

file - Shanker speeches
XOX - UTPA

29th ANNUAL MEETING
AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES
FOR TEACHER EDUCATION

Thursday Evening Session
March 3, 1977

"PROFESSIONAL RELATIONSHIPS:
REALITY AND ACTION"

MR. ALBERT SHANKER

THURSDAY EVENING SESSION

MARCH 3, 1977

The General Session of the 29th Annual Meeting of the AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES FOR TEACHER EDUCATION, held at the Conrad Hilton Hotel, Chicago, Illinois, convened at 8:10 o'clock p.m., Mr. Daniel E. Griffiths presiding.

- o -

CHAIRMAN GRIFFITHS: Will the meeting please come to order.

Before I introduce the speaker of the evening I would like to make two announcements. This meeting will be followed by a reception for President Fred Cyphert and it will be in the International Ballroom, immediately across the way.

This evening we will have a little innovation for lecturers or speakers here at the AACTE. Following his speech Mr. Shanker will take questions from the audience. We have one microphone set up here, so that if you feel that you've lost your classroom voice, come over to the microphone; otherwise, we can probably hear you wherever you are.

I think it is safe to say that no one is indifferent to tonight's speaker. Everyone has strong

opinions about Albert Shanker, the dynamic and outspoken leader of the United Federation of Teachers, 65,000 teachers, para-professionals, guidance counselors, psychologists, and other school personnel in New York City and of the American Federation of Teachers' almost one-half million education professionals. He is known in various ways, alternatively, as intelligent, tough, and liberal, and as abrasive, power hungry, and reactionary. In any event, whatever the disagreements people may have with him, he stands as the "boss teacher," the man who with steady personal energy forged his colleagues into an organized professional force.

Al Shanker's beginnings are familiar to many in this audience. He is a product of the New York City schools, an honors graduate from the University of Illinois, and an A.B.D. from Columbia. Al started his career in 1952 teaching mathematics in junior high schools in Queens and in Harlem at \$2400 a year, with a take-home pay of \$36 per week. Just about pays for a room here, one night. (Laughter) Teachers were followers rather than autonomous professionals then, and collective bargaining rights were a dream.

That change that began in New York and spread throughout the country is due in large measure to Albert

Shanker. Teacher unionism has not only won pay increases and improved benefits through skillful negotiations, but it has made teachers keenly aware of their own ongoing development as professionals. Al's role in the Teacher Center bill is but the latest example of what I mean.

And so, between those Middle Ages of the teaching profession just a short time ago, and today, Al Shanker found his true vocation as a union leader and public policy architect. He started with work for the New York Teachers Guild, proceeding to the AFT, where he became an organizer in 1959. When the UFT replaced the Teachers Guild in 1960, he became secretary of Local 2, and in 1964 he was president. He has held the post ever since, winning renown as a tough strike leader, a skillful negotiator, the guiding spirit behind the union's \$1 million scholarship program for children of low-income families, and of its career ladder program that allows paraprofessionals to earn degrees while working. He became President of the American Federation of Teachers in 1974 and a truly national force to be reckoned with.

In addition to the presidency of the UFT and AFT, Mr. Shanker wears other labor hats. Among them, he is executive vice president of the New York State United Teachers, and the first teacher to sit as vice president on

AFL-CIO executive council. His not-so-extra-curricular activities include membership on the boards of the A. Philip Randolph Institute, the League for Industrial Democracy, and the United Fund of Greater New York. The weekly Shanker column, which Al writes himself and which is run as a paid ad in The New York Times, ranges over the educational, social, political, and economic spectrum and is widely read and respected. It shows, I think, his deep concern with human welfare on a broad scale. Such a life leaves little time for recreation, but he does manage to bake Viennese pastries, occasionally take some photographs, hike, and listen to Baroque music.

Teachers have fallen on hard times, particularly in beleaguered New York City, and Albert Shanker is neither evading nor euphemizing the facts. On one hand he is searching for educational solutions to ameliorate the effects of drastic cuts (22%) in the city's school budget. On the other hand, he believes, as I do, that the so-called oversupply of teachers is artificial. If this nation offered proper attention to children in school and formal educational opportunities on the "Educare" principle to preschool children and to people who want to continue their education in the adult years, there would be work for all teachers, and our

society would be better off for it.

Schools of education are, of course, equally concerned about the upgrading of teaching and about the employment of education professionals. We have been exploring some avenues for cooperation with the organized profession, and I hope Mr. Shanker will give us the view from his perch.

A1. (Applause)

"PROFESSIONAL RELATIONSHIPS:
REALITY AND ACTION"

MR. ALBERT SHANKER: Thank you very much, Dan. And I want to thank Johnathan Messerli for getting on the phone a few times and forcing me to come here this evening, because I think that in a time of trouble -- and we are all in that time now -- it is important to analyze just what our problems and troubles are, and to see if there is some creative way to deal with those troubles.

Now I'm sure that in this meeting and in previous meetings there has been a recitation of the various problems that we face together. We have, of course, something that most of us did not expect, and even after it happens we refuse to believe it. When the birth rate went down and we could have started counting very early how many students would or would not be coming some years later, we waited until it hit us.

We are faced with an economic disaster of proportions which again most of us believed that there would never be another depression again. We read all of those articles and books about how a fellow named Paynes taught the government how to do it back in the 30's, and it would never happen again, and here we are, not exactly of the same magnitude but certainly rather immense.

And then we have also experienced over the last decade and a half or so a very changed attitude on the part of many toward the schools, toward education, toward teachers. I think that if any of us were to walk a few blocks and find a bookstore that was well stocked, and if it had one or two or three shelves of books in the field of education, we could be quite sure that the overwhelming majority, and perhaps all of the books stocked, would be books of critics of education, of the schools as an institution, we would have de-schooling societies, and we would have the Coles and Cozzels and Friedenbergs and Yvonne Litch and others. Fortunately, most people don't read those books. (Laughter) But nevertheless they have had quite an effect, because it is the authors of these shocking works who are from time to time interviewed on the Today Show and on other programs, they get their five minutes and the typical format is that

this person who used to be a teacher in a public school in a big city for four or five months has just written this marvelous book, and he comes on and says, "Now, I was only there for four months, I was fired after the four months, and I was fired because I was the only brilliant creative person in the school and they just couldn't tolerate me, and everyone else takes these bright young, inquisitive children, and you know what the purpose of the school is -- it is to beat all of that out of them and see to it that they don't move up but are taught to stay in their place, and it is because I couldn't accept that system that I was thrown out and now I have opened up my own little school in my garage (laughter) and the three kids and I love each other and if only you would smash the public schools and give each kid a voucher and each teacher a garage, we would have a perfect educational system." (Laughter)

That of course is a bit of exaggeration, except that the books that come out have been hostile, negative, they have been ideological and polemical rewrites of history, and unfortunately they have been accepted by the media as providing accurate evidence of what goes on in schools.

Now, that is one part of our problem. I think another part of our problem has to do with the success of the

institution that we are involved in. And here I think back to my own experiences as a student and child in school. My parents were immigrants and to them school represented an opportunity which they never had in the old country, and if I came back and criticized the teacher or curriculum or anything else, I really had a problem. They would certainly "give it to me" then. The teachers of schools, the principal, all of the whole institution was on a pedestal, was respected, was the authority of each of the people and the institution was just absolutely unquestioned, and my parents were certain that as a result of their children being able to go to school, and as a result of their firm attitude with the children as to what they had to do, that this would mean that their life opportunities would be quite different.

Now, that wasn't such a long time ago. That was the 1930's and the mid 1940's. And the reason, of course, that my parents had that feeling is that we lived in a community where if anyone had graduated from elementary school, that person was a pretty well educated person in that community. There weren't too many who actually completed elementary school, and if a person had completed high school, that person was one of the few intellectuals in the community. We didn't know anyone in that whole community, except for the

teachers, and the doctors and the other people whom we saw from time to time, who had gone to college. That was a world apart.

So there was this great distance between most of the people whose children were being served by the schools and the teachers who were among the very few in those days who had had a high school education, some training school or teachers college, or some college education.

Well, one of the great problems that we have faced in recent years, I submit to you, is that we have educated the population. Yes, they have all gone to elementary school and to high school, and we now have teachers who live in communities where the majority of adults in the community have graduated college; indeed, they not only graduated college but most of them believe that if they weren't busy at jobs where they are making more money, they could do a better job in educating their own children than the teachers do. So that we no longer have this educational gap between the masses and teachers, where the people in a community look up to the teachers, one of the few educated people in the community. We have succeeded, we have educated masses of people, more than any other society in history, to a point where the average citizen can now look,

not up to the teacher, but either straight at, or perhaps in some cases, down. Well, that is hardly a reason for feeling that the institution has failed, but it does mean that our own existence as an institution is subject to greater criticism.

I think that there is a third major problem which deals with the relationship of the general public and how it sees the school teachers, educators, and that is, the preoccupation of American schools, administrators and teachers with the notion of innovation. The idea is that you've got to show that you are alive by constantly doing something new and doing something that is different, and showing that you are trying, and that you are abandoning what you did before. Now, for a long period of time that worked, this business of "We're innovating," but, you know, the extent to which that concept has been universalized in schools and education, it has become rather destructive.

Suppose that you went to a doctor and he looked at you and said, "I don't know what is wrong with you, and 99% of all the other doctors would prescribe the following which certainly works but I'm not a doctor who likes to do the same thing all the time, so I am going to innovate." (Laughter) Well, you would probably run away pretty fast.

You can't build any institution on the basis that you do not have things which you know, and things that are of value, and things that ought to be preserved. You cannot sell to the public something which is constantly moving and constantly changing. You can't get across the idea that everything we did before is so bad that it has to go, merely for the sake of novelty. And I am afraid that in many places, that is exactly what happens and we have these great slogans that people use all over - "Every educational experiment is doomed to succeed" - things like that. We are always proclaiming success and yet we are always throwing out what was successful in order to innovate and to bring in something that is brand new, and we do not have a field -- Well, you take the field of medicine where a doctor can establish quite a reputation by advertising his failures. He can write saying, "Now I had the following five people who came to me and they had the following symptoms, and I had read the efforts to conquer this disease by Doctors A, B and C, and knowing that the following new developments had taken place, I tried the following and the patients all died anyway." He writes this article and he gets quite a reputation in the world of medicine because no one will ever die of the same "cure" again. (Laughter)

Now, can we say that? (Laughter) We can't because no one will employ someone as a principal or a superintendent because he wrote three or four articles saying that he tried the following things and they didn't work. It would be very refreshing, and it might very well have greater acceptance on the part of the public if we admitted from time to time that something didn't work and that is why we want to change, and if we also said there are certain things we are doing that are right and that we don't want to change them unless someone proves to us that they have something that is better.

Then, of course, we also have along with this innovateness, the greatest innovation of all, every couple of years we get rid of the superintendent and we hire one that is being fired from some other school district. (Laughter) That is a great sport but it is not designed to inspire any kind of public confidence in the long run.

Well, all right, we have a decline in the number of students, we've got problems in terms of the economy, and we certainly have some problems in terms of how the population sees the schools with this decade and a half of criticism, and I wish, by the way, that our colleges would produce as many answers to these critics as there are critics.

We live through these waves of popularity, and when is the last time there has been a book on the American educational scene that enjoyed any kind of public popularity which provided some kind of defense or rationale of the institution? That just doesn't seem to go.

Well, what do we do when we have problems? My approach, starting as a teacher in New York City, and when I started teaching in 1952 there were 102 different teacher organizations in the city of New York - 102. There was one for each of the five boroughs, one for each religion, one for each grade level and there was one for each grievance. (Laughter) You see, in 1928 they had changed the pension law and that meant that those before 1928 were on one pension, and then after that you had pre-1928 teachers and post-1928 teachers, and in 1947 the state went on a single salary, and the high school teachers wanted to restore the differential, and the elementary school teachers wanted to retain single salaries. There was a group called the "Sixth and Seventh Grade Women's Teacher Association of Bensenhurst" because at some point somebody had done something to them and they were organized to get even, I guess.

All of these organizations had a philosophy, and the philosophy was that the smaller the organization, the more

effective. (Laughter) Now, wait, don't laugh. They had solid evidence and some pretty substantial reasoning behind their views. In the first place, they all believed that since the most important thing was to handle their own little special interests, that if they were in a large group that their own interests would be neglected and they would be swallowed up, and therefore the smaller, the more you have a group with only your own small interests, and let everybody else take care of the general interests, "We'll take care of this thing and if we get into one big organization, they will never take care of our problems." So that was one of the reasons.

The other reason was, as one explained to me, and at that time there were 50,000 teachers in the city, "Look, if you go in and ask the Board of Education to give each teacher \$1.00, that is a lot of money, that is \$50,000. But in our organization there are only 50 of us. (Laughter) So we ought to be able to negotiate more effectively because if they give us \$1.00 each, it will cost them a lot less instead of giving it to everybody."

Sometimes people in organizations and institutions that face problems tend to meet those problems in just that way. They tend to retreat and deal with the narrow issues that

concern them, and what they do is they break off ties or neglect relations with other groups that really do have a common interest.

I want to specifically here talk about something which is of major interest, I'm sure, to you. Teacher experience with their preservice education -- and I am not exempting their inservice education, I am just concentrating on this part of it -- by and large, the experiences as teachers report them, they are not particularly elated, they don't feel that their preservice education prepared them for some of the great problems which they later face in the classroom. And so there tends to be quite a bit of bad mouthing of teachers education among teachers and among principals. That bad mouthing, and the consequences of that bad mouthing, are somewhat similar to what has been going on in the field of collective bargaining. You know, teachers organize, and the Board of Education starts saying to the public, "Look at these teachers, they are no longer interested in Latin or driver education, or sex education, or English, or social studies, they are now greedy monsters, all they want are more dollars, and they are terrible." And so what do the teachers do? All the teachers in self defense, in order not to have their reputation completely tarnished in the

eyes of the public, turn around and say, "That Board of Education is quite incompetent. They are wasting money on the following things, the administration is terrible, and, you know, when we are all finished with that fight, the public believes both of us." (Laughter) Which means, of course, they believe there is nothing good about the institution and it is a terrible crime to waste any money on it.

I think it is about time that we try to resolve a similar problem that exists in the relationship between teachers and colleges and universities. I think there is an analogous relationship there, and that many in colleges and universities are constantly talking about teachers and their lack of competence, and talking about devising teacher-proof instead of foolproof, teacher-proof materials, and curriculum. And, on the other hand, the teachers constantly engaging in this bad mouth of the fact that they claim they got absolutely nothing from their education, and they had to do it all by themselves. Because when we begin to think about it, and I think the teachers are starting to think about it, those outside of the profession who are now aiming their guns at colleges and universities, and who are talking about developing, not only a teacher corps, but other professions, through some

sort of apprenticeship or life experience, or other direct programs, that the people who are proposing the dismantling of higher education, to a large extent, are no friends of teachers; that teachers have to begin to realize that those who are now joining them in the criticism are really saying that, "Look, you ought to deprofessionalize. You ought to require less time, and you ought to require less training. And by and large, the motivation of the other critics is not the same as that of teachers. The motivation of the other critics is to really open up almost any field to anybody and to deny there is any body of knowledge, or any training or expertise that is needed."

I don't think it will take too long a period of time for teachers to understand that whatever their problems were with their education, that if they join in this chorus of criticism and say "Hurrah, I didn't like the training I got," therefore they are hurting themselves, they are hurting their own position, they are hurting the entire institution, they are aligning themselves with those who really want to create a downgrading in this entire field.

This I think is the first step. I think that teachers have to -- I am not saying they can't speak freely about some of the shortcomings, or some of the changes they

would like to see, and I don't think we should ask that of them -- but I do think that teachers have to see the threat that is posed by the current attack, and that that is not merely an attack on teacher training or on higher education; it is an attack on them too, it is an attack -- Well, gee, if they went to an institution where they didn't learn anything and it didn't make any difference, then why should they be teaching instead of somebody who out on the street never went to school at all? That is the consequence, the logical consequence of some of the attacks, and I think it is the job of teacher organizations to bring that message to teachers.

I want to assure you that for the American Federation of Teachers that we have been, and will continue, doing that. We do not believe that the attack is a healthy one, either for higher education or for the teaching profession. I think that at the same time, when all of us are under attack, that there is an obligation on the part of those of you in higher education to understand some of the problems that teachers have. And I want to say that I do not think that colleges and universities have moved very far in their understanding of the new world of teachers and of their power, and of their organizations. Many colleges and universities are still living in the pre-collective bargaining world. They

still believe that maybe it will go away if we just continue to lecture about professionalism, that maybe it won't happen here, that maybe when we work with a given school district we will work with the professional teachers who aren't involved in all this stuff, and not with the others, and to the extent that out there are teachers, just as you in higher education are at this point, fighting a life and death struggle for your survival, and your survival is one that teachers have to be interested in because it is related to their professionalism and their status.

So I think it is about time that just as teachers are going to have to understand that just because maybe they didn't like something, or a lot of their education, that doesn't mean they should destroy an institution which is very important, and destroy it rather than approve it.

I think that same obligation on your part, to try to understand that when teachers are involved in life and death struggles, that there is an obligation on your part to not instantly condemn or instantly react on the basis of what life used to be like, but it is I think your obligation to take a look at what it is that teachers are trying to achieve and try to understand it; in those cases where you can, to cooperate with them. But also to understand that

the only way our problems are going to be resolved is not if we have those 102 different organizations that used to be around, but if we in the education community are able to build a strong coalition, we will be able to come through this period very well. But if we do not, if teachers have to pick fights with you over the quality of what used to be, and if you've got to pick fights with them over whether you think they should organize or engage in collective bargaining, or whatever, if during this period of time we are busy fighting each other, then I think the fight is over and we are all going to lose. I think the question that we've got to raise at this point is, where is the important fight, what is the important battle? I think the important battle is one over the entire future of American public education. There is an attempt, many attempts, aimed at schools, at almost every level, more anti-school feeling, a great deal of higher education feeling all across the country, some of it with some intellectual support, with Carolyn Byrd and others on the value of higher education, started some years ago, I guess with Iverberg's book "The Great Training Robbery." Quite a number of those now. I don't think that the critics can succeed if we are able to form a coalition on the key issues.

Now, what is it that teachers see from their

experiences?-- and then I want to get back to this coalition. Teachers, many of them, have had the experience of having gone to elementary, high school, college, perhaps some practice teaching. They do everything that they were told to do. They walk into the classroom the first day, very unprepared, because it takes them about a half hour to get the students to stop yelling and to sit down, and when the teacher says, "My name is...." then five children start yelling and screaming and laughing, and throwing back variations on the teacher's name. Then the teacher starts reading the roll to get them seated in some order, so that the teacher can tell who this child is, and who that one is. Of course, the students don't cooperate and say there is no Joe Adams in this room, ha! ha! Then they assume different names.

So here you have a teacher who has been through five years of higher education and a bunch of little kids make a monkey out of him in the first three hours. A very shattering experience. Then on top of it, the principal walks by and opens the door, calls the teacher over, and probably says, "Mr. So-and-So, why don't you motivate them?" (Laughter) Then he closes the door. (Laughter)

So the teacher tries for a few days, perhaps tries

for a few weeks, to learn all the techniques and methods that the teacher learned, and they don't seem to work. And then the teacher starts doing other things. The teacher finds that if teaching techniques won't work, "I am going to try some survival techniques." Teachers develop many different survival techniques. They find out that if you get the students to copy some things, they will keep quiet for a period of time. If you have a chore of assignments, you see to it that there is some accounting on those so that the students will behave then. They find out that there are ways of suspending students, without suspending them. You can make them student monitors and have them take notes of the rooms. That really expels them from the room, it keeps them out and the worst kid in school becomes the principal monitor and he is never in any classroom.

Then there are one or two teachers in each school who are known as Cecil B. DeMille, they show films all day long. (Laughter) That has a soporific effect on the students. In one school that I worked at, we were two blocks from Central Park and I would say a substantial portion of the faculty took the students to the park all day long, where they had some athletic activities and there were no problems with the students in those situations.

But the teachers in many of these cases where the teaching techniques, which were taught to them, do not work and so they develop a series of survival mechanisms, which enable them to keep the class in some order and to avoid problems with the administration of the school. This is not an unusual experience. What can we do?

Let me raise another question. We have teachers, and in the old days when we had a big teacher shortage, we used to have 10,000 new teachers a year in New York City. Some came from north, south, east, west, different backgrounds, religious and racial, etc., but one thing you noticed very quickly. You would take 10,000 teachers leaving the system and put 10,000 new ones in, and inside of one week you couldn't tell those who came in and those who left, they were doing exactly the same thing.

So there was something about the classroom, the school, the principal, the parents' expectations, that whole complex of things, there was teacher education going on right in the classroom. The children, the way the classes, the rooms, everything else was structured, that, more than anything else, decided what a teacher was to do.

We have another problem that teachers face constantly. They are largely evaluated on the basis of whether

they are able to maintain order. The teacher who has got a lot of noise in the room, a lot of movement, everything else, very frequently creates problems for the teacher next door, for the principal, the parents walking through. And yet while we want teachers to maintain order, or we say that we do, we also want the teacher to innovate. Every time you change what you do in the classroom, the students decide they are going to renegotiate the rules of the classroom with you. Innovation involves a certain amount of disorder and a certain amount of changing of rules and procedures. So at the same time that the system continues to tell the teachers, "Look, you've got to have this orderliness or it shows that you are not quite up to it," the system simultaneously says, "While we want you to keep things pretty neat and nice and quiet, still we want you to constantly change, which undoes the quietness and the stillness and everything else that goes with that.

Then, on top of it we have a system of supervision in schools. From time to time I am invited to conventions of school principals and administrators as part of "know your enemy program." (Laughter) At some point in the proceedings I usually ask them, "How many of you when you were teachers had a principal come in to your room and sit in back

and observe you and at the end of it write up the report, and then maybe have a conference with you?" Of course, they all raised their hand because that is the standard way of doing things. And then I said, "How many of you after you have received such a report telling you that you had done the following things not quite right, or that you might do them a little differently, how many of you felt that that helped you with your teaching and that it improved your instructions?" I look out over the whole audience and if there are a thousand people there, maybe two of them raised their hands and all the other were shouting them down.

Well, we have a system that almost everyone agrees that when it happens to them, when someone came in and told them what was wrong, they were offended, they thought the person didn't understand, they felt threatened, and yet they continue doing it.

These are some of the -- I am trying to state these briefly -- these are some of the experiences that are at the heart of the teacher thrust to want to bring about some change. One of those changes is the notion that we should as a part of entry into the profession have a very substantial internship period; that teaching is not just something that you learn from books and it is not also just

something that you can acquire in a short period of time and practice teaching as we now know it. It involves a complicated set of performance skills on top of the knowledge that one gets in the education that one gets in college, and that these perhaps are best done on the job, and this will also give us an opportunity to find out those who probably should not come into the profession.

We are very much committed to that, and this is a field which I'm sure that we can work on together. We have no intention of saying that this internship should not be a part of a person's education. The internship has to be designed and monitored and worked with the same way that a medical school has a relationship to the doctor intern and to the hospital.

We also believe that after a teacher starts teaching, that the teacher will many times find that he or she has problems, and the chances are that the teacher will be unwilling to go to a supervisor, because if I go to my principal and say, "You know, I really never did understand fractions when I was in school and I am supposed to teach them," that that is likely to be used as a confession of guilt and may very well be used against me in a proceeding, either not to employ me during the probationary period or

after that in some proceeding." So the principal is not a person I am likely to go to. To go to a college or university, well, I am now teaching, and there may be some distances involved, you just can't move in and out of there. But some way in which teachers can get help, whether it is with disciplined questions, or whether it is with subject matter questions, or whether it is just trying to do something different. That is where the notion of teacher centers comes from, and there too there is no reason why teacher centers should not be a cooperative venture, which involves higher education. And I want you to know that the American Federation of Teachers is not in agreement with the movement which excludes higher education. I think the whole question of who has 51%, or 49% on the board, is kind of cosmetic, and I think it is unimportant. I think if there is a relationship, it will work, and if there is no relationship, regardless of how many votes one side has or another, it is not going to work, but this is something we have to work on together.

That leads to one other point and that is this whole demand for accountability in the last decade. I don't like the word because usually it comes from those who think that education can be reduced to accounting - the more you

get for the buck, and how many dollars do you save if you do it this way or that way. That is one of the great definitions of accountability that has recently come forward. The other, of course, deals with kind of personal servant relationship, where the teacher is supposed to be the servant where people say, "You are the teacher. You are working for me in this community. You have to be accountable to me, which means if I don't like you, or if my child didn't succeed this year, that shows you are a poor teacher and out you go." I am not talking about accountability in either of those senses. I am talking about it in a true sense, and that is, if the people of our country are spending the billions, which they are spending, and we expect them to spend many more billions on education, then they have a right to know that those moneys are being spent in a worthwhile way. Part of the job which you in higher education, and the practitioners, elementary and secondary education, have, are to devise certain ways of improving what we are doing and, secondly, to devise ways of testing what we are doing, which have some credibility, and these tests have to be done in such a way that the teacher isn't frightened, that she is going to be fired, because the children didn't do well that year. The principal should not

be encouraged to cheat because it is going to show that his school isn't marvelous, and the school board, you know, one of the big facts of American education is when Mr. Coleman set out to do the Coleman Report -- Thirteen of our largest cities would not let Mr. Coleman in to test the children because they didn't want their schools compared to any other schools, because it would be a reflection on their own service as a Board of Education members. This is something that has to be done together.

Well, at this juncture, with the problems that we face, there are really two roads: One is a view that there is a limited pie, we are under attack, the pie is going to get smaller, and therefore the best way to succeed is to turn around and to grab as much of the remaining pie as is there for you and let everybody else do the same thing. I must say that there are teachers and administrators in higher education who take exactly that view. "Let's now fight each other for a share of the small pie."

That isn't the only way in which it can go. There is no reason during this period of time to be pessimistic. In spite of the problems we face, and I have mentioned some of them and I certainly wouldn't underestimate them, I think that we have great reason for optimism and that there are quite a few positive and even educationally

revolutionary things which could happen in the next couple of years if we are able to pull ourselves together.

I think one of the signs is the fact that in spite of the criticisms of education, in spite of the fact that we have educated people up to the point where most of them feel they are quite able to tell us what we ought to be doing, in spite of these negative things, that year after year the one piece of legislation or package of legislation in Washington where even if a President vetoed it, there was an override, a huge override, and that was the education funds. If you take a look at the history of the last eight years, and anyone who says that the American public doesn't support education, I think they just don't know what they are talking about, because not only has the Congress consistently overridden the vetoes of the President, but we have in education the only tax structure in this country where the people have to vote for the money to support the schools. I don't know whether we would have an army, a navy, Social Security, welfare, hospitals, or anything else, if the people had to vote for it. I don't know if we would have a country, if the country had to go through the same kinds of things to get support for its programs as we do for education. But in spite of the fact that there are rejections of budget, the

overall history has been one of support and continues to be one of support.

Now, we have the beginning of a new educational coalition and formation. A couple of years ago a number of organizations, including yours, the leadership of these organizations were appointed by the President to go to a conference in Paris to the Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development, and at that time the groups that were meeting there decided that it would be worthwhile to continue meeting back in the States in order to develop a common program on a number of educational issues. We have done that. I'm sorry that only one of the major national groups decided not to stay and to leave and go it alone, and that is the National Education Association, and I hope they come back. But all the other groups have been working together on major pieces of legislation, major programs.

Now, why should we get together, and what are the grounds for optimism? Well, one of them is the fact that there is a major piece of social legislation that is on the agenda which, if we can pull ourselves together, will move, and that is the -- some version of the Child and Family Service Act, some creation in this country of universal early childhood education and daycare. So while we sit in our

conferences, crying about the fact that there are too many teachers, of which there are not, we haven't delivered anywhere near the services in the schools that we now have that we should be delivering, nor are we providing facilities for five-year olds and four-year olds, three-year olds, whose parents are working and who have to fend for themselves in the neighborhood.

This is an area in which we should be developing a program, and I don't know how many of you are aware of the fact that there is a big fight going on right now, not over the question of whether or not there should be early childhood education, yet that is part of the fight. There is a whole rightwing movement in the country that says that the purpose of early childhood education is for the schools to take children at a very early age and indoctrinate them and have them spy on their parents, and do things like that. But I am not taking that very seriously. I am taking seriously, however, the fact that this country is on the verge of expanding educational opportunities for millions of children, and there is grave doubt as to whether this expansion will take place with the public schools sponsoring these programs. The development at the present time is that there are offices of child development being created in almost

every state in the country, and the notion is that the school can't do a good job with what they've got right now, therefore, "let's set up a new school system for these youngsters, with new programs and different standards and with different training programs." What we have are the developments of extremely low standards, no training or education required; we have a large number of groups in the private sector, Kentucky Fried Chicken has opened up some daycare centers, not using that name (Laughter), they've got some other name, some story book name, and we have a large number of private sector people arguing that this should become private enterprise with the government giving vouchers to little children to go to these places. And the private groups are already lobbying in Washington against any educational requirements for those who are going to be working with children in early childhood. This is an area.

Another one. We in the AFT have given an overall name of "Educare" -- look, we've got 10 million people in this country who are unemployed. We are not going to let them die. They get food stamps, they get unemployment insurance, they get welfare money, they get supplementary help in terms of handling their medical bills, a whole range of services that they get. For every one per cent of the

people in this country who are unemployed, the federal government loses \$16 billion as a combination of taxes, which are not paid by the unemployed, and services and benefits which the federal government has to supply to them.

Now, why have 10 million people been sitting at home unemployed looking at themselves in the mirror, wondering why they have been rejected, why they are no good, why they are worthless? Why not approach the Congress of the United States and face the President of the United States and say, "Look, isn't it time that we gave people in our society a chance to go back to school periodically throughout life? This particular fellow who dropped out of high school and has been working at this menial job for X number of years is now sorry and if he had a chance he would like to go back and do something else." Here is someone who graduated high school but didn't want to go to college. And here is someone who went to college for two years and who would now like to return. Wouldn't it be a much more constructive and better use of funds if we said that instead of having 10 million people sitting out there unemployed, that we would provide educational opportunities for millions of people who want to take sabbatical from their job to return to get an education, and while they are being educated their

places would be taken by some of the 10 million who are sitting at home collecting this money.

We have all had an experience with this. It was called the G.I. Bill of Rights. There were a lot of people there who dropped out. I went to school during that period. I was not a G.I., I just missed by a few months being drafted, but I was in school, and it was about 60% at the University of Illinois during that period of time that were G.I.'s, and there is no doubt in my mind that that was the best generation of college students that this country has ever seen. They knew what it was like to work. They knew what an education meant. They were serious. They were mature. You know something, it was a great investment this country made, not only in those people as individuals, but what kind of a country would this country have been in the 1950's and 1960's without the doctors and the lawyers and the engineers, and the physicists, chemists and computer specialists, had we not made that investment.

Well, why? Why not? Why not mobilize and ask that there be a commitment within our country to education throughout life, from early childhood, throughout life, as long as anyone wants it.

I would like to conclude by saying that I am

optimistic for another reason, and that is, that outside of teachers, and outside of those in higher education, there happens to be a fairly large movement in this country known as the labor movement, the AFL-CIO, United Automobile Workers, others, and I want you to know that in spite of what Caroline Byrd writes about the value of college education, that the members of the AFL-CIO want their children to go to college, they want their children -- and they don't go too much for career education, insofar as career education is viewed as taking their children out of the classroom and putting them on to a work site which will be a broadening experience. The fellow who is on the assembly line has been doing the same thing for 35 years of his life and he doesn't think that that is a very broadening experience. (Laughter and applause)

So we have a large movement out there which is supportive of education, and supportive of education not because they are trying to create jobs for teachers or trying to get more money for colleges, or for teacher education, or for research. They support education because they still believe, and I believe that they are right, that education is the key to providing opportunities for their children which they did not have. The existence of a large powerful

block like that should lead us to think a little bit more.

We have a large teacher organization in this country, the N.E.A., which says we are an independent teaching profession. What does independent mean? Independent means we will not have anything to do with any other groups of people who work for a living. That is what it means. It means that they will not be associated with other people who work, because that will lower their esteem in the eyes of the community if people think that teachers work. (Laughter) And if they associate with other people who work, people will think they do, and that is very, very bad.

This is kind of silly, and it is kind of silly for this reason. We are facing our current problems, money problems, pressures. Why? Is it because we didn't go down and lobby for more state aid for education, more federal aid to education, more scholarship programs? No, we have been lobbying for all those things. We are in trouble because our problems are linked with other problems that are outside of the field of education. What problems are they?

One problem is that with 10% of the people in this country unemployed, and with each one per cent of the unemployed costing the federal government \$16 billion,

this country is losing \$160 billion a year because of the rate of unemployment, and therefore all of us who want some of that \$160 billion a year for our programs should be involved in trying to get programs which will reduce the rate of unemployment. We have to develop interests that are outside of the educational sphere alone.

Let's take a look at the question of welfare. New York City spends \$1 billion a year on welfare. New York State spends \$2 billion a year, and other local communities spend another billion. In other words, all together, state and city funds, \$4 billion a year in the state of New York. Why should the state of New York pay those welfare benefits? You know the law of the land. The law of the land says that someone in Mississippi is being given welfare, \$2,000 a year, and they find out that by coming to New York they will get \$5,000 a year, and so they take the ride and they come to New York. New York is part of the United States of America, in spite of what some people say. Therefore, we do not have a right to have immigration standards, we do not have a right to send people back on the border, there are no passports for New York. And the Supreme Court said we have no right to have a residence requirement. As soon as someone comes in, they have a right to the benefits. Therefore, the

people in New York State have to pay huge taxes to relieve the taxpayers of Mississippi, who are not willing to provide a certain standard for the poor.

Now, where is that money coming from? That is \$4 billion which could be used for schools, for higher education, for public construction, for tax relief. Does this make sense from a national point of view? That Illinois, Michigan, California, Ohio, Massachusetts, New York, that states that have higher standards should now have to have tremendous tax burdens to do this? Is there a relationship between what these states can do for education? There certainly is. We have to be involved in a series of other issues, issues that are broader than just education on its own.

That is my quarrel with most education groups. When the N.E.A. says "we are independent", an independent profession, it reminds me of the fellow who looks outside his house and he looks next door and he sees that his neighbor's house is burning down. For a minute he smiles because he didn't like his neighbor. But it doesn't take too long before he realizes what the wind factor is, and that is a question of self interest. Now, we have the same relationship to people who work in the private sector, because

we, the public schools in this country, live from the profit, from the well being of the private sector, and if we do not have a relationship and do not have a concern for that sector, if we don't have an interest in those things, we are really not taking care of our own concerns.

We are at a point where we can go either way. I want to state that I believe the time is ripe for an alliance in this country of education groups, the labor movement, other groups that are concerned and interested in advancing education. One of the things we have going for us is that we do have now a new type of political power. Teachers, by organizing, and maybe many of you didn't like the fact that teachers were organizing into unions, but whether you like it or not, it has happened. I want to point out to you that Mr. Henry Ford had a private army to prevent the auto workers from joining a union in the 1930's. He did everything that he could to prevent them from organizing, but at the present time if the Ford Motor Company could press a button and get rid of U.A.W., they would not do it. As a matter of fact, in the middle of a strike the auto companies lend the U.A.W. money to provide health and welfare benefits for the employees. Why? And, by the way, this is true of every major industry in this country which fought the

unionization of their workers, and today those industries value those unions. Why? The reason is that the health of the auto industry is not going to be based on whether the employees make a nickel less or a nickel more. The health of the auto industry is going to be based on federal policies of whether we allow a lot of cheap imports to come in from other countries which would shut down our auto industry. The health of this industry is going to be based on whether the federal government decides that it is going to provide new cars for those federal personnel who get a car every year and a half or every two years, or every three years, and that decision is 300,000 cars.

So that what happens is that in those fields managements and the unions have gotten together for a common purpose in order to secure the health of that particular industry. And I say to you the time has come in education for us to do the same thing. We have two powerful teacher organization in this country, and they have an advantage no other employee group has. There is no other industry that has members in every single election district in the United States of America, there is not. We have an advantage with school boards. There is no other institution in this country that has elected officials in every single district

in the United States of America. The same is true with administrators, and the same is true when you take a look at the spread of colleges and universities throughout the United States of America. And if you add to that, AFL-CIO unions who are interested in thriving colleges and universities, because they don't want to see the doors shut to their children, they don't want higher education in this country to become the place where the few rich can afford it and some of the poor who will get special scholarships and everybody in the middle is frozen out by what is happening in terms of tuition, in terms of grants, and in terms of admission policies, and everything else.

We have the makings of an extremely effective coalition, millions of people, provided that we can bury some of the old differences and the fights that we've had with each other. Then I think we can face some very pleasant times. Thank you. (Applause)

CHAIRMAN GRIFFITHS: We will now take some questions. Each time I open a session like this I am reminded of the first time I ever attended a meeting of this in New York City. They had a panel and they presented their points of view, and then they opened the floor to questions. A woman jumped up, gave a five minute impassioned speech in which she

declared a particular point of view with a great deal of vehemence. Then she sat down. The chairman said, "But, Madam, what is the question?" She bounced up again and said, "Is that not so?" (Laughter)

So tonight I hope that we will start with the "Is that not so?" So may we have the first question, please?

QUESTION: I wonder if you can tell us a little more about the nature of this coalition as the result of the AFT that you alluded to?

MR. SHANKER: It includes school boards, the school administrators, your own organization, the AFT, Congress of Parents and Teachers. I'm going to leave out one or two, I'm sure. But this group has been meeting. We did get some funding from the Office of Education, and the group has been meeting regularly. After quite a number of months, the first thing we worked out was, we did study the problem of early childhood education and the question of who should sponsor early childhood education. And for the first time I guess in American educational history, all of the major national groups in education jointly had a press conference and asked that the prime sponsorship for early childhood education be with the public schools. The group has also done a number of other things. There was a public works bill,

which was passed, and I am sure that when you hear about public works bill going through the Congress, you will be sure it has nothing to do with us, but that is wrong. Part of the public works bill, \$3 billion of the public works bill, is devoted to what is known as counter-cyclical aid, to counter the economic cycle. It is really a form of welfare for state and local governments. It is just as an individual, when they lose their arm with no means of earning a livelihood, the government should provide them with certain subsistence. They said, well, during this period of time of high unemployment in certain cities and in certain states, and those places with high unemployment, should get extra sums of money in order to stimulate the economy in those areas. There is \$3 billion, and that money -- There was a big fight as to whether that money could or could not be used for education.

The League of Cities and the governors went down there and they argued very hard and strong that this money should go to states and cities, but not to schools, not to education. Our Alliance, we got together and said, "Look, this is wrong. The schools of this country employ half of the non-federal public employees in the whole country and we ought to have our share of it." We got schools

written in as having one of the priority considerations in funding. This will amount to hundreds of millions of dollars in the field of education.

We have another project, CETA, Comprehensive Employment Training Act. There is a Title I in CETA. What is Title I of CETA? Title I provided for vocational training and guidance, helping people find jobs. Let me tell you a little story.

New York City alone gets \$58 million in Title I under CETA. Now, if you would ask yourself, "Who should be entrusted with the function of giving people an education to help them get jobs and help to find them?" The Board of Education was given \$6 million of the \$58 million; the rest of it, to a lot of private companies, and I have looked at the record here. Some companies got \$3 million and placed two people last year.

But what we are now faced with, and what this group is concerning itself with, is that more and more, when we take a look at the philosophy behind -- I am not saying that education shouldn't be related to job or careers or the world at work, but I am talking about the notion that you can close schools down and give students a better experience by sending them out to work. And then you take the attack on

public schools as being unable to handle early childhood education, and then you take this notion that teachers need not go to college but can be trained in certain other ways like getting proficiencies and skills elsewhere, and you take the development of hundreds of millions of dollars in CETA, which should go to the educational system, it should go to colleges, universities, to secondary schools, which have been and are the primary training centers of people and jobs and in terms of guidance functions, and when you have these hundreds of millions of dollars going out to the private sector, what we are facing now is not that the federal government is spending less money on education, it is spending much, much more money on education but it is not putting it into the Department or Office of Education. It is putting it into the Labor Department, the Defense Department, the Welfare Department, and so forth. It is spreading it out all over, and that is one of the major concerns.

The group is now also studying the whole question of testing. We do not accept the view that testing should be thrown out because tests are inaccurate. And we do not accept the view that they should be thrown out because they sometimes are liable to be misinterpreted, or that the

newspaper headlines aren't correct. We are developing, together with some of the professional groups in psychology, we are developing a position which we hope will come to prevail in many of the states on that question.

So that is the group that we have, and those are some of the things we are working on.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFITHS: We will have one more question.

QUESTION: What do you think about the competency based education movement?

MR. SHANKER: The idea is good, it is excellent. Who is against competence? And who is against getting people to be more competent, and selecting them on the basis of competence, a motherhood sort of issue. That is what all of you have been about all this period of time. So there is no objection to that. There certainly is no objection to trying to be more scientific. Obviously, we are in a field which doesn't lend itself to the same type of precision that chemistry or physics, or the hard sciences do, but there is also no question that we could know a lot more and be a lot more precise. I do not go along with those who say that this is completely an art and it is ineffable and you can't speak about it, or you can't think about it, and

you can't do anything about it. Because if that is so, then all of us are out of business instantly, and there is no basis of selecting; it is all a matter of taste, it is all a matter of individual judgment, it is all a matter of style. You get into chaos that way. I don't believe that is so.

I think the problem with a performance based movement is that like most other things in education, people did not take the view that they were beginning to search for answers, using a certain method and that eventually it would lead to something. They immediately announced that they had a cure, and that it was present. If you take a look at a state like New York, which sort of mandated that within a certain period of time all of the institutions of teacher education shall immediately have programs which are performance based, well, when you really haven't developed this over a period of time, what it leads to is cheating. Cheating is that you take exactly what you have been doing and you rewrite it with a new jargon, which doesn't help anybody.

I am very much in favor of the idea, and I am in favor of putting the time and energy and money into what is necessary to develop it so that in ten or fifteen years from now we can turn to the public and say, "We are now

training and selecting teachers on the following basis, which is a lot more scientific and produces better results than the system we had before." I think all of us would be in much better shape if we had it. But we also ought to admit there is no such system that exists today.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFITHS: One more question.

QUESTION: I know that N.E.A. does the same thing because I am a member and, of course, N.E.A. has a Department of Higher Education. I wonder, sir, if you can account for higher education membership --

MR. SHANKER: I don't know what your question is.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFITHS: What is your question?

QUESTION: Can you account for the number of paid membership in higher education?

CHAIRMAN GRIFFITHS: How many paid memberships of N.E.A. in higher education?

QUESTION: There are, 500,000.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFITHS: I have no idea.

QUESTION: I find that a number of colleges have no paid membership. This is a marvelous group. We come together here once a year and we pay the fees at this meeting, but so far as trying to do anything, political action, I know in one state I'm acquainted with they have 50,000 public

school teachers and where they have 10,000 higher education personnel, they have 500 members.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFITHS: Thank you very much.

I think we have had a splendid evening and it is time for us to call this to a close.

I would like to remind you that there are questionnaires on the chairs and would you please complete these. And we will now move to the reception across the hall.

Thank you very much. (Applause)

...The session adjourned at 9:30 o'clock p.m. ...
