

*file Shanker*

WORLDNET

UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

TELEVISION AND FILM SERVICE

WASHINGTON, DC 20547

GUESTS: DR. LEWIS M. BRANSCOMB, CHAIRMAN,  
CARNEGIE TASK FORCE ON TEACHING AS A PROFESSION  
  
MR. ALBERT SHANKER, MEMBER,  
CARNEGIE TASK FORCE ON TEACHING AS A PROFESSION

TOPIC: CARNEGIE FORUM ON EDUCATION AND THE ECONOMY'S REPORT:  
"A NATION PREPARED: TEACHERS FOR THE 21ST CENTURY"

HOST: NELSON BENTON

INTERACTIVE CITIES:

BRUSSELS, LISBON, HELSINKI, THE HAGUE, MADRID, VIENNA

ORIGINATION CITY: WASHINGTON, D.C.

DATE: THURSDAY, JUNE 11, 1986

TIME: 9:00 A.M. - 10:00 A.M. EDT

DIVERSIFIED REPORTING SERVICES, INC.  
1511 K Street, N.W., Suite 428  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
(202) 628-2121

PAGE 2 WORLDNET

ANNOUNCER: -- United States Information Agency in Washington, D.C. transmitting via satellite over the --

ANNOUNCER: Today with participants in Brussels, Lisbon, Helsinki, The Hague, Madrid, and Vienna, Worldnet presents a discussion on the Carnegie Report on American Education. Now, live from our studios in Washington, D.C., here is your moderator, Nelson Benton.

MR. BENTON: On May 16th in San Diego, California, the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy under the sponsorship of the Carnegie Corporation issued a major report on the American education system. The report charged that as currently structured American schools are ill prepared to educate workers for an increasingly technological society. The task force has recommended the implementation of the first nationwide system of certifying elementary and high school teachers.

We are pleased to have with us today in Washington three distinguished leaders in the field of education: William J. Bennett, the United States Secretary of Education, and two members of that task force, Dr. Louis Branscomb, Chairman of the task force, and Vice President and Chief Scientist of the IBM Corporation, and Albert Shanker, President of the

PAGE 3 WORLDNET

American Federation of Teachers and the President of the International Federation of Free Teacher Unions.

Gentlemen, welcome to Worldnet.

I would like to go now to our participants in The Hague for their questions, and I would like to remind each of the speakers in The Hague to, one, identify yourself and your organization, and, two, identify which of our guests your question is addressed to.

Go ahead, Hague.

MR. SHALTON: My name is Shalton (ph). I am Secretary General of the Ministry of Education and Science of the Netherlands and speaking on behalf of Minister Deetman who is regretfully not able to be here.

I would like to congratulate the Carnegie Commission for a stimulating report which I hope will have the same impact on the quality of education as a nation at risk. I would like to address a question to the Secretary of Education, Mr. Bennett.

It may be necessary to make some cuts in current education expenditures and programs to implement the rather costly recommendations. You point to only one area for savings, namely administrative expenditures outside the schools. Could you say a bit more about what tradeoff may be

required within the education budget to make extra funds available?

SECRETARY BENNETT: Well, I think we need to make it plain that the Carnegie recommendations are not principally recommendations for the federal government or for federal budgets. They do have implications for education spending nationwide, but this would be done the way education spending has been done in the United States for some time; that is, the burden, whatever burden there is because of implementation of this report would fall on the states and locales and only to some extent on the federal government. Remember, in the United States the federal government only spends about six or seven percent of the spending on education.

I think it is important to point out about the Carnegie report that it is not a report that tells the federal government what it should do or requires the federal government to act in any way. This is something that can be implemented quite apart from the federal government's involvement. I think that is a very important point to make.

MR. BENTON: Dr. Branscomb, since you were the chairman of the task force, perhaps you could tell us what is the

purpose of this report and what it means so far as U.S. education is concerned.

DR. BRANSCOMB: Well, the main purpose of the report is to try to make a very substantial structural change in the way our schools operate and most importantly to empower the teachers to exercise more innovative capability as teaching professionals in our schools. It is aimed very much at the fact that the kind of education we gave our children in the 1950s is probably not adequate for the kinds of jobs people will have in the future when they will think for a living rather than using their manual dexterity so much. It is very much aimed at improving the effectiveness and the productivity of schools.

So on the question that was just asked Secretary Bennett about the costs, I think the right answer is, yes, Americans will probably want to spend more on schools if indeed they are certain that those schools will be very much better and will assure a better opportunity for their children.

MR. BENTON: Another question from The Hague?

QUESTION: I would like to ask another question in the - - aspects of the thing. How realistic is it to expect that incremental improvements in the status of quality of teachers will actually alter your economic growth perspectives?

MR. BENTON: I think that is a good question for you, Mr. Shanker.

MR. SHANKER: I believe that changes in the economic prospects will be very great. We have gone through a period in American education, I think a sad period, from the late 1960s until A Nation at Risk during which time we as adults and as a society gave up on what our obligation should be. We essentially said that anything that the children want to do, they can do. Some people had faith that if students made their own choices that they would ultimately choose the right things. They didn't. They didn't take very much math, they didn't take very much science, they didn't read very many classics. So we have now returned to the position that this is an adult responsibility.

There is no question that our ability to function economically, and there are aspects of this that go beyond economics in terms of citizenship and in terms of what kind of human beings we want to develop, but just in the economic area there is no question that the failure to teach most of our youngsters mathematics and science or even a satisfactory level of the use of their own language has a very, very negative effect both on the economic capabilities of the

country and on the prospects of many of these students as individuals.

MR. BENTON: We will take another question from The Hague. Again, let me ask you to identify yourself, your organization and the person to whom your question is addressed.

Go ahead, The Hague.

MR. VELDHUIS: My name is Jan Veldhuis. I am Chairman of the Netherlands for the Higher Professional Education, and I would like to address a question to Mr. Branscomb, the Vice President of the IBM Corporation.

The report sounds fairly ambitious to me, and widely so I think. The aim is, as I read, to make teachers from an occupation to a profession. My question is, how easy is it to make professions?

My considered opinion as a sociologist, which happens to be my profession, is that professions in society grow and that it is seldom a successful story to make professions where they aren't embedded in a culture of the nation.

DR. BRANSCOMB: I think that's a very astute question. My answer would be that a great many teachers are very professional in the way that they look at their work and indeed in the education and training they have. One of our

recommendations is that American schools of teachers, teacher education institutions, no longer provide the undergraduate degrees in education but instead that all of our teachers should be university graduates with a major concentration of their studies in English literature or history, physics, mathematics, or some other subject, supplemented by training and education and then completed with a very specific masters-level degree in how to teach, much of that education taking place in fact in collaboration with real schools.

It will certainly take a long time. To a great extent, the problem we have in our schools today is that they're run rather more like factories than like a partnership of professionals working in the collegial way to deliver an important service.

But that is in fact I think what we must do, and however long it takes I think we need to get at it, for the central objective is to make the student more independent and creative and indeed more professional in the way they approach their lives. I don't see how to do that if the education that they get is in fact a highly regimented, bureaucratically structured delivery of knowledge rather than a stimulating experience where people learn how to create their own solutions to problems. That's the sort of



education we're looking for, and we've got to have teachers whose attitude towards their own work matches that requirement.

MR. BENTON: Thank you, sir, and we than our questioners in the Hague.

We turn now to Brussels for their first questions. Go ahead, please.

MR. EYNDHOVEN: My name is Eindhoven. I am chairman of (inaudible) of the World Federation of Teachers. I am glad to know Mr. Al Shanker personally. I would like to put the question forward to him.

Under the heading "School Administrative Changes," the report puts that the performance of students may have financial implications for the teaching and the whole school staff. If students do well, the entire school staff might be rewarded, possibly by financial bonuses.

My question is don't you fear that with such a conception, there is the danger that schools will put through a strong selection among their students before their terminations in order to be sure to obtain good results and hence improve their reputations. Isn't that a danger that inequality in level of schools will be enlarged concern of quality of education but also with regard to teachers

salaries, who will be willing to teach in, let us say, poor quality schools? And what about the equality of opportunities for children from lower social classes?

MR. SHANKER: Well, certainly, it's good to talk to you again, and it's certainly an excellent question. We have already experimented with this proposal. The State of Florida has a program known as the Merit Schools Plan. It avoids the traditional pitfalls of merit pay; that is, instead of pitting one teacher against another, it essentially offers an entire school a reward and therefore gets the teachers, the principals, school secretaries, psychologists, school-related personnel, to try to plan to work together.

That is, it's an incentive for collegiality to get people to work together as a team because they're competing with other schools.

Now, there is nothing that says that the standards will only be examination scores. I hope that that would not be so. In the schools throughout Florida they never were only examination scores; there were many different indices. The indices were agreed to by the teachers and by the school administration in advance, and there were different goals set depending on where the students were when they start. It

obviously would be very unfair to expect the same final achievement level in a school where the students are now, let's say, three years behind the students in another school.

Some of the schools that won this prize money or incentive money in the State of Florida were indeed schools that were near the bottom, but because their faculties pulled together, came up with new and good ideas, worked well together. Some of these schools which had the most difficult students were actually the schools that won the money. That's the kind of thing we're looking at. We're not seeking to reward schools that are performing well because the children who come to them are already performing well anyway. That is not the idea.

MR. BENTON: Another question from Brussels.

MS. DE MEUTER: I am Mia De Meuter, from the Flemish Ministry of Education, and I would like to address my question to Mr. Bennett, please.

You want to restructure schools and to raise the standards for teachers. Does that mean that you establish new schools or courses for teacher training, or will you organize in-service training sessions for the different types of teachers?

SECRETARY BENNETT: Well, let me comment briefly. I should say at the outset that I am not one of the authors of this report. The authors of this report are sitting on my right and left, and they should, I think, give their own account of what the report recommends.

But as I read it, the report comes out strongly for a basic training in the liberal arts for every candidate for teaching. That is, as Mr. Branscomb was saying earlier, we would not have our teachers or our to-be teachers majoring in English or history or mathematics or chemistry. I very much endorse this idea.

I think it's a very sound one and think it has been a mistake up until now in the United States that many people who have studied in a subject intensively such as history or chemistry and didn't take certain education courses in college cannot get teaching jobs. So I think this is a welcome change, but I think perhaps one of the authors here ought to comment on the question.

MR. BENTON: Well, let's go left to right. We will start with you, Mr. Shanker.

MR. SHANKER: We feel very strongly that there just isn't enough time in the programs that we now have in undergraduate work to have a major in education and have

enough substance and content. One of the things that we have been experiencing over the last few years since examinations have been instituted in various states for prospective teachers is that we find that many prospective teachers cannot pass a sixth grade test in mathematics or they have such an inadequate use of the language that you could truly say that they are bordering on literacy illiteracy.

So this is not a criticism of the education schools. That is not where they learned mathematics or where they learned English or history. But you are saying that lawyers don't start by entering law school the first day of their college career, doctors don't start in medical school the first day of their career. We have a general pattern of a liberal education that precedes professional education. We need this in our field as well.

MR. BENTON: Mr. Branscomb, would you comment on that and maybe particularly the economics of four years versus five years of education?

DR. BRANSCOMB: Let me first respond to the question which was a good one. It had to do with where do the teachers get additional training if indeed their professional level and standards are to be raised.

First of all, we expect the schools of education in our university still to play an important role. Indeed, their role I think would be focused more on the delivery of a clinical education, if you like, as medical schools deliver clinical education to physicians, a kind of education that is really designed to help teachers to teach.

But there is another idea in our report which I think is very important with respect to the upgrading of either partially qualified or inexperienced teachers. This is the notion that instead of all teachers in the school having the same job description and playing essentially a similar role as they do today, we introduced the notion of a more flexible structure of people. For example, we introduced the idea of lead teachers. Lead teachers would be teachers who have more experience, more advanced training, and more leadership skills, and whose role is not only to teach but to work with other teachers and help them learn the additional skills they require. So a lot of the supplementary education that teachers will need I hope will in fact be obtained right in the school they work in from the experienced teachers.

MR. BENTON: Thank you. Thank you, Brussels.

We will go now to Lisbon. Once again please identify yourself, your organization, and the person to whom your question is addressed.

Go ahead, Lisbon.

MR. LIMBON: My name is Franz Limbon (ph). I am Deputy Director of the Portuguese Ministry of Education. I would like to address a question to Mr. Shanker.

MR. BENTON: Go ahead, Lisbon. You have a question for Mr. Shanker.

MR. LIMBON: (Inaudible). We would like you to comment on the lead teacher concept.

MR. BENTON: I think that was a comment on the lead teacher concept of the report.

MR. SHANKER: I think we arrived at that notion for several reasons. First, we want to get away from the factory model of education where teachers are viewed as the workers at the bottom to be always managed by someone else. In other professions, the members of the profession themselves develop leadership. Not everyone in other professions plays exactly the same role, but it is not viewed as a factory relationship where you have the group of workers here and a forum above them. So that is one item.

Secondly, we have 2.2 million elementary and secondary school teachers in this country. One-half of them are about to leave in the next seven years. We cannot find 2.2 million people at the professional level that we want. It will take 24 percent of all the college graduates in this country for the next ten years to meet our needs in the schools. If we try to raise everyone to a level of excellence, first of all, our society cannot afford to provide that proportion of the outstanding college graduates to one field, elementary and secondary education.

What happens then is that we lower standards, we pay poor salaries, we treat all of the people as though they are factory workers and have to be watched very carefully. Essentially we said why not have different levels of certification. Develop a national system. Those who have advanced certification, they will not be everyone in a school, but there will be an opportunity for people entering teaching to know that if they are good at it, if they are good in their performance, if they do get additional training, if they are nationally certified as being outstanding, and if they are seen as having those leadership abilities, then there is an opportunity within this career, just as there is an opportunity to become a senior partner in



a law firm -- not everybody who becomes a lawyer gets to be a senior partner, not everybody who goes into another profession reaches the heights of that profession -- but that there ought to be similar opportunities in teaching for a person who begins to know that eventually I cannot only be working with children, but I can be evaluating textbooks, working with technology, training new teachers, assisting teachers who have been around who now are not working very well any more, that I can take a share of what these management functions are and eventually I can be earning \$60 or \$70 or \$80 or \$90,000, not everyone will, but those who are outstanding and reach this position.

We feel that if we are to have our share of the best and brightest coming into teaching, there must be the opportunity for some members of the profession to reach those heights.

MR. BENTON: Another question from Lisbon.

MS. MARQUES: My name is Margarida Marques. I work in the Planning Department, Portuguese Ministry of Education.

Dr. Branscomb, which -- knowledges must be given by the school to the pupils for a good insertion into the work life, how, and at what age, and in the face of the rapid

technological changes or do you think should the professional curriculum be?

DR. BRANSCOMB: I can't be very specific about what the curriculum has to be. Indeed, our intention and our tradition in this country is to leave that as a matter for decision by the states and communities which are concerned with it. But I think there are several very important principles in answering your question.

One is, in our country we see a great deal of interest by the governors of our 50 states and by industrial and other employment leaders in those states and communities together with educators discussing the very question you ask: what kind of education is really going to be important to the jobs of the future?

In fact, our political leaders at the local level and at the state level, the governors, compete with one another to attract new employment and new industrial investment in their states, both from companies operating in other states and even for foreign investment for new jobs and new plants.

In the course of that competition and that dialogue with the private sector a great deal of consideration is given to the specific answer to your question, the kind of education required.

But I think we all agree on the task force at least that the important issue is that students need to be given both a firm grounding in the bases, something that all educators and parents agree to today, and it is a major focus of American education today, strengthen the basic skills. But on top of that it is vital that students understand what it is that they know, understand how they know it and be given the tools to invent creative solutions for themselves. Because the nature of the tools that workers are given to work with in today's society are much more mentally demanding, and if the people are well trained and can think for themselves, can produce extraordinary increases in productivity.

The bottom line in the economic competition is a productivity competition. To be productive people have to be able to think for themselves and create solutions to problems. So it is a problem solving oriented education that we are talking about.

MR. BENTON: Secretary Bennett, do you have a comment on that?

SECRETARY BENNETT: I just wanted to add to Mr. Branscomb's comment that it is certainly not the federal government's responsibility to set curriculum. In fact, we are proscribed from setting curriculum in the United States.

But we can observe trends in the curriculum. I think we are to some extent returning to a consensus about the curriculum; at the elementary school level a strong emphasis across the country on reading and teaching reading, on computation, and on the importance of acquainting students with a sense of their heritage, their culture, their responsibilities of citizenship. The report does mention this, and I want to commend the authors of the report for mentioning that last point.

In high schools I think we are very clearly seeing a trend. If you look at state requirements over the last few years since The Nation at Risk report, we are seeing a very clear trend to strengthen the disciplines Mr. Shanker was talking about, math and English and history and science. There is some weeding out, some cutting out of subjects and courses which I think many of us felt came into being in the sixties and were rather extraneous to the essential business of education.

MR. BENTON: Thank you to Lisbon.

We are going to Helsinki next. Your first question please, Helsinki.

MR. SCHUBRICK: I am (inaudible) Schubrick (ph) of the National Port of Education. I will direct my question to Mr. Branscomb.

The report is based on the assumption that education is a fundamental factor in overcoming national economic problems and abolishing unemployment. Which are the main grounds for this optimistic opinion?

The main grounds are observation of what is in fact happening in the world economy. First of all, no nation is an island anymore. Technology itself has created a world market for most products, and in spite of some political tendencies to protectionism in some places, even in our own country, the fact is that we are in a world economy. It is necessary that each country expect its own standard of living to depend ultimately on the productivity of its work force.

As we look at the changes that have taken place, even in my own company, we find that our products -- we make computers and other information machines -- we find that labor is still an important part of product costs, but automation has reached the point where the factory labor is perhaps only two or three percent of product costs. Who are all these other people? Who, in fact, are the labor content

of products? They are people who used to work on the factory floor whom we have trained in our own schools and courses in IBM to take care of the machines, to program them, to handle the logistics, to arrange the operation of the factory, to assure quality control -- many other roles.

These roles require a different kind of educational level and, importantly, a different set of skills than those traditionally taught to people who are going to do more structured jobs under more rigid supervision.

As we look at other countries around the world, we find that we no longer live in the world in which there are few highly industrialized countries with strong education engaging in economic trade with developing countries, low wages and poor education in every case.

For example, it came as a great surprise to me -- I find it very interesting -- to discover that the IBM Korean Company in South Korea has the highest education level of its employees of any of the IBM subsidiaries around the world. 91 percent of the employees of IBM Korea have a university degree.

So we're not competing in the United States, and Americans need to understand this. We're not competing with people who are necessarily less well educated than we are.

Since the United States has moved pretty far towards being what you might call an information society, three-quarters of our workers are in services.

Clearly, the education industry is itself the central industry in an economy that is based primarily on the value added from education.

MR. BENTON: Another question from Helsinki. Go ahead.

QUESTION: My name is (inaudible). Mr. Branscomb answered that problem-solving is the key word. But problem-solving is actually a way of getting knowledge. What type of knowledge do you think should be taught in schools if you think that it won't be used until at least a decade later?

DR. BRANSCOMB: Your question, I think, almost contains the answer. Technology changes so rapidly, there is no way you could specify the things an individual knows to last a lifetime. In fact, our educational institutions of the country, as Secretary Bennett could certainly describe better than I, are moving very rapidly towards the provision of lifelong education.

So the job, it seems to me, of public education in the first 12 years is to equip people to be able to avail themselves of that opportunity for lifelong learning and to

motivate them to understand how valuable it will be to their own future progress.

So in that sense, the role of education is to incent people and to equip people to continue to be educated.

MR. BENTON: Thank you, Helsinki.

Let's move now to Madrid. Your first question, please?

QUESTION: Hello. This is a question posed by Paloma Larena, from Madrid Daily World, for Mr. Shanker. Last fall a program was held in which 100 Spanish teachers went to New York City to teach. Does your report take into account the possibility of more teacher exchanges, and particularly Spanish-speaking teachers?

MR. SHANKER: If I heard the question correctly, it dealt with the fact that New York City brought 100 or so teachers from Spain to New York last year. There have been a number of such exchanges. I think that there are some teachers from Germany in Georgia, and a few others.

I think it's too early to know whether this is successful. At least the early reports from New York City indicated that while the teachers who came from Spain were very qualified and spoke Spanish and English quite fluently, and I am sure were very good teachers, that they were not quite accustomed to the free-wheeling manner of American



students, and that a number of them didn't end up being teachers but ended up in other roles in those schools.

Certainly, as long as we have a shortage here, and we do have a shortage of teachers, I would welcome teachers from other countries, provided that they can adjust to the different way in which students in this country relate to adults. That's very, very difficult for teachers from other countries.

MR. BENTON: Secretary Bennett, I think you would like to have something to say about that.

SECRETARY BENNETT: Well, just that I am not sure that in all cases we should take the behavior of students, the free-wheeling behavior of students as a given about which we can do nothing, because our own teachers, I think sometimes for very good reasons, are concerned, worried, and troubled sometimes by the nature of that free-wheeling activity. It's no coincidence that many of the teachers we talk to who are leaving the profession are distressed about their inability to protect themselves and the lack of support for their safety, well-being, and not just safety and well-being but for insufficient respect for them as adults and as teachers.

MR. BENTON: Another question from Madrid.

QUESTION: The question posed by Miguel Bereda, from the Ministry of Education, for Mr. Shanker: Within the field of staff development, do you think merit pay is positive, and how do American teachers react to it?

MR. SHANKER: I am sorry, I didn't understand the question.

MR. BENTON: Merit pay, whether it was positive and how do American teachers react to merit pay.

MR. SHANKER: Teachers in the United States are somewhat divided on the question of merit pay. If you ask the question in general do you think that better teachers should be paid more, on many polls you get about 50 percent of the teachers saying, "Yes, in general I think that that's so."

However, we in this country have had merit pay in the majority of our school districts. From the turn of the century to the present time more than half the districts in this country have had some merit pay plan and almost all of them have abandoned those plans, which meant that those particular plans that they adopted didn't work very well, were very unpopular in the way they were implemented.

We think that in the report that we've issued here, that we've dealt with the question of rewarding merit but getting away from the objections that teachers have had

traditionally. Traditionally, teachers have felt that the problem with merit is not that some teachers weren't more deserving, but that they didn't trust the principal at the local level or that superintendent or that school board to make objective decisions and judgments. They felt that there were political considerations and there was favoritism.

Under this system, the system described in the report, there would be a national board of professional teaching standards and there would be teachers who would get additional preparation and would pass an examination, which is not necessarily only a paper-and-pencil examination, but they would be certified by their own profession as being at a very high level, and there would be also an advanced level here.

So that what we're building in here is a system of recognizing that some are better than others and some are able to do more things than others, but not on a local or on a political arrangement; on an arrangement which is very similar to that which other professions in our society have, which are national systems of certification.

MR. BENTON: Thank you for your questions, Madrid.

We turn now to Vienna, and your first question, please, from Vienna.

MR. GRUBER: Good afternoon. This is Karl Gruber, from the Department of Education of the University of Vienna. There are two short technical questions that I should like to ask, and one rather sweeping one, of Mr. Bennett.

The technical one: A lot would depend on the assessment procedure on which the teacher's certificate is based. Is there not a danger to concentrate on the measurable aspects of teacher behavior and to leave out the soft, caring, humane ones?

SECRETARY BENNETT: Yes. My answer is yes. I think so. Again, Mr. Branscomb or Mr. Shanker may want to comment. But as I understand the idea of both the lead teacher and also the national board, the criteria for evaluation, as I understand it, would be broad enough to take into account the whole range of a teacher's effectiveness, not, for example, just the scores of students but the reactions of parents and students and other teachers to that teacher's effectiveness, because we know that a teacher's art, when it is great, is not reduceable simply to improved test scores on the part of students but to other factors such as the ability to encourage inquiry and to inspire students to learn.

So as I understand it, unless I stand corrected, that would be part of one's evaluation of the teacher.