton and Carroll Campbell, who had just replaced me as Governor of South Carolina, led the Governors, and Gerry Baliles was our gracious host that year.

As we all know, this Summit set our nation on a new course --a new Federal role in education and a recognition that education reform was a national priority. The governors and the Administration agreed to some very significant ideas -- to set national education goals, to align Federal programs with State education reform efforts, to encourage the Congress to provide the Secretary of Education with waiver authority, and to the creation of the National Education Goals Panel -- among other things.

At the time, I do not think that many people grasped the significance of the road map that the Summit laid out. It was the first time that we had made education a national priority, not just a priority for the separate 50 states. This provided a clear, new phase for education reform.

They set goals for the year 2000 and, even though we failed to achieve those goals, that failure taught us something about how hard it is to achieve education reform at the national level. If you don't put money and teeth behind the goals, not much is going to happen. Also, education improvement takes time.

The next phase was the development of the national standards. The Summit also helped spark the standards movement. It was clear immediately to governors and to the

new members of the National Goals Panel that it was hard to reach for the national goals without a set of standards for core academic subjects. While I was the U.S. Secretary, a great deal of our effort was invested in supporting the states in creating their own standards.

The Summit also called for new measurements and emphasized a performance-based approach to education and accountability, a concept promoted by the National Governors Association in its 1985 Time for Results report and by the Southern Regional Education Board through its Goals for Education: Challenge 2000 in 1988.

In agreeing to this new national focus, the governors also insisted on and agreed to two other propositions.

One, they agreed that the Summit should focus on how the Federal government could best support State-led education reform efforts, while insisting that States should remain the senior partner in K-12 education reform.

And, two, they called on the Federal government to maintain and strengthen its efforts to support early childhood programs (that is, Head Start), expand access to postsecondary education, support adult education and job training programs, and provide additional support for disadvantaged students in K-12 education systems.

One thing to think about is who was excluded from the Summit. Members of the United States Congress -- with Democratic majorities in both the House and Senate -- were left out. State legislatures, often in battles with governors, were left out. Both groups, of course, were later involved on the Goals Panel.

The Clinton Years

When I became Bill Clinton's U. S. Secretary of Education, we made a clear and positive decision to support the basic policy parameters laid out by the national Summit. Our first immediate project was to pass the Goals 2000 legislation.

We added two goals -- the arts and foreign language -- to the list agreed upon by the governors and the President at the Summit. Congress added two more goals -- safe and drug-free schools and parent involvement -- both of which we supported.

The standards movement was a conservative approach to education. Bill Clinton presented a moderate view -- a third way of making education bipartisan.

We wanted to enshrine the goals into law – as statements of national aspiration, not federal mandate. We wanted to establish the National Education Goals Panel as an independent agency. And we wanted to make the Federal government a junior partner in a State-led, standards-based reform.

We proposed the following: that the states would agree to set State standards for all students, to implement assessments aligned with the standards and hold schools accountable for student learning on State assessments, and to develop a comprehensive plan for improving student achievement.

In return, the Federal government would provide the states with (1) additional funds and technical assistance to support State efforts to set standards and develop and implement plans; (2) broad flexibility in the particulars of each plan, including State control over the standards; and, (3), complete flexibility over the use of funds provided under Goals 2000, as long as the funds were used to carry out the State's reform plan.

In addition, the Secretary of Education for the very first time had the authority to waive statutory and regulatory provisions in Federal education programs – including Title I and other ESEA programs, as well as vocational education – if those provisions interfered with a State or local district's strategy for improving student achievement.

We also supported the provisions in Goals 2000 to create an Ed-Flex Demonstration Program, which enabled the Secretary to delegate authority to 12 states to waive Federal requirements on their own, without seeking approval from the Federal government.

Our experience over the years showed that the vast majority of waivers -- both via requests to the Secretary and through
Ed-Flex designation authority-- sought to protect schools that would have lost Title I funds due to our own targeting provisions or because of population changes that resulted in reductions of low-income students.

There were hardly any requests to waive other provisions of law, suggesting that there were relatively few Federal barriers to reform in the first place.

I might add that Goals 2000 was administered without writing a single new regulation. It was a no-strings-attached law and, because it was so novel and unusual, most states did not believe it. We had some difficulty getting the states to believe that we were giving them the money and the flexibility to design their own reform strategies.

It was very novel to tell people at the State level that we at the Federal level considered this to be a partnership and that the Feds were the junior partners.

Opposition to Goals 2000

There also was a great deal of suspicion among conservative groups that Goals 2000 was the camel getting its nose under the tent and that more federal intrusion was on the way. Little did these groups know that a few years later a Republican President, in the name of "compassionate conservatism," would lead for the Federal intrusion that they were so worried about back then.

We made every effort to reach out to those groups that were concerned about this issue. The suspicions were very real and they were not easy to dismiss, even when they were on the borderline.

I remember getting to the office one morning and reading a newspaper clipping sent in by one of my Western regional reps about the opposition to Goals 2000 expressed at a local legislative hearing.

The headline read, "I became a sex slave to Goals 2000." This was one of the few times in eight years that my communications staff did not know how to respond.

But, in the end, we got all 50 states to support Goals 2000, and that legislation created a framework for much of our thinking in the years ahead. (Again, Goals 2000 was influenced by the 1989 Summit and Bill Clinton's active involvement in that process.)

In fact, the legislation later provided the framework that guided the reauthorization of federal education programs – Title I, the Eisenhower Professional Development Program, School-to-Work, IDEA, Perkins legislation dealing with vocational education, and others.

Our goal was to take a more coherent approach for Federal support for State-led reforms, while retaining the historic Federal commitment to equity and to assistance for disadvantaged populations.

The Improving America's Schools Act (IASA) -- the title of the 1995 reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) -- moved this framework into all ESEA programs, where it remains today under the No Child Left Behind Act.

What did we accomplish?

I believe that we accomplished several things. First, we put standards-based reform on firm, nationwide footing. When I became the Secretary of Education in 1993, the idea of higher standards for all children was emerging, but really only in fits and starts.

Many people simply did not believe or accept the fundamental principle that is the very foundation of the standards movement -- that is, that we should have the same high expectations for all children . . . including those living in poverty and newly-arrived immigrants from a foreign land.

People found it difficult then -- and some people find it difficult even now -- to give up the idea of using our schools as sorting machines. What I mean by that is the old idea that one-third of our children should be prepared for college, one-third should get a

high school education so they can work in the factories, with the bottom one-third left to drift through school or drop out, with little hope for the future.

Second, we laid the groundwork for a broad-based consensus for standards-based reform. The Goals 2000 legislation was enacted with broad bipartisan support and with the support of a coalition of business groups, education groups, such as the AASA and NSBA, and organized labor -- including the AFL-CIO, not just the NEA and AFT.

Third, every State now has aligned assessments in place – about half had met the specific requirements of the 1994 Title I law by 2000, the rest were pretty much on their way, though slowly at times.

There are some who make the point that Goals 2000 and the reauthorization of ESEA were essentially toothless. But I want to make the point that we had very good reasons not to promote a compliance-based reform. Indeed, we thought that such an approach was counter-productive and would do little to encourage reform to take hold.

Bill Clinton and I had the advantage of being former governors, so we had a pretty good sense of what would be accepted and not accepted at that level. We were acutely aware that many State and local leaders remained suspicious of Federal mandates, especially from a Democratic President.

Our efforts to take a leadership role in education became even more tenuous with the sea change in 1994, when Newt Gingrich led the Republicans to power in the Congress. This led to a very intense and very public battle over the Federal role in education.

Newt Gingrich sought to shut down the Federal government over the size of the Federal budget, which included new spending for education, and Bob Dole ran for President on a platform to close down the U.S. Department of Education.

Those were not the easiest of times to be the Secretary of Education. Quite often, I found myself thinking about an old country tune, "I don't know whether to kill myself or go bowling."

This was my job, and my hard work made it possible for Rod Paige to have a job today!

Well, we won that debate and the U.S. Department of Education still exists. And one reason that we did win is because our Republican critics essentially misread the American people.

While the Republicans moved to the right and talked about closing down the Department and the need for private-school vouchers, the Democrats under Bill Clinton moved to the center.

While the new Congressional leaders listened to the concerns of their Republican base, we were listening to the concerns of the parents of the "baby-boom echo," as more and more children crowded into our schools.

We also made a very strategic decision to change how we talked about Goals 2000 and the other important Federal legislation. Instead of talking about who did what, block grants and other federalism issues, we began to talk directly to parents in very concrete terms.

For example, in 1996 we set a new national goal that every child should be able to read well and independently by the end of the third grade. To achieve that goal, we proposed legislation to enhance parent and community support and to provide college work-study reading tutors.

We talked about getting technology into the classroom and creating the E-rate at a time when Americans were eager to learn about the Internet. We responded to the concerns of parents about the problems of overcrowding, the need to build new and modern schools and the need for smaller classes.

We proposed specific legislation to add 100,000 new teachers, as well as the Hope Scholarship, the Lifelong Learning Tax Credit and expanded Pell Grants to help get more people on the path to college.

We also did not ignore the debate over values. In 1995, for example, we defused the long and bitter struggle over prayer in public schools by proposing for the very first time voluntary guidelines for principals and superintendents. We called in lawyers for religious groups to interpret Supreme Court decisions and help write those guidelines. Some of you may also remember President Clinton's support for school uniforms and our efforts to end social promotion.

All of these clear, concrete and very specific ideas seemed to ring true to the American people, if not to their children.

Despite our many successes, though, we also had our failures. In 1997 and 1998, we proposed voluntary -- and I stress the word "voluntary"-- national tests in reading and math.

Looking back, I see that this proposal gave our conservative opponents a rallying point around the issue of State and local control. We also made the mistake of not recognizing changes in the political landscape -- such as the fact that Republican governors, who had no great love for Bill Clinton, controlled the majority of states in the nation.

We lost that fight for a voluntary national test in reading and math. And then two years later, as we all know, President Bush came forward with No Child Left Behind, a radical departure from our partnership approach to education reform.

Lesson to Consider

So what lessons can we learn from all this as we look to the future? Let me suggest several specific ideas.

First, when we passed the Goals 2000 Act, the states were leading the education reform movement. The energy was in the State House and not in the White House. Bill Clinton and I put a high value on partnership and working with the governors, as called for at the 1989 Summit.

This turned out to be exactly the right approach in 1993 to get standards-based reform moving in every State, to build momentum, and to broaden support for it. However, states proved to be unable or unwilling to take on the tough-minded accountability necessary to make this approach work as envisioned.

In 1985, when NGA released Time for Results and called for states to hold schools accountable for results, only six states had laws on the books permitting this approach to accountability. In the year 2000, 15 years later, only 19 states had such laws on the books – a growth rate of only one State per year.

In a 1998 evaluation of Title I, fewer than half of the principals in the nearly 9,000 schools then identified by states as "needing improvement" reported that they received any extra help from the State or district. They didn't get technical assistance, training, or additional resources.

This track record accounts, in large part, for the much more prescriptive accountability and Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) provisions in NCLB – Congress didn't trust the states on this issue any more. As we all know, there has been a backlash at this top-down, compliance-based reform approach and some of these concerns are very legitimate. South Carolina, for example, has much higher standards and therefore fares poorly on national comparisons.

The Department of Education has already made some sensible mid-course corrections. I am sure that there will be a very significant debate about other changes as reauthorization of NCLB goes forward.

We certainly have to do a much better job of giving school staff the tools they need for continuous improvement – high-quality diagnostic assessments that provide real-time data on student learning and learning needs, as well as the web-based analysis tools and the training necessary to support data-driven improvement.

I also believe that the movement to raise achievement levels cannot be driven by standardization. If we create an accountability system that is more punitive than diagnostic, more about fear than achieving success, then we will have missed the mark entirely about how to raise standards.

We have to recognize that our effort to raise achievement levels can't be about just testing and accountability. It must be about teaching and learning. It's about raising our expectations and the achievement of children all across the board. This means more quality teachers, smaller classrooms, and greater family and community involvement. It means building smaller high schools and providing greater after-school opportunities and creating new pathways to college.

Second, during the last 15 years we have been successful in creating a new education framework based on three inter-connected and defining principles -- high standards for all children; new accountability measures linked to those high standards; and, equally important, new investments to improve learning to meet those high standards.

If you demand more, you need to invest more. You can't have one without the other. It just isn't fair.

It has taken us the last 15 years to create this new framework. We probably will spend the remainder of this decade smoothing out the edges of this new system of education.

The lesson here is that it takes time to make education reform happen. You have to stick with it year in and year out – being dogged and persistent and being willing to learn from your mistakes are important attributes for leaders in this very important field.

Third, both the Federal and State standards developed in the 90s reflected a consensus among experts about what was important in terms of teaching and learning. As a result, this first cut at standards often reflected compromises and language that did not help classroom teachers.

Over the last ten years, states have learned to revise their standards to make them more specific, clear, focused and teacher friendly.

We also have learned to come at standards from an additional perspective – instead of relying on a consensus among experts to define what students must learn, we are beginning to look carefully at what students must know in order to succeed in postsecondary education and work after they leave high school.

Achieve's American Diploma Project has forged new ground in this area, defining an ambitious set of benchmark expectations in English and math that all students need to meet, whether they are headed for college or work.

Here I want to recognize the good work of Mike Cohen, the president of Achieve, who is a true leader in improving American education. Mike was here at the first Summit in 1989 as a staffer for the National Governors Association. Fifteen years later he is still a workhorse when it comes to improving American education.

Fourth, while we have made significant progress in developing a consensus on the issues of equity and access, we are still sorting out the issue of "adequacy" and who will pay for an adequate education. I put the emphasis on the latter phrase – who will pay for it.

Like so many great issues in our society, this question has found its way to the courts. And in State after State, the courts have mandated major reforms in our public education system.

For the last ten years, my law firm -- Nelson Mullins Riley & Scarborough -- has worked, on a pro bono basis, on just such a case in South Carolina. We have spent more than 16,000 hours of lawyer time representing 36 poor, rural school districts in South Carolina, largely minority, that are demanding a minimally adequate education for their children.

The lawsuit is focusing on eight of those school districts, and -- after many years -- we are only just now finishing up the trial phase. The sad thing is that we are addressing some of the very same issues that defined Brown v. Board more than 50 years ago.

Indeed, the current South Carolina case is being argued in the Clarendon County Court House -- the very same Clarendon County involved in Briggs v. Elliott, the case that eventually became part of the Brown v. Board lawsuit. The word "intractable" comes to mind here . . . after 50 years, we're still dealing with issues of equity and adequacy in education.

Fifth, another challenge is a new and growing gender gap. Put simply, boys are struggling. We have had great success in the last 30 years in giving young women access to a quality education and all that goes with it. From the classroom to the playing field, we have been successful.

Title IX, obviously, has played an enormous role in the athletic achievement of girls. But in the process, we have overlooked the increasing struggle of boys and young men with regard to staying in school, going on to college and graduating. The numbers speak for themselves.

Two-thirds of all students in special education are boys.

Only 64 percent of all boys are graduating from high school -- and that number is a dismal 42.8% for African-American boys, according to a new report by the Urban Institute.

There are now about 2 million more women than men in college. By 2010, according to the U.S. Department of Education, the gender gap will grow to 138 women for every 100 men on a college campus.

My point here is not to detract from our success in ensuring that young women have equal access to the finest education possible. There is no turning back when it comes to equality for women.

But we simply do not know why boys and young men are struggling with education. There is little in the way of research that gives us a framework for addressing this issue – an issue, I might add, that has significant long-term social and economic consequences for our nation.

Sixth, we are doing a good job at improving early education, and we need to do a better job at reforming America's high schools. This is a challenge that Governor Mark Warner has taken up, and I am so pleased that he is taking on this leadership role on behalf of the NGA.

According to the well-respected and nonpartisan Urban Institute, approximately 1.2 million students did not graduate from high school this year. These are the young people who are, in fact, being "left behind" right now.

So we need to do a much better job of getting our middle school students ready for high school and a much better job of helping our young people stay in school until they graduate.

Some urban school districts are starting to move in the direction of creating smaller high schools. Los Angeles is a good example. The issue, though, is not small schools vs. big schools but how to build schools within schools in a cost-effective manner.

I am on the board of the KnowledgeWorks Foundation in Ohio and, with Gates Foundation support, we just led the way in opening up more than 50 small high schools in eight urban school districts.

Seventh, we still have our work cut out for us when it comes to supporting teachers in the classroom. We must pay greater attention to strengthening teaching as a profession and providing better preparation and support to teachers. This means that higher education has to step up to the challenge.

One of the fundamental problems we face in American education is the continuing disconnection between higher education and our nation's public elementary and secondary schools. America is fortunate to have the finest system of higher education in the world -- a model of quality, diversity and opportunity. UVA and the Curry School of Education under Dean David Breneman are fine examples of high quality.

But, unfortunately, too many university communities see themselves apart from the rest of public education. They make no connection between the quality of the teachers they educate and the quality of our public schools.

I firmly believe that we cannot give all of our children an excellent education if our universities continue to marginalize their colleges of education and fail to play a larger role in reforming public K-12 education. Those of us working in public education need help from our colleagues in the higher education community. We cannot do it alone.

Conclusion

I end now in the hope that I have conveyed to you some sense of the challenges and opportunities we face in improving American education. There is much to do. And to my way of thinking, what we do in the classroom to educate the rising generation is vitally important to helping our great country in these difficult times.

Today we hear a great deal about patriotism. I am a veteran of the U.S. Navy and am very patriotic. But we need to expand our view of patriotism.

Every time a high school teacher inspires a young person to stay in school, a patriotic duty is being performed. Quality teachers and principals and superintendents and parents and students are all patriotic citizens.

Every time a guidance counselor persuades a young person to take the core courses that get them on the path to college or meaningful careers, our nation becomes a little stronger.

And every time a college professor encourages a bright, young person to become a teacher, our great nation becomes more secure.

If we offer our young people a future of hope and an education of excellence, they will respond. They will fulfill the great promise of this nation to achieve equality in freedom. And they will continue to sustain America as a democracy of learning.

Thank you.