

## **Keeping Watch on the Official Education Agenda**

January 2000

by Robert Holland

---

### **Executive Summary**

The U.S. Department of Education has let political agendas influence its education policy. It has collaborated with special interest groups to preserve the federal presence in K-12 education and to block liberty-enhancing alternatives, such as school choice.

This report cites several examples of this politicization, such as:

- The attempt to re-regulate charter schools, which would crush the innovative purpose of these largely independent institutions.
  - The Department's chiming-in with the teacher unions in contending with stunning illogic that vouchers and tuition tax credits should be disallowed because public schools enroll more than 90 percent of schoolchildren. (It's a monopoly; just leave it alone.)
  - DoEd's joining with the teacher unions in claiming -- once again with a lack of logic -- that class size reduction must take precedence over school choice.
  - The upholding of the National Assessment Educational Programs (NAEP) reading gains as real, though averages obviously were inflated in several states by the growing exclusion of disabled children from the testing.
  - The endorsement of 10 fuzzy math programs as the nation's best, despite the warning of distinguished mathematicians and scientists that they are among the nation's worst.
- 

### **Keeping Watch on the Official Education Agenda**

The U.S. Department of Education (DoEd) has a bond with lobbyists for special-interest groups that are opposed to school choice and in favor of maintaining the status quo in federal education programs. Among these organizations are the two teacher unions (the National Education Association and American Federation of Teachers), the National School Boards Association, the American Association of School Administrators, the Council of the Great City Schools, and the Committee for Education Funding.

During 1996-97, Paul Steidler, then a senior fellow of the Alexis de Tocqueville Institution, watched these collaborators in action during weekly meetings at DoEd's offices in Washington, D.C. Mr. Steidler witnessed such strange happenings as an NEA lobbyist berating a career DoEd official for strong charter-school expansion language that had been proposed in President Clinton's school construction bill. In addition, he

heard a lobbyist for the Council of the Great City Schools, which represents the largest urban districts, tell senior DoEd officials with regard to charter schools, "this thing has gone too far." Other collaborationists regularly criticized attempts to expand charters as well as scholarship/voucher projects for low-income families.

Mr. Steidler's exposé caught the interest of Senator Larry Craig's office and sparked a General Accounting Office investigation. Because of his efforts, the Department of Education evidently has become more circumspect about facilitating a lobbying operation out of its taxpayer-funded quarters. A friend of Lexington Institute who has continued to attend the now-biweekly meetings observed that lately these sessions "are very carefully conducted to comply with prohibitions against lobbying by federal agencies. An attorney is now present at every meeting to clarify questions for Department staff on what can and can't be said." This observer added: "The impression I get is that they are scrupulously trying to avoid even the appearance of impropriety. There is never any discussion on how to stop or slow the school choice movement."

So, thanks to Mr. Steidler's efforts, the get-togethers at DoEd apparently now are within the bounds of federal law. But there are many signs of continued overlap of agendas on the part of the Cabinet-level education agency and interest groups. Whether this results from collaboration or an informal meshing of purpose, it bears watching because politicization can taint official reports and data about education that citizens might assume to be objective information.

By monitoring public statements and sites on the World Wide Web, and attending congressional hearings and many of DoEd's weekly meetings, Lexington Institute scholars have collected the following evidence of intertwined agendas affecting policy:

### **Charter Schools**

Even though the Clinton Administration now generates frequent press releases lauding the fast-growing charter-school movement, President Clinton recommended only a \$30 million increase -- from the current \$100 million to \$130 million -- in charter school start-up and development aid for Fiscal Year 2000.

By contrast, the President proposed spending \$491 million to continue Goals 2000 into the year 2001, even though that plan for federal coordination of local and state school reform has fallen far short of meeting its objectives.<sup>1</sup>

The evidence suggests that because of the oft-repeated opposition to autonomous, innovative charter schools from its teacher-union allies, the Administration is going slowly on backing this movement.

A key feature of the Administration's proposal for reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act caused concern among supporters of charter schools. For the ostensible purpose of improving the quality of teaching, the Administration sought to

require that all states attain within four years a level of 95 percent of teachers being state-certified. The problem is that many states currently give charter schools flexibility permitting them to hire teachers of varied backgrounds – including many who have not gone through the education-school track toward official certification.

As private schools' success with non-state-certified teachers demonstrates, there are many people in varied walks of life who could make a contribution to classrooms. Charter schools were set up partly to be able to take advantage of that pool of talent. If a state had to reach the Administration's arbitrary 95 percent level of certified teachers, it might well look less favorably on charter schools that brought down its average. A state would be tempted to use its legislative power to remove flexibility in teacher-hiring, thereby damaging charter schools. The Administration's unwillingness to exempt charter schools indicates it will join in, at some level, efforts to regulate charter schools out of existence.

The tactic of using regulation as an anti-charter weapon has been on display in California. There the National Education Association affiliate pushed a bill in the state legislature that would have required charter-school teachers to join teacher unions.<sup>2</sup> The bill failed but another measure preventing charter schools from offering long-distance learning via the Internet passed. In addition to regulatory overload, some foes of charter schools were playing the race card. In North Carolina, the NEA affiliate urged the state to close down charter schools that exceeded 85 percent black enrollment. The heavy minority interest in charter results resulted not from segregationist rules but from the free choices of parents seeking better schools. Nevertheless, the education establishment sought to turn the charter schools' success in serving the disadvantaged against them.<sup>3</sup>

Likewise, the race card was being played against charter schools at the national level, by the Justice Department's Civil Rights Division, in consultation with the U.S. Department of Education. The "acting" chief of the Civil Rights Division, Bill Lann Lee, blocked the opening of a Louisiana charter school approved in 1998 by the East Baton Rouge Parish school board. Federal officials contend longstanding desegregation orders require that any new school must undergo review for how its opening will affect the district's desegregation efforts.<sup>4</sup> But such reviews can take months or even years; meanwhile, parents who want their children to have the advantages of attending charter schools find the schoolhouse door barred. Charter proponents say the federal officials have been vague and subjective in enforcing provisions of civil-rights orders that long preceded the start of the national charter-school movement. A Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Anita Hodgkiss, told *Education Week* (October 20, 1999) that the Civil Rights Division is working with DoEd "to guide states on charter schools and desegregation." Rules set in Louisiana could affect charter schools in as many as 19 states with existing desegregation orders.

As more and more charter schools prepare to open (there were more than 1,700 operating in the fall of 1999), their founders can expect official efforts to bury these promising islands of innovation in unreasonable and even mean-spirited requirements. Despite its warm words for charter schools, DoEd aims to please many establishment interest groups that would revel in the destruction of charters.

### **Vouchers and the 90 Percent Dodge**

The U.S. Department of Education joins with the education special interests in sternly opposing any experiments with vouchers or tuition tax credits enabling children in inadequate public schools to choose private or parochial schools. Lately, one tactic has been to oppose vouchers by pointing out that 90 percent of children attend public school.

For instance in a news release of September 2, 1999, criticizing the proposal of Republican presidential contender George W. Bush to make Title I money follow the child to a school of choice if his assigned public school failed to measure up after three years, Secretary of Education Richard Riley stated:

"Our Administration has insisted upon strong accountability measures for low-performing schools. Governor George W. Bush would have us start down the road of accountability, then take a dangerous detour into vouchers. Vouchers undermine our public schools -- which educate about 90% of our children -- by draining badly needed public tax dollars into private and parochial schools. If we are serious about strengthening our public schools, we need a sustained commitment to improve them -- to raise standards, to have accurate assessments linked to standards, and to adopt the strong accountability measures we've proposed, but not to try to solve a public school problem by abandoning public schools."<sup>5</sup>

Meanwhile in the fall of 1999, the American Federation of Teachers was running radio and TV ads opposing vouchers and similarly stressing that 90 percent of American children attend public schools. AFT president Sandra Feldman cites that statistic in the radio spots.

Testifying before the House Budget Committee, the Co-Chairman and CEO of the Children's Scholarship Fund, Theodore J. Forstmann, commented on how bizarre it is that the voucher opponents are parroting each other with the 90 percent figure:

"It's certainly true that 90% of children currently receive education from the government system, or what we call public education. But far from being a reason for rejecting competition, it is precisely why we must embrace it. Because a system that can command, indeed enforce, a 90% market share is a monopoly. And as everyone knows, monopolies always produce bad products at high prices. Because when there is no competition, customers have no alternatives. And with no alternatives, they have no

recourse but to accept whatever a monopoly decides to produce, and pay whatever a monopoly decides to charge."<sup>6</sup>

Through the generous spirit and hard work of Mr. Forstmann and investor John Walton, it has been established beyond a shadow of a doubt that huge demand exists for alternatives to the monopoly schools with their 90 percent-plus market share. When the two men offered 1,000 partial scholarships to children in Washington, D.C., they received almost 8,000 applications. Mr. Walton and Mr. Forstmann then went national -- putting up \$100 million between them and raising another \$70 million to start the Children's Scholarship Fund. Offering 40,000 partial scholarships to low-income families (parents must put up \$1,000 on their own), they received a staggering 1.25 million applications in the spring of 1999. These were from households making less than \$22,000 a year -- families so desperate to get their children out of public schools that they were willing to spend hard-to-scrape-up money for that which they now receive "free" from the government.<sup>7</sup>

Yes, public schools have a 90 percent market share, as the education collaborationists boast; but as the CSF has demonstrated vividly, if all families had the wherewithal and freedom to choose the best school, that market share would decline -- or the public schools would have to improve greatly to hold onto their share, and that too would benefit the children.

### **Class Size Reduction Versus the Voucher Bogeyman**

Another area of overlap between the federal DoEd and education establishment groups like the NEA is the emphasis on class size reduction as the centerpiece of all education reform.

President Clinton is pushing for almost \$13 billion in federal aid over seven years to assist local schools in cutting elementary class sizes to 18. Both the NEA and the American Federation of Teachers are using class size in opposition to school choice, as though an either/or decision is in order: Either Americans will see smaller class sizes for their children or they will get to choose among public, private, and parochial schools. "Class size trumps vouchers every time," declared the AFT leadership, which bitterly opposed voucher experiments in cities like Cleveland with troubled public schools. Of course, the truth is that if students were distributed more evenly among crowded public schools and underutilized private schools, class sizes in public schools could fall. Americans could have choice and smaller class sizes. The unions are posing a false dichotomy.<sup>8</sup>

The NEA and AFT also assert that in terms of raising student achievement class size reduction works and school choice fails. Both assertions are false. The opposite is true. Well-respected University of Rochester economist Eric Hanushek has reviewed 277 separate studies of class-size cuts and has found that more than three-fourths of them

show no improvement at all for smaller classes.<sup>9</sup> Only when classes are slashed to about 15 pupils, and only in kindergarten, did the research show some gains from class-size reduction. In contrast, practically every study that has been done of public voucher programs in Milwaukee and Cleveland, and private vouchers in New York, Dayton, and Washington, D. C., has shown positive effects in terms of test scores and parental satisfaction.<sup>10</sup>

A collaborative effort to taint school choice has been most evident with regard to Milwaukee. There, People for the American Way, a liberal group founded by TV director Norman Lear, has received NEA subsidies to undertake anti-voucher work. The NEA's executive director, Don Cameron, is a PFAW board member. Among other things, PFAW has sent forth decoy parents to call schools of choice to see if they can detect any problems with admissions requirements. They made such allegations as that schools violate rights to religious liberty by discouraging parents from opting out of religious instruction. But according to Joe Williams of the *Milwaukee Journal Sentinel*, such charges – while making national headlines – are basically a "non-issue" in Milwaukee. No actual parents have complained – quite plausibly because they like the orientation, religious or otherwise, of the schools they chose for their children.<sup>11</sup>

The campaign of falsehoods about private-school choice does filter into the national dialogue, though. In June, North Carolina Governor James Hunt – a close ally of President Clinton and Secretary Riley in government-directed "systemic" education reform – told the *Atlanta Journal-Constitution* that most vouchers in Milwaukee, instead of going to help black children find alternatives to weak inner-city schools, were aiding parents of "suburban white kids who are either already in private school or whose parents wanted them to be there." In fact, all Milwaukee voucher students must live in the city, and the vast majority are low-income minority youngsters. But that's the kind of untruth that opponents of free choice -- whether in the government or special-interest groups -- are eager to spread on talk shows.<sup>12</sup>

The task of choice supporters is to correct misstatements like Gov. Hunt's and get the truth before the American people.

### **The Strange Case of the NAEP Release . . .**

For the federal government to have a legitimate place as a collector and reporter of data about what works in education, it is absolutely essential to keep political agendas out of the process. Yet politics took center stage February 10, 1999 at the unveiling of scores on the 1998 National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) reading exam.

Education lobbyists and political appointees at the U.S. Department of Education received the best seats at the front of the auditorium, and Vice President Al Gore -- the lead speaker for the event -- received thunderous standing ovations upon his arrival and departure. Some who attended said the event resembled a Gore for President rally,

with Gore boasting of modest gains in reading proficiency in the latest round of NAEP testing.<sup>13</sup>

Those who collected and reported the data were not caught up in the excitement, however. "The format, tone, and substance of that event was not consistent with the principle of an independent, nonpartisan release of . . . data," declared Mark Musick, chairman of the National Assessment Governing Board (NAGB), in a letter to Pascal D. Forgione, Jr., the Commissioner of Education Statistics for the Department of Education.

Mr. Musick said the campaign-like atmosphere undermined the credibility of the results. NAGB had maintained a policy whereby Mr. Forgione would announce results of the tests, and only afterwards would political figures comment on them. Unless such a policy is followed, Mr. Musick said, "it eventually won't matter how much attention is paid to the results; people won't believe them." *Education Week* quoted Mr. Forgione as adding that the incident was "anomalous" but if regularly repeated it would damage the reputation of NAEP.<sup>14</sup>

During the event, Mr. Gore had hailed a rise in fourth, eighth, and 12<sup>th</sup> grade scores in 1998 over those on the 1994 NAEP reading test. But it fell to Mr. Forgione to observe later that the fourth and 12<sup>th</sup> graders had shown "no net gain" since 1992, the first year that the current version of the NAEP test had been given. Mr. Forgione also later launched an investigation in response to allegations that some states' improvements had been inflated because of an expanded exempting of learning-disabled children from the testing. (See the next item below.) In May, the White House refused to support Forgione's renomination for reasons it claimed to be unrelated to his clash with Clinton/Gore staffs over presentation of the NAEP results. Senior members of the House Committee on Education and the Workforce expressed concern and said they would look for models to see how the National Center for Education Statistics could be insulated from political influence in the future.<sup>15</sup>

### **. . . And the Even Stranger Validation of NAEP Data**

In addition to the overt use of NAEP data as the occasion for a campaign-style rally, there was the more subtle spin given the results. With scores up modestly from the 1994 testing, the Department of Education tried to attach huge significance to statistically significant gains in states that have been pursuing its favored model of systemic, standards-based reform. The department singled out states like Kentucky (reading scores up 6 points since 1994) and Connecticut (scores up 10 points) for praise. "States that have taken the lead at standards-based reform are getting good results," declared Education Secretary Riley.

That was a hasty judgment, as it turns out. Government statisticians had not taken into account the rate of inclusion or exclusion from the testing of what's bureaucratically called the IEP children. IEP stands for "individualized education program," the

accommodations that under federal law public schools must make for each disabled student. The extent to which such children are tested – and the concessions some get in taking a test – can swing achievement trends up or down.

After the NAEP/Gore celebration at DoEd headquarters, it came to light that Kentucky had excluded a whopping 10 percent of its potential test-takers – IEP children – from its tested sample. For the 1992 and 1994 runs of NAEP, it had excluded only 4 percent. Connecticut, too, removed 10 percent of the IEPs after pulling out 6 percent of them in 1994. When this was brought to public light, Mr. Forgione sheepishly (but honestly) admitted that the exclusion could have influenced overall scores. However, he said, there was no intent to influence NAEP scores. It had been an honest mistake. A subsequent review by the Educational Testing Service confirmed that reading scores in states like Kentucky and Maryland probably got a boost from the rise in exclusion rates.<sup>16</sup>

The person most responsible for bringing the facts out in the open is not a federal employee. He is retired Air Force officer Richard Innes, an electrical engineer and commercial pilot who lives in northern Kentucky. Mr. Innes, who programmed automated teaching machines for the Air Force in the 1970s, has followed Kentucky's so-called "reform" assessments with a critical eye over the past five years. His accurate observations on the fallacies underlying the recent NAEP results caught the attention of reporters, and the story got national play.

"The inclusion problem," Mr. Innes predicts, will continue to taint the validity of national assessments -- as well as the national tests President Clinton and others would like to institute. The problem, he suggests, "is perhaps unsolvable." The nature of the IEP itself is a basic obstacle. Some of these call for special accommodations when disabled students are taking tests – for example, a teacher may read a "reading" test aloud. But if it must be read aloud, can the pupil be accurately called an independent reader? (And is it really a test of reading?) Moreover, teachers sometimes even paraphrase test items, which raises the question of who is doing the real work.

In setting rules for the 1998 NAEP, the NAGB held that if an IEP states that a child requires special help to be tested fairly, then the tester should remove his scores from the sample. Given its philosophical leanings toward "full inclusion," Kentucky has added many more disabled students to statewide testing -- but now under the new NAGB rule must remove their scores from the state's overall results.

Rather than learning from the NAEP debacle, however, DoEd and its National Center for Education Statistics contracted for a second round of research with the evident hope of putting a better face on the situation. In response to a request from Kentucky officials (Kentucky Education Commissioner Wilmer Cody is a member of NAGB), the NCES retained Dr. Laress Wise, president of the Human Resources Research Organization, to look at Kentucky's scores and factors influencing them. (Dr. Wise also does research for

Kentucky's education department.) By comparing Kentucky fourth-graders who were excluded from the 1998 NAEP with similar students who took the state's own reading test, Dr. Wise concluded Kentucky's gains in reading were significant and that the impact of the IEP exclusions was "modest."<sup>17</sup>

Richard Innes responded that what the DoED-subsidized researcher had done "is purely and simply compare apples to oranges." Mr. Innes' alternate analysis of Kentucky's NAEP exclusion assumes that the state's excluded students properly could be scored a zero on reading because their teachers had declared them such poor readers that all test questions had to be read by proctors. Under this analysis, Kentucky's reading score would be no higher than a 204, in contrast to the 218 the state actually received.

Mr. Innes says a regression analysis of published NAEP fourth-grade reading scores and exclusion rates indicates no less than 3.2 points of Kentucky's 6-point increase "might be solely caused by increased exclusion of students with disabilities." Moreover, "piecewise linear regression analysis implies a still higher inflation occurred due to the high rate of exclusion in Kentucky. Either of these situations would mean Kentucky's score change was not statistically significant."<sup>18</sup>

Certainly legitimate questions exist as to how test results are compared state to state when there are major differences in who's tested and who's not. But given the seepage of political agendas into the Department of Education's recent use of NAEP data, it is clear that citizens must be wary of facile conclusions from such testing.

### **Federal Favors for Fuzzy Math**

Another bizarre sign of DoEd's ideological agenda influencing the national education agenda came November 18, 1999 when some of America's sharpest mathematical minds went public with their concerns about the state of mathematics education. They placed a full-page ad in *The Washington Post* condemning DoEd's endorsement of a Top Ten in K-12 math curricula. All 10 programs federally blessed as "exemplary" or "promising" are from the fuzzy genre of the New New Math.<sup>19</sup>

The signers were from intellectual citadels like Stanford, Cal State, Yale, and Harvard -- 200 in all, with four Nobel laureates among them. They complained in their open letter to Education Secretary Richard Riley that DoEd's Expert Panel in charge of selecting the programs lacked the views of practicing mathematicians and scientists. The panel in fact was under the sway of the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM), the prime proponent of national standards that de-emphasize computational skills in favor of students better understanding math concepts -- or even creating their own.

A visit to MathLand, one of DoEd's "promising" programs, helps provide insight as to what this battle is all about:

While he was mathematics chairman at the University of California/Santa Barbara, Martin Scharlemann sat in on a local school system's explanation of MathLand and was astonished to find that the standard method of doing multiplication is not even taught. Instead, a MathLand curriculum czarina presented a "Russian peasants' algorithm" for calculating  $13 \times 18 = 234$  that entailed "cutting and pasting various strips of paper in various places" and doing 3 divisions, 3 multiplications, a cancellation, and finally a mysterious addition of three numbers. In contrast to such murk is the straightforward algorithm, which requires just two multiplications and an addition of two numbers.<sup>20</sup>

"Skipping something so beautiful and basic will handicap MathLand victims for the rest of their lives," said Professor Scharlemann in an account posted at [www.mathematicallycorrect.com](http://www.mathematicallycorrect.com), the Web page of the foes of fuzzy math.

Indeed, one of the leaders on DoEd's Expert Panel, proposed in an *Education Week* piece in 1994 that computational algorithms be abandoned altogether,

"It's time to recognize," wrote Steven Leinwand, math adviser for Connecticut's Department of Education, "that, for many students, real mathematical power, on the one hand, and facility with multidigit, pencil-and-paper computational algorithms, on the other, are mutually exclusive. In fact, it's time to acknowledge that continuing to teach these skills to our students is not only unnecessary, but counterproductive and downright dangerous."<sup>21</sup>

Another of the favored programs, rated "exemplary" by DoEd, is Connected Mathematics, which has sparked an outcry around the country. In Plano, Texas, parents have sued the local school board for failing to provide alternatives to Connected Math. A *Washington Post* feature described it in terms of fun and games: ". . . percentages are taught with story problems about restaurant tips and the sales tax on CDs. Fractions, ratios, and perimeters are taught within the context of movie tickets, brownies, and bad cat breath."<sup>22</sup>

In a way the open letter to Riley was just the latest skirmish in the 30-year Math Wars. Before the New New Math came the New Math in the Sixties. Eventually it was hooted to the sidelines before returning in a new uniform, as mindless education fads usually do. In 1997, many of the California signers of the 1999 letter to Riley were successful in convincing the Golden State to junk NCTM's fuzzy standards in favor of a much more traditional curriculum. They argued that in a high-tech society, students will need to have command of basic skills in order to move on to advanced technical concepts, or to have a shot at being physicists or engineers. The Expert Panel's Top Ten, then, looked like payback by the NCTM pedagogues.

But there's a deeper issue than a game of gotcha between PhDs and ed-school majors. There's the whole question of the appropriateness of the federal education agency

peddling curricula for any reason, but particularly of its doing so to promote an egalitarian ideology.

DoEd's Expert Panels did not just spring out of the blue. Congress signed off on this venture in 1994 when it passed the Goals 2000: Educate America Act, Title IX of which called on DoEd's Office of Educational Research and Improvement to set up Expert Panels to endorse top programs in gender equity, safe and drug-free schools, technology, and, yes, math and science. Title IX (like Goals 2000 itself) stressed the idea of equal outcomes; the achievement gap for minorities (which is lamentable, to be sure) must be closed at all costs.

That mandate was right in line with the NCTM commission that had promulgated the fuzzy math standards in 1989. The group declared that social injustices had given white males an advantage over women and minorities in math and promised the NCTM's reinvented math would equalize scores. Specifically, they claimed that eliminating the "computational gate" would bring the desired equality of results.

In essence, they sought to bring designated victim groups up to par by taking the math out of math. (One MathLand exercise invites students to conjure their Fantasy Lunch, draw it, then cut out the servings and place them in a bag. Math? *Zero*.) Could anything be more insulting to females and minority children than to suggest that only through such dumbing-down can they excel? Can anything be more limiting for their aspirations?<sup>23</sup>

Finally, what about all of us when we must deal with the consequences of physicians, airplane designers, or architects having been indoctrinated in school with hostility to mathematical precision? The U.S. Department of Education's political agendas for education can be hazardous to our health.

### Notes

<sup>1</sup>"Goals 2000: The Hour Has Arrived to Re-Evaluate The Federal Role in Education Reform," Issue Brief, the Lexington Institute, Arlington, Va., July 21, 1999.

<sup>2</sup>Mariel Garza, "Contract Clause," *Reason*, August/September.

<sup>3</sup>National Center for Policy Analysis, Idea House, "N.C. Teachers' Union Out to Close Charter Schools," December 23, 1998.

<sup>4</sup>Clint Bolick, "Bill Lann Lee's War on Charter Schools," *The Wall Street Journal*, March 22, 1999.

<sup>5</sup>Statement by U.S. Secretary of Education Richard W. Riley Regarding School Voucher Proposals, September 2, 1999, [www.ed.gov/PressReleases/09-1999/voucher.htm](http://www.ed.gov/PressReleases/09-1999/voucher.htm)

<sup>6</sup>Theodore J. Forstmann, Testimony Before the House Committee on the Budget, U.S. House of Representatives, September 23, 1999, [www.house.gov/budget/hearings/testimony\\_forstmann.html](http://www.house.gov/budget/hearings/testimony_forstmann.html)

<sup>7</sup>Theodore J. Forstmann, "A Competitive Vision for American Education," *Imprimis*, September, 1999.

<sup>8</sup>"Vouchers vs. Small Class Size," AFT on the Issues, April, 1998, [www.aft.org/vouchers/report/index.htm](http://www.aft.org/vouchers/report/index.htm)

<sup>9</sup>Eric A. Hanushek, "The Evidence on Class Size," Occasional Paper No. 98-1, W. Allen Wallis Institute of Political Economy, University of Rochester, February, 1998.

<sup>10</sup>Robert Holland, "What Works: School Choice," the Lexington Institute, Arlington, Va., December, 1999.

<sup>11</sup>Joe Williams, "School Choice Attacks Often Fail Accuracy Test," *Milwaukee Journal Sentinel*, September 3, 1999.

<sup>12</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>13</sup>David J. Hoff, "Board Contends Gore's Role Politicized NAEP Release," *Education Week*, March 10, 1999.

<sup>14</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>15</sup>David J. Hoff, "Renomination Blocked; Forgione To Depart," *Education Week*, May 26, 1999.

<sup>16</sup>Richard G. Innes, Unpublished Paper on NAEP, October 7, 1999, archives of Education Consumers Clearinghouse (<http://education-consumers.com>) See also: Robert Holland, "Beware of Politicians Bearing Test Scores," *Richmond Times-Dispatch*, March 31, 1999.

<sup>17</sup>David J. Hoff, "Ky's 1996 NAEP Gains Declared Statistically Significant," *Education Week*, October 6, 1999.

<sup>18</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>19</sup>"Mr. Secretary, We Ask That You Withdraw Your Premature Recommendations for Mathematics Instruction," full-page advertisement, page A-5, The Washington Post, November 18, 1999. Also found at [www.mathematicallycorrect.com](http://www.mathematicallycorrect.com)

<sup>20</sup>Martin Scharlemann, "Trouble in MathLand," Mathematically Correct Newslines, October 11, 1996, [www.mathematicallycorrect.com/ml1.htm](http://www.mathematicallycorrect.com/ml1.htm)

<sup>21</sup>Steven Leinwand, "It's Time to Abandon Computational Algorithms," *Education Week*, February 9, 1994.

<sup>22</sup>Brigid Schulte, "Divided on Connected Math," *The Washington Post*, October 17, 1999.

<sup>23</sup>Debra J. Saunders, "Where's the Math?", *San Francisco Chronicle*, October 17, 1999.