

The Blumenfeld Education Letter

"My People Are Destroyed For Lack Of Knowledge" HOSEA 4:6

Vol. 9, No. 5 (Letter # 93)

EDITOR: Samuel L. Blumenfeld

May 1994

The purpose of this newsletter is to provide knowledge for parents and educators who want to save the children of America from the destructive forces that endanger them. Our children in the public schools are at grave risk in 4 ways: academically, spiritually, morally, and physically — and only a well-informed public will be able to reduce these risks.

"Without vision, the people perish."

OBE and Big Brother: Data Collection for the New World Order and Carnegie Corp. Launches Plan for Fed Control of Children

One of the more disturbing, if not frightening, aspects of the Outcome-Based Education revolution is its obsession with data collection. But it all makes sense if you see it from the point of view of the educational totalitarians whose aim it is to use behavioral psychology for the purpose of modifying and controlling human behavior. Thus, the National Center for Education Statistics has been designated by the psycho-educators to be the recipient of computer dossiers on every school child and every teacher in America.

According to Beverly Eckman's *Educating for the New World Order*, the super computer already exists. It is called the Elementary and Secondary Integrated Data System and it will be linked with all of the other federal computer networks collecting data on American citizens. Vice President Al Gore has been in the forefront of the effort to create a "national superhighway for computer information," and as Senator, he introduced the Supercomputer Network Study Act of 1985 which Congress enacted into law.

That this data collection program has been in the works for sometime is indicated by the existence of a Handbook issued in 1974 by the National Center for Education Statistics on State Educational Records and Reports. In their section on Student/Pupil Accounting, they list the major categories of student information. A three-digit system is used to categorize the data. For example, Personal Identification falls under 1 00: Name 1 01, Student Number 1 02, Sex 1 03, Racial/Ethnic Group 1 04, etc. Note the use of an identification number which will probably be the individual's Social Security Number, which is gradually becoming the American citizen's all-purpose ID number.

Family and Residence data fall under 2 00, Family Economic Information 2 40, and Family Social/Cultural Information 2 50.

Physical Health, Sensory, and Related Conditions fall under 3 00, starting with the Student Medical Record Number 3 01, and then covering every aspect of the student's physical health and medical life.

Mental, Psychological and Proficiency Test Results and Related Student Character-

The Blumenfeld Education Letter is published monthly. Sources of products and services described are not necessarily endorsed by this publication. They are intended to provide our readers with information on a rapidly expanding field of educational activity. Permission to quote is granted provided proper credit is given. Original material is copyrighted by The Blumenfeld Education Letter. Subscription Rate: 1 year \$36.00. Address: Post Office Box 45161, Boise, Idaho 83711. Phone (208) 322-4440.

istics fall under 4 00. All data collected through psychological testing will be placed under that category, with Specific Mental and Psychological Characteristics under 4 30.

Enrollment information falls under 5 00, with Type of Program entered 5 23, and Type of Class for Instructional Grouping 5 24.

Performance falls under 6 00, Transportation under 7 00, and Special Assistance under 8 00.

Who Gets the Information?

Undoubtedly, the handbook has been further revised since 1974. But who will have access to all of this information, and for what reason? Will potential employers, recruiters, and police departments be given this data? Is the U.S. government now to become involved in dispensing private information about its citizens as a new information service? Supposing some of that information leads to negative consequences for the individual. Will he or she be able to sue the government for releasing that information? Who will own that information?

If the government is not going to make this information available to others, then why are the bureaucrats collecting it?

The government of a free people does not collect dossiers on all of its citizens. A police state does. According to the Declaration of Independence, the purpose of government is to secure the unalienable rights of its citizens, of which privacy is one of the most important.

The federal government's rationale for collecting all of this data is that it is needed to see if the nation is reaching the national goals set by Goals 2000. According to the Student Data Handbook for Elementary and Secondary Education developed for the U.S. Department of Education by the Council of

Chief State School Officers, the National Cooperative Education Statistics System was established by the Hawkins-Stafford Education Improvement Amendments of 1988 (P.L. 100-297) "to involve state and federal governments in a mutual effort to produce state comparable and nationally uniform data on public and private school systems."

Permanent Student Records

To understand how all of this works, you have to get down into the bowels of Washington's educational bureaucracies. For example, the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) is the grand overseer of all of this data collection. In 1991, it awarded a three-year contract to the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) "to facilitate the implementation of a national education data system." The project was called the Education Data System Implementation Project (EDSIP). Two years prior to EDSIP, the NCES began constructing "an interstate student records transfer system, currently called ExPRESS," an acronym for Exchange of Permanent Records Electronically for Students and Schools. The function of ExPRESS is given as follows:

This activity has included the development of standard data elements for inclusion in an electronic student transcript and a pilot exchange of student records across school districts and from districts to institutions of higher education. The system is now ready for further development, including the appointment of a Governing Board, making formal arrangements with a communications network for exchanging the records, and expansion to more sites.

EDSIP also included implementing a Personnel Exchange System for sharing state expertise in solving education data problems, the development of an Information Referral System for sharing information to improve data systems across states, and the

development of student and staff data handbooks.

The CCSSO has carried out two other projects for the NCES. The first, the Education Data Improvement Project (1985-88), "analyzed each state's capacity to provide standard, comparable, and timely data to NCES on public elementary and secondary school and school district, staff, students, revenues and expenditures." The second project was the New Education Data Improvement Project (1988-91) to provide technical assistance plans for each state, which addressed the state's problems in responding to Common Core of Data requirements.

All of these projects are being carried out by highly efficient bureaucrats who love to micromanage the details of data collection, with no thought of what all of this means to American freedom.

As has been stated, the government's rationale for collecting all this data is to find out if the nation is achieving its goals as outlined in Goals 2000. Goal 5, for example, states: "By the year 2000, every adult American will be literate and will possess the knowledge and skills necessary to compete in a global economy and exercise the rights and responsibilities of citizenship."

Since the U.S. Department of Education determined through its \$12-million survey that about half the adults in America can barely read and write, it makes one wonder how Goal 5 is to be achieved by the year 2000 without all of these poor readers being given crash remedial reading courses in intensive, systematic phonics. That will never happen. So what is the real purpose of Goal 5? It has something to do with the "responsibilities of citizenship."

Enter Anita Hoge

For a better idea of what the government has in mind, let us look into a publica-

tion put out in 1975 by the Pennsylvania Department of Education. Its title is *Getting Inside the EQA Inventory*. EQA stands for Educational Quality Assessment and it was meant to be a prototype for measuring national objectives. This is the document that got Anita Hoge, the indefatigable Pennsylvania mother, into a David and Goliath struggle with the federal and Pennsylvania governments over a parent's right to see the psychological tests which were being given to her child in school without her knowledge or consent. Beverly Eckman's book is about Anita Hoge's saga, without which we would know very little about the data collection plans of the government. The document states (p. 19):

Viewed in its broadest sense responsible citizenship implies a respect for law and proper authority, a willingness to assume responsibility for our own actions and for those of the groups to which we belong

Opportunities should be provided for pupils to cooperate and work toward group goals and to demonstrate integrity in dealing with others. Pupils should be given the chance to take the initiative and assume leadership for group action as well as lend support to group efforts as followers.

Apparently, according to government bureaucrats, "responsibilities of citizenship" has more to do with collectivist activity, than with an understanding of the U.S. Constitution. In fact, if you analyze what the educators will be testing in order to determine whether or not the student has achieved the desired goal, you will see that they have a very strange idea of what citizenship is all about. For example, the document states:

The mores, codes, laws and social expectations of society provide the reference points for judging which behaviors reflect *responsible* citizenship and which indicate poor citizenship. A review of literature revealed that the National Assessment of Educational Progress developed nine general citizenship objectives. The criterion for inclusion of any one

objective was its relative importance to society as agreed upon by a committee of scholars and lay people.

These national objectives were used to provide the frame of reference for what was to be measured. Objectives in the factual domain such as (a) knowing structure of government and (b) understanding problems of international relations were not considered in developing the scale.

There, you have it. The psycho-educators are not interested in whether or not the student knows anything about how the government works. Their interest is in attitudes and behavior. "The display of responsible citizenship behaviors like *honesty* or *integrity* are most often situational," says the Pennsylvania Department of Education.

In other words, there is no absolute standard of honesty or integrity. The document continues:

A person's display of good citizenship behavior under one set of motivating conditions tells us little about the way he or she can be expected to act if those conditions are altered. The context in which the behavior is elicited therefore becomes at least as important in determining the outcome as the predisposition of the individual involved.

A very neat bit of psycho-babble. So what's the solution? Read on:

To assess citizenship, a behavior-referenced model incorporating elements related to the psychological notion of *threshold* is used. In reference to citizenship, threshold refers to that set of conditions necessary to bring about the desirable responses. Thus by varying the situation and introducing conditions of reward and punishment we are able to determine the cutoff levels at which the student will display positive behavior. In this way it is possible to assess not only the students' predisposition to behave in a manner consistent with responsible citizenship but also provide some measure of the intensity of that predisposition across a wide spectrum of situations.

What kind of questions are asked in such an assessment? The document continues:

Fifty-seven items measure willingness to ex-

hibit good citizenship in many social situations under a variety of motivating conditions. Social contexts are given by 19 situations, each posing a problem and suggesting an action predefined as good or poor citizenship. Each story has three items which list positive or negative consequences resulting from the action. Students are asked to decide whether to take the action for each consequence.

Sample situation (grade 11):

There is a secret club at school called the Midnight Artists. They go out late at night and paint funny sayings and pictures on buildings. A student is asked to join the club. In this situation, I would JOIN THE CLUB when I knew . . .

1. My best friend asked me join.
2. Most of the popular students were in the club.
3. My parents would *ground* me if they found out I joined.

The response for each choice is Yes, Maybe, or No. Guess what the politically correct answer is. In the norm-referenced scoring, "Positive Citizenship" was scored as 2 Yes, 1 Maybe, and 0 no. "Negative Citizenship" was scored as 0 Yes, 1 Maybe, 2 No.

These are the kinds of psycho questions that will be asked and tabulated by all of these expensive computer data collection systems. Students will not be tested on their knowledge of the Constitution, or of our political system. They will be tested on how well they relate to the group.

A Christian student would have had a very difficult time responding to the situation posed in the test. First of all, he or she would not have wanted to join a secret club, or stay out late at night, or paint pictures on private property. The situation as posed in the test represents the psychologists' view that honesty and integrity are situational. But that would not be the case with a Christian. If 0 Yes, 1 Maybe, and 2 No equal negative citizenship, what would a 3 No score mean? Hopeless anti-collectivist? Incurable Christian?

The situation posed in the test is very much like the lifeboat survival games, or the fallout shelter survival games used in values clarification programs. They are all artificial situations which do not represent reality and provide no useful information about anything. Yet, our government will be spending billions of dollars to collect this "information" so that our socialist educators can determine what kind of brainwashing is needed to create the new socialist man.

SCANS

There is also the matter of SCANS, the Secretary's Commission on Achieving Necessary Skills. The Secretary in this case is not the Secretary of Education, but the Secretary of Labor. One of the ways the psycho-educators have been able to recruit support from big business for Outcome-Based Education and school restructuring is by promising to turn out well-trained students for the workforce. In other words, the federal government will become involved in training students for specific jobs based on the needs of the economy, which is what the Communist government of the Soviet Union did in the past.

In order to earn a Certificate of Initial Mastery, the student will be required to learn specific skills for a specific job. Which means, that for most American students, public education will become a form of job training, with little emphasis on the academic skills and knowledge which traditionally were considered to be the most important aspect of education, public or otherwise.

Data from the student's computerized record will be used to create a Résumé summing up the student's workplace competency, personal qualities, academic courses, extracurricular activities, etc. In other words, each student will be under total administrative control by the educational

and labor bureaucracies, guided, trained, and brainwashed by the psycho-educators to behave in a manner acceptable to the powers that be.

The OBE people have criticized traditional public education as having been structured along the lines of the factory model. What is the new OBE school model? It's the Pavlovian-Skinnerian psych lab based on operant conditioning. The emerging product will be a semi-literate, intellectually crippled human being, with robotlike responses to the demands of the workplace. The superior students, identified early as the gifted and talented, will be shunted off into higher education to be groomed for membership in the ruling elite. They will have the situational honesty, integrity, and sociability of Bill and Hillary Clinton.

Is that what Americans want from their public schools? Probably not. But whether or not they do anything about it is still to be seen.

Carnegie Corp. Launches Plan to Control Early Childhood Development

We have long suspected that the purpose of Goal 1 of the Goals 2000 program is government control of child rearing, education and development in America. Goal 1 reads: "By the year 2000, all children in America will start school ready to learn." Sounds innocuous enough until you read the small print. There are real teeth in Goal 1 as confirmed by the release in April of the Carnegie Corporation's report on early childhood development. The event was reported in *Education Week* of April 13, 1994 and provides the reader with a pretty good idea of what's ahead in government policy and federal legislation, and since it comes out of

a Carnegie foundation, none of it is good for American freedom:

Calling the birth-to-3 span the most critical period in a child's development but the most neglected by policy-makers, an expert panel is proposing a broad blueprint for improvements in education, child and health care, and community services to support young children and their families.

In a report scheduled for release this week, a Carnegie Corporation of New York task force highlights compelling research evidence on the importance of the first three years of life.

A "remarkable" consensus is emerging on what it takes to spur healthy development, the 30-member panel says, while warning that a pattern of social neglect has dimmed the prospects of a "staggering number" of children.

"The crucially formative years of early childhood have become a time of peril and loss for millions of children and their families," writes David A. Hamburg, the president of the Carnegie Corporation, in the foreword to the report.

Among the group's recommendations to spur "responsible parenthood" are expanding family-planning services—including birth control and, in some cases, access to abortion and adoption services—and starting parenthood education in elementary school.

The report also calls on educators to incorporate services for the youngest children in "plans for schools of the 21st century" and urges secondary schools and community colleges to provide training and technical aid to child-care providers. . . .

The report signals an increasing awareness "that what goes on in the first three years of life is very important to school readiness," noted Kathryn Taaffe Young, the director of studies for the Carnegie task force and the report's primary author.

"We need a systematic approach," Ms. Young emphasized. While urging a 10-year investment in young children, the panel did not offer a cost estimate. . . .

The document, which Ms. Young described as the first major national report to address the needs of infants and toddlers, is being released at a meeting here that is expected to feature an address by Hillary Rodham Clinton and talks by Cabinet members, policymakers, child-development experts, and business leaders.

Note how easily the Carnegie Corporation was able to arrange to have the First Lady and members of the President's Cabi-

net take part in the release of the report. The article continues:

Dr. Julius B. Richmond, a professor of health policy at Harvard University and the first director of Head Start, said the group hopes to spur community-based responses that integrate health, education, and social policy. Dr. Richmond and Eleanor E. Macoby, a professor of psychology at Stanford University, took over as co-chairman of the task force last year after the original chairman, Richard W. Riley, became the Secretary of Education. . . .

The report points to data showing that early brain development is far more rapid, extensive, and vulnerable to environmental influences than once thought. . . .

"Increasing the proportion of planned, low-risk births requires a national commitment" to expand access to both prenatal care and a "full range of family-planning services," the report states. . . .

Other recommendations include:

- Providing, as part of a "minimum health-care-reform package," primary and preventive health-care services; immunizations; and preconception, prenatal, and postpartum services.

- Offering home-visiting services to all first-time mothers with a newborn and more comprehensive visits to families at risk of poor maternal and child health.

- Expanding the federal family-leave law to cover small firms and to provide leave for four to six months with partial pay.

- Channeling substantial amounts of aid to improve child care for children under 3, providing incentives to states to improve child-care standards, and bolstering care-giver training, wages, and benefits.

- Expanding federal nutrition programs to serve all eligible women and children and adapting Head Start to serve poor families with infants and toddlers.

- Expanding programs to teach nonviolent conflict resolution and enacting stringent gun-control laws. . . . The report urges federal agencies and states to remove obstacles to serving young children comprehensively and urges action by a wide range of social forces, including the media and parents.

Quite an agenda for the nation set by the Carnegie Corporation, formulated by statist cadres of social engineers from academe, passed through to the White House, Congress and government agencies to be enacted into law. This is cultural revolution in

a hurry, imposed from above on an unsuspecting nation too busy with the business of economic survival to notice.

Education Week of April 20, 1994 reported the follow up:

A Carnegie Corporation of New York report sounding the alarm about a "quiet crisis" facing the nation's youngest children evoked a loud and emotional outpouring of support from top government, business, health, and education officials at a meeting here [Washington, D.C.] last week.

Hillary Rodham Clinton, the first speaker, conceded that it will take uncommon "political will and institutional fortitude" to fill the report's mandate. But there is reason for optimism, she said, simply because of the players involved.

"This room is filled with people who are willing to work to make it happen," Mrs. Clinton said. . . .

In a pitch for the health-care-reform plan she helped draft, she also argued that the Carnegie panel's goals cannot be met without universal health coverage.

Attorney General Janet Reno, Secretary of Education Richard W. Riley, Secretary of Health and Human Services Donna E. Shalala, and Secretary of Housing and Urban Development Henry G. Cisneros each talked about the steps their agencies are taking.

Apparently, when the Carnegie Corporation talks, everybody in Washington listens! But what an incredible sham. "A loud and emotional outpouring of support" for a foundation report by government bureaucrats. Really spontaneous, I imagine, while we know that bureaucrats are neither loud nor emotional. And Hillary talks about the "report's mandate." A mandate, according to my dictionary, is "an authoritative order or command, especially a written one." And she praises all of these people "who are willing to work to make it happen." They were all paid to be there, from the panelists paid by Carnegie, to the Cabinet members who follow orders when Hillary commands. Further follow up was reported in the *Boston Globe* of April 23, 1994:

Head Start could soon be reaching out to preg-

nant women, infants and many more working families—three decades after it first touched the lives of the nation's poorest preschool children. In a late-night vote Thursday, the Senate agreed to expand and improve the comprehensive early childhood development program now serving about 720,000 children, most of them 3 to 5 years old. . . .

In another expansion of Head Start's mission, the bill sets aside a small percentage of the program's budget for services for infants and toddlers. . . .

The Senate's vote comes a week after the Carnegie, Corp., a New York philanthropy, warned that the nation's infants and toddlers are in trouble and that their healthy development—and ultimately the country's economic strength—are at risk.

How many private entities in America can get that kind of attention and action out of the White House and the Congress in the course of one week? I wonder, if we put out a report on illiteracy and the need for intensive, systematic phonics in the primary schools, how far we'd get with the press, or the White House, or the Congress. It was only last September that the U.S. Department of Education revealed the results of its \$12-million survey of adult literacy, stating that about 90 million adult Americans, or half the adult population, have reading and writing skills so poor that they are seriously handicapped in their ability to get good jobs. Now that's a crisis, a real crisis. But Secretary Riley somehow did not get the "loud and emotional" support from officialdom that one might have expected. Instead, he recommended that functionally illiterate Americans go back to school for a "tune-up."

But when it comes to a revolution that will bring the federal government into the bedrooms and nurseries of every family in America, the statist elite simply salivate at the thought of all that new bureaucratic power and regulation they will control. That is the name of the game: controlling people for the New World Order. Remember, every time the Clintons win, we lose a little more of our freedom.

U.S. Ed. Dept. 1995 Budget: \$31.7 Billion

If it's federal dollars you want, the place to be in Washington is the Education Department, which is one of the few federal agencies that will get a boost under the fiscal 1995 budget. The proposed spending would allot the department a total of \$31.7 billion, including big increases for the massive reform agenda and for Chapter 1. The department received \$28.8 billion for fiscal 1994.

The 1995 budget includes \$26.1 billion in discretionary spending—up 7 percent, or \$1.7 billion, over 1994. In addition, about 350 new employees would be added to run the direct-loan program, offset by 222 cuts in other areas of the department.

While aid to the Carnegie-conceived National Board for Professional Teaching Standards is listed as a cut, the department would continue to fund it under a new professional-development program. Head Start is slated to receive a \$700 million increase, for a total of \$4 billion in 1995, through the Health and Human Services Department. Goals 2000 will receive \$700 million, up from \$105 million in 1994. Chapter 1 compensatory-education will receive \$7 billion, an increase of \$664 million. Education research will get an increase of \$35 million to \$191 million, which includes a \$15 million increase for the National Center for Education Statistics and a \$10 million increase for the National Assessment of Educational Progress. Special-ed will get \$3.3 billion, about \$200 million more than in 1994. (*Education Week*, 2/16/94)

Comment: Of course, pumping more money into public education will only make things worse. From 1966 to 1986 over \$49 billion was spent on Chapter 1. The money was supposed to help children in inner cities improve their reading ability. But the very opposite has occurred. In 1988 DE's budget

was about \$21 billion. In fiscal 1995, it will be \$31.7, up \$10.7 billion in 7 years.

A Parent's View of OBE

The following are excerpts from a letter by Karin Knittle-Small, a parent in West Chester, Pennsylvania, and chairman of Daniel Boone Concerned Parents, published in the *Daily Local News*, 8/24/93:

For the past two years, my children have been exposed to the OBE (outcome-based education) monster. Disguised as intervention programs, OBE and the Daniel Boone School District have robbed my children of valuable academic time—instead concentrating on feelings, self-esteem, acceptance of others, and family living programs.

With the use of relaxation tapes, chanting exercises, group encounter situations, emotional stories, and worksheets designed to elicit personal information about students and their families, the Daniel Boone School District and schools across the nation have been watering down academic curriculum for years.

Since OBE's inception in our school district five years ago, parents and taxpayers have watched SAT scores decrease by 2.5 percent and taxes increase by 68 percent. So much for OBE proponents' claims that more money will create better education.

Personally, I have witnessed my children being changed dramatically. Being of Amerasian decent, my children have been raised to look beyond skin color and accept people regardless of race or background. Group encounter programs that encourage young children to point out their differences have changed that.

Suddenly, young children who never saw skin color or ethnic background as a barrier towards friendship are building social walls. Not only have my children been excluded by these social walls, but they have also constructed some of their own.

Academically, my children have also changed. My gifted son, academically bored, has found more disruptive ways to occupy his mind. My average daughter struggled through her homework assignments because she didn't have her "cooperative partner" to copy answers from. . . .

It's time for educators to be truthful with parents. OBE is an expensive psychological experiment, and our future generations are the guinea pigs.