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MR. DALY: This public policy forum, part of a series presented by the American Enterprise Institute, is concerned with what is learned and taught in our schools at all levels, how they may be improved, and the place of government in the process. Our subject: Crisis in Education: Whose Responsibility?

The dimensions of the problem are spelled out in declining test scores, 11th-graders reading at 8th-grade levels, major language problems, tragically also in English, our mother tongue, in math skills that fail the challenge of simple division and fractions, spelled out also in developmental studies courses in our colleges and universities, academic argot for noncredit remedial courses which it is hoped will equip already admitted students with the reading, writing and math skills to survive, spelled out in college level courses, core and otherwise, the nature and quality of which raise questions year by year.

One professor notes a current wry slice of academic humor. Some universities, it goes, stopped passing out degrees at commencement for fear that parents might ask their children to read aloud what was printed on them.
The public has raised a hue and cry for back to basics, and too often that public rejects school bond issues, curbs taxing authority, challenges the academic quality of teachers. Teachers, in turn, despair, protest classroom disorder, physical violence, and grossly inadequate skill levels in students shovelled up to them from below.

At the same time, Dr. Ernest Boyer, president of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and former U.S. Education Commissioner, describes the teaching profession as reaching the crossroads of disaster, caught in a vicious cycle spiralling downward, and adds, "Rewards are few, morale is low, the best teachers are bailing out, and the supply of good recruits is drying up."

And teachers, in another wry slice of academic humor, tell the tale of the plumber who unplugged the kitchen sink in five minutes and presented a bill for $35. The grateful but complaining housewife, "I certainly appreciate that you came so quickly, but that's nearly twice the hourly rate I pay a tutor to come in to my house for my child."

Plumber, "Yes, I know, I used to be a teacher."

The bill for education for the 1981-’82 schoolyear is roughly $198 billion, 20 billion’s from the federal
government, $77 billion from state government, 50 billion's from local government, and 51 billion's from a variety of private sources, tuition, fees, gifts, et cetera, all of it, in the last analysis, out of the pockets of our citizenry.

It is charged that this great enterprise is badly managed by the campuses and the governments and the citizen school boards.

The Federal Department of Education, scheduled to be dismantled into an education foundation alone has a 150-odd programs and spends roughly $14 billion a year. How many of these programs and dollars are realistically necessary? What should be done with them?

Well, to chart a course through this labyrinth of crisis, we have a highly expert panel. To my far right, Mr. Albert Shanker, president of the American Federation of Teachers. Mr. Shanker was instrumental in forming the United Federation of Teachers in the 1950s, became its president in 1964, still holds that office in the largest American federation local in the United States, and is also vice president of the AF-of-L-CIO.

To my immediate right, Dr. T.H. Bell, Secretary of Education, former U.S. Commissioner of Education under
President Ford, and then served as Commissioner of Higher Education in Utah.

To my immediate left, Representative Paul Simon, Illinois Democrat, Chairman of the House Education and Labor Subcommittee on Post-Secondary Education. Representative Simon was elected to Congress in 1974 after serving for more than 15 years in the Illinois state legislature.

To my far left, Dr. John Silber, president of Boston University and university professor of philosophy and law, formerly professor of philosophy and university professor of arts and letters at the University of Texas, Austin. Dr. Silber is the author of the "Poisoning the Wells of Academe: The Flight from Excellence and the Precarious Future of Higher Education."

Well, to begin, gentlemen, I would pose the same question to each of you in turn. What is the way out of the crisis in education?

Secretary Bell?

DR. BELL: Well, that's a tall order, in a few moments. I'd say, to begin with, we should take some actions that are long overdue to enhance the teaching profession to make teaching attractive again and to also give more incentive and
motivation for students to want to learn.

MR. DALY: Congressman Simon?

CONGRESSMEN SIMON: I would say three things: number one, quality—we have to pay attention to the quality problems that do exist in education and not duck them—second is opportunity—make sure that we assure the opportunity for a good education for all young people, and not just young people, but for all Americans—and third is recognize that adequate resources are vital if we're to do the first two.

MR. DALY: Mr. Shanker?

MR. SHANKER: I think the answer to that question depends on what one considers is the crisis, and I think that part of the crisis is the fact that we're, for the first time, reaching most American youngters and we're about to pull back in terms of the resources. I think that that's—that the whole fiscal question in terms of the other economic problems that we face in the decade ahead is central.

Beyond that, I think the question of maintaining safety and order in the schools is number one in the minds of the American people in terms of schools; secondly is the question of standards; and the third, the question of whether schools can transmit the values of our culture and not just
be absolutely neutral.

MR. DALY: Dr. Silber?

DR. SILBER: Well, I think that the purpose of education in a democracy is to bring as many of our citizens into the main stream of our national life as possible. So, equal opportunity has to be fundamental.

On the other hand, I think, by making education available to all, we have tried to interpret equal opportunity by judging in terms of results. And we have tried to argue that if the results aren't equal, then the opportunity hasn't been equal. And through that passionate desire to be as just as possible, we have ended up destroying our standards.

Those standards, I agree with all the speakers, must be restored with a good deal of efficiency and austerity.

At the same time, I would say that this administration and every administration must recognize that an investment in education is a savings plan in human resources.

And just like saving cash, when you save people you can anticipate payoffs in the end. We can anticipate payoffs, financial payoffs, in a reduction of crime, in a reduction of welfare. We can anticipate payoffs in terms of enhanced invention, enhanced happiness, enhanced productivity
of our people.

So that I don't believe we should make the mistake of treating education as if it is a consumer item or a luxury, but treating it, instead, as a savings plan.

MR. DALY: Well, I suggest we attack our subject in steps, beginning with primary and secondary education where it appears most public discontent is focused.

What is basically wrong, and what can and should be done to improve the quality of teaching and learning? Secretary Bell?

DR. BELL: Well, I think, first of all, that we've--as I said earlier, I think we need to make teaching attractive once more. I think that we need to provide ladders, career ladders, and opportunities for advancement in teaching, like we have it in other endeavors.

Indeed, there are more opportunities in higher education in teaching than there is in the primary and secondary schools.

So I'd emphasize that as a--as a starting point. Without effective teaching, all else fails. So I'd stress that as--I think there needs to be massive reform in our teacher personnel policies, how we educate teachers, how we
compensate them. And I think schoolboards' policies related to that need to be drastically revised. Until we can attract effective teachers, all other questions are--go back to that.

MR. DALY: Are such reforms possible, Dr. Silber?

DR. SILBER: I think they're--I think they're possible. But I have had literally hundreds of letters from schoolteachers in the primary and secondary schools, and their discontent doesn't focus so much on salary or so much on material rewards as on the fact that they fell unappreciated if they try to follow serious standards.

Many of them complain about the quality of their supervisors and the quality of principals, and complain that if they try to develop an imaginative curriculum or an imaginative course and hold their students to high standards, that they're subjected to very severe parental pressure, community pressure, and that they are not supported by their superintendent or they're not supported by their principal, or they're not supported by their head teacher.

And I think that we can do a great deal to improve the quality of life for these teachers by saying that excellence will be rewarded.

When, as it was reported on CBS in September of
1981, the teachers association in Atlanta cancelled a spelling
bee on the grounds that they said that spelling wasn't es-
sential to education. That said—that said everything about
demoralization in the schools. And we've got to free the
ambitious teachers, the ones who care about their students,
from the levelling pressures of those who are less concerned.

MR. DALY: Mr. Shanker?

MR. SHANKER: Oh, I—I agree with both statements. I think
we have to free all teachers from false conceptions of what
the schools are going to do. We've had attacks on testing
because giving tests will make those students who don't pass
to feel bad. Well, I should hope they should feel bad if
they don't pass them. And I agree with you on the spelling
bee.

But I think it's important they get some perspective
in this, as to why it is that we feel that there's a crisis
and why the public feels there's a crisis. I don't think
I'm a very old man, but when I grew up, there were very few
people in my neighborhood who were high school graduates.
There were practically none who had been—who had had any
college at all. Anyone who had graduated elementary school
was considered a pretty well-educated person in my working
class neighborhood in New York.

And so my parents and the other parents there automatically held the schools and the teachers and the principal on a pedestal. This was--this was it; this was--these were educated people, this was opportunity, this was everything.

Well, in a way, our crisis in education is due to the fact that we've been so successful. We're all living in communities where half the people have gone to college. Why? Because the schools are pretty good and the teachers were pretty good.

And we're not reaching 5 percent of the students to go to college, or 7 percent, we're reaching more than 50 percent. And, of course, we're going to have problems.

I think that in everything that we say here tonight, we ought to realize that if you want to go to a place where education is respected, go to a Third World Country where half the people are illiterate. And education--there is no crisis in education. The crisis there is how to get the other half of the people literate.

The crisis here is a different one. It's that we've got an educated public that expects a lot more, and I think we ought to give it--them. We ought to live up to those
MR. DALY: Congressman Simon?

CONGRESSMAN SIMON: I agree with, literally, everything everyone has said, but I think we have to face the realities of where we are now. And maybe Al Shanker and I--well, we're going to agree on quite a few things here tonight--I think may--might disagree just slightly here.

I think, when you take a look at the tests and you see in those going into the various professions, those going into teaching now, at the very bottom--and I'm not suggesting that tests are the only criterion that should be used, or that an ACT test in the last eight years of those going into teaching have dropped 69 points, or the North Carolina study--that shows that of the top tier of teachers, the better teachers in the test, those teachers are leaving, the bottom one-tenth are staying in the profession.

That indicates a severe problem. And I think we then--when you see the nature of the problem, then you have to look at what you do about it. I think pay is part of it. And I think a fairly substantial part of it. I think it goes beyond that.

I think we have to be looking at sabbatical leaves,
at elementary and secondary level. I think that we have to recognize that we have to pull in people we have not pulled in part of this, is the exodus of women who now can become engineers and, you know, radio announcers and TV announcers, and all kinds of things that they couldn't become not too long ago. Part of this is good.

And another area--I think we ought to experiment in a few schools, and get Ted Bell to finance, help finance, this, now--

MR. DALY: Good luck.

(Coach.)

CONGRESSMAN SIMON: Experiment in a few schools with doing at the elementary and secondary level what we do at the college level, and that is, have a professor, and assistant professor, and instructor. I am concerned by this, that the weakest teacher in a school receives the same pay as the best teacher in the school.

And if we could have a few schools experiment with it and have a few teachers and administrators and schoolboard members work out the system, so it's not just an arbitrary thing that an administrator does, I think, maybe, we would come up with some better answers.
MR. SHANKER: Well, there's no system--you know, there have been systems like that tried before. They're called merit rating. And in theory, obviously, someone who's got great merit ought to be rewarded more than someone who's got much less merit.

The problem is--and it goes back to what Dr. Silber said before in terms of some of the very bureaucratic and very poor management schemes that you have there--is very, very little faith in elementary and secondary education that anyone is going to come up with a system that's fair or objective because it's going to be viewed as political. It's going to be reviewed as a system of petty rewards and punishments. That's one of the problems that we've got.

And I--money is an important issue, and there's no question about it. But beyond that is the question of collegiality. Do these people have enough time to talk about things that are important in their profession and in their calling. Right now, they've gotten very little of that time.

How are they treated? Are they treated, in a sense, the way factory workers are treated? Are they given things and told to do this and do it in the following way?

And you're not going to get top-notch people coming
into a field which has poor rewards in terms of pay, in which they're treated like factory workers, in which there is very little collegiality, and in which the philosophy of excellence has not been there for a long time.

CONGRESSMAN SIMON: Al., isn't it true that the merit pay experiments up to this point have all just been that the administrator just arbitrarily says Joe Jones or Mary Smith gets an additional $100 a month, or whatever?

We have not really tried to structure something as it has been done at the higher education level.

DR. BELL: Well, that--if I could chime in, that's merit pay, I think, and the connotation of that in the past is the wrong approach. Higher education doesn't do that, President Silber. We have peer review. We--you don't have anything like that academic rank that you are talking about, Congressman Simon, in--in the public schools, nor do you have endowed chairs and distinguished professorships and ways for teachers to distinguish themselves and to be recognized for it.

I think it goes beyond the old style of merit pay systems. I think the teachers ought to be involved, just as the faculty are involved. They wouldn't let the--they wouldn't let the deans and the vice presidents handle faculty
promotion on a university campus. They just wouldn't--wouldn't do that. So--

DR. SILBER: I don't think the concept of merit is--is as foreign to the public schools as all of that. I--I remember, as a fairly small boy, riding around the country schools in Bear County, Texas, with my mother, who was a supervisor of schools. And she would visit every class in that entire county system several times every year and observe the teachers teaching.

And she filed a report on the teachers who were inadequate, and she also encouraged them to develop special programs for improvement. And those--those that were doing an excellent job, she sent letters of commendation to the school boards at those little villages where they were operating.

Now, I do think that--that the pay in the public schools may be inadequate, but one thing we have to remember is that people who traditionally went into the teaching profession were prepared to trade some money for time. They had more time for self-development and they had a happier working condition because their work consisted in watching the flowering, watching the development, of young people.
This is inherently more attractive work than collecting garbage, or than going down into a mine and mining coal, or it's not—it's less dangerous, by and large, at least it used to be less dangerous, than—

(Laughter.)

DR. BELL: --than working on an oil rig.

So--so there were--there were very definite non-monetary compensations to do with teaching. I think many of those have been washed away by simple redundancy.

In the Boston schools, for example, when we--when we now have probably about four teachers for every three that we need, the sense of responsibility, the sense that you know your life makes a difference to the success of the program, is lost.

And in that system, we had at least two administrators and two non-teaching staff for every one we need. That's where the great waste in the Boston schools are, is in redundancy of administration and non-teaching staff.

Well, you have so many people with nothing to do that the busy work abounds. And as busy work and bureaucratic nonsense begins to increase, it becomes an increasing distraction for the student--for the teacher. The teacher no longer
has the time to focus on what counts.

MR. SHANKER: But you have--you have a very unusual situation in Boston that is really due to the loss of student population resulting from a court order, and so forth, so that's--and provisions for no layoffs is part of that. So that's--there's nothing like that anywhere else in the United States.

We do, however--you know, the choice for teachers is not whether they're going to become coal miners. They have other choices. New York City, during the great fiscal crisis, there were 15,000 teachers laid off, and a year later, 10,000 of them who hadn't been recalled were recalled. Of the 10,000 only 2,000 came back.

And when we phoned some of them, well, this was the first time in their life--they'd always been in school. They went to elementary school, junior high school, high school, college, and then right back in school again. And for the first time, they were out there in that world that they thought was a pretty bad world compared to schools. And 8,000 of them said, "We will never come back. This is tough--"

They described being in a classroom, they said, "we're not going back to the coal mines." That's a word that we heard very, very frequently.
They felt it was filled with tension, that it was unpleasant, that whatever other work they found outside—and we found no coal miners—they preferred it. And I think that one of the problems that we have is making the job attractive.

MR. DALY: Let's move--

CONGRESSMAN: If I--before you move here—interestingly, I come from coal mining territory. And we have quite a few teachers who have become coal miners, who have indicated they—they prefer that.

One other final—final little vignette. I have a friend up in your territory, John, who—Milton Cass. And Milton says he's no great sports enthusiast, but he really thinks that high school and college athletics are a great thing because, he says, it's the only place in the whole educational world where we reward quality.

And there is just a touch of truth to that.

MR. DALY: Well, that's what I wanted to come to, is to come to what—before we leave this and go to post-secondary education, come to from teachers to students. Their performance—

I have some small acquaintance with the private secondary world. And one of their great complaints is the number of
remedial courses that have to be set up at the— in the secondary field because of the product that's coming out of the public school primary and, to some degree, secondary system.

What can be done, or what needs to be done, to instill at least the sense that performance is going to be necessary before there will be progress up into future grades.

I used a verb "shovelled up"—how many teachers are in their classes having— you know, students come to them who are just unequipped to handle the work that they're supposed to do. What do you do, Dr. Silber?

DR. SILBER: Well, there must be an end to social promotion. There is no basis for allowing a person to advance in a class to a higher level without having demonstrated the competence required at the earlier level. And that— that's a very simple way to put a stop to a large part of that problem.

DR. BELL: That— that gives me an opening for renewing here my running debate with school boards. Some time ago on an interview with U.S. News and World Report I was asked the opening question you asked, "What's wrong with the schools?"

And I said, the school boards.

I don't want to pick on school boards, but they're the problem, John. I've had this going with Tom Shannon and
the National School Boards Association.

They need to adopt no-nonsense standards. You read the school board policy manual and you can read all about the business management of the schools, and the functional things, but they're silent about quality, and Paul—adherence to excellence, and motivation and rewards for teachers, and for students that strive to excel. The school boards are elected to be in charge of the schools. And they've got to take charge and they've got to pay attention to instruction and teaching and learning and have incentives and recognitions for teachers and for students.

And until they do that, we're not going to move in the direction. And they ought to be supporting teachers, and they ought to be making it more attractive than it is. And so I—I just take after school boards. They're great people, and that's the American tradition, that grassroots management of schools. But lately, school boards have not been carrying out their responsibilities.

And I've been exchanging letters and sort of had a running debate with the School Boards Association on this. I just think that where it stops.

I know some school superintendents who have left,
including the superintendent of schools in this city that left because of lack of school board support when they wanted to do something about excellence.

The board policy manual ought to prohibit those social promotions. There ought to be no nonsense statements there. Students would respect it. Parents would know about it, and we'd move a long ways if there were reform in the teacher system in the school board policy manual, we'd move a long ways right there in this situation.

They're elected, and I don't know why the media doesn't hold that elected group of people accountable like they do others.

MR. DALY: Mr. Shanker?

MR. SHANKER: Well, I think social promotion is why I agree with that but it's more than that. I think we've got to get rid of the mickey mouse courses that—loving, living, hiking is as good as Shakespeare, mathematics, foreign languages.

There's not question about it that time spent in school is spent on recreation rather than on things that you're not going to get by yourself. It's lost.

The amount of time that's spent in school on hard
subjects, homework which can perhaps give you 50 percent more time. The discipline question is very important. In many of our schools and classrooms, a teacher has to spend 20 or 30 or 40 or 50 or 75 percent of the time with two or one or three very disturbed children. They need help but they're not getting it in that classroom, and none of the other children are being educated.

Testing, yes, not because tests are perfect but it's the same with automatic promotion or social promotion. Sure, if a child isn't part of his peer group and doesn't move up it creates problems for that child.

Sure, the tests aren't perfect. Sure, you don't have to have every child taking exactly the same course and a standard curriculum.

But when you begin to do what we have done over the last 30 years which is to soften up on every one of these so that you end up without any standards at all, there's not much function for school.

It's the students who are determining it, and by the way, the students themselves want more. They feel that they're wasting time and the teachers feel that they are wasting time.

DR. BELL: You need to persuade your NEA colleagues to join
your point of view.

MR. SHANKER: We're trying very hard. (Laughter.)

I don't think that--I'd be willing to have a national

referendum of teachers, of all teachers, AFT members and NEA

members, on the differences on these issues between our two

organizations.

I have no doubt as to where the teachers of America

would stand on the questions of education.

DR. BELL: There are a couple, while we are on this a minute,

that I can chime in on. A couple grips I have, though. Time

on task, and we've been studying that, and our National

Institute of Education has explored that. We're losing time

on task for several things.

For one thing, we let school out. There are only

180 days in this country for school. We let school out for

parent and teacher conferences. We let them out for teacher

preparation days. We let them out for an afternoon football

game.

It's not uncommon to close the library two weeks

before school ends so you can inventory the books so you can

shut down on time, check the textbooks out the last week.

School board policies ought to prohibit all of that
nonsense. And then we'd start to get to where we ought to be. That's why I come back to the school board. They're in charge of the schools and they ought to take charge of them.

MR. DALY: Congressman Simon?

CONGRESSMAN SIMON: I think Al used the key phrase. Softening up. And it is a softening up that is not only in the class room, it is with the public. Somehow education has to become a greater priority, and I don't mean simply schooling, but the education in the broader sense, libraries, everything.

The Secretary mentioned 180 days a year elementary and high school on an average. Japan, it's 250 days a year. Soviet Union, you go to school six days a week, not five days a week.

A high school graduate in the Soviet Union has four years of physics. In the United States, 9 percent of the high school graduates have one year of physics.

There are virtually no countries on the face of the earth where you can go through elementary school without getting foreign languages or a foreign language. In the United States, fewer than 1 percent of our elementary school students get foreign languages, and one-fifth of our high schools offer no foreign languages. One-fifth of our community
colleges offer none, and we have state universities that offer none.

We have to be tougher on ourselves all the way around and education really has to become much more of a national priority than it is.

DR. SILBER: Of the three that have just spoken, I think beginning with Al and the softening up of the curriculum and coming, coming to the conclusion with the Congressman's statement, all of this adds up to a tremendous indictment of the present situations in the schools, and it indicates the extent, the scope and some of the detail of the crisis.

It is a crisis because the schools aren't as good as they were. They may be reaching a larger percentage of the students, but they're not reaching them with what schools were supposed to reach students with.

They reach them with time but they don't reach them with substance, and the inability of the public schools to cope with the problem of discipline is simply a confession of bankruptcy on the part of the schools.

Just as surely that there should be no social promotion, there should be no retention in an ordinary public school of a child so disturbed that he's incapable of civil
behavior, that he is incapable of the kind of conduct that
is appropriate to a school.

We cannot turn teachers into wardens. We cannot turn
them into prison attendants, and if there is no difference
between the life in a prison or in a penal institution and the
life in a public school, then there is something wrong with
that public school.

So we simply have to introduce some rational form
of segregation with regard to those students who are so
seriously disturbed that they can't meet the civilized
standards that are absolutely essential to education.

MR. DALY: Dr. Silber?

CONGRESSMAN SIMON: If I may disagree just slightly with
John Silber--

MR. DALY: You may.

CONGRESSMAN SIMON: Maybe we're a little too negative. There
are a lot of negative things, but there are also a lot of
good schools, and when I see--my daughter is in college now,
but when I saw her come with work far beyond anything I did
when I was in high school, you know, that exists, too.

So I think we have to balance this thing a little bit.

DR. SILBER: If you want to talk about a country like Germany
or like England that tries to provide higher education for, let's say, 10, 15 percent of their population, they do it well and we do it well.

I wouldn't--I wouldn't take second place to any foreign country with, with regard to the best that is offered in the public schools of the United States.

But the fact is that that's not more than a 10 to 15 percent fringe of the total operation, and we, we simply do not guarantee to the ambitious and talented youngster who grows up in the inner city that he's going to have the opportunity to go to nuclear high school.

If we're going to use the public schools to guarantee equal opportunity, if we're going to use the public schools to make a meaningful statement out of the American dream to bring people into the mainstream of American life, then quality schools have to be located in every community, and it's not good enough to say, "Well, scattered around this country we have some great schools. That's not good enough.

MR. DALY: Let's move on to higher education. The sense of diminished quality in teaching and learning is as prevalent there as in the primary and secondary schools, I would suggest.
We all hear of the baccalaureate who cannot write a simple declarative sentence, who, put upon his feet and asked to express a simple thought cogently and clearly, is entirely unable to do so, who has no language capacities and who minus his little dingus for adding and subtracting and dividing has problems.

Now, Dr. Silber, what, in a word, can and should be done to improve the quality of higher or post-secondary education?

DR. SILBER: Well, the reason why we have to call it post-secondary is because it's not necessarily higher than anything. (Laughter.) And I think it is essential that we stick to the name higher education and that it be higher, and I think, again, that some, some objective standards have to be insisted upon.

The open admissions program that has become fashionable over the last ten years, it seems to me, on the whole, is probably a good idea because it is a remedial opportunity, but no one who is admitted to a university or college under an open admissions programs should receive college credit for any courses that he passes until he has reached the college
Once the remedial program which might last one year, it might last one semester, it might last two years, once that's been completed and the student has now made up through the aegis of the college the work that he should have done in high school, then and only then should he receive college credit.

And I believe that most of the remarks that we've made about the primary and secondary schools can be made with equal fairness and equal justice with regard to our colleges and universities.

The shoddy is present in higher education just as surely as it is present in primary and secondary education.

MR. DALY: Mr. Shanker?

MR. SHANKER: I agree with what Dr. Silber said. I think that the movement to open up post-secondary or higher education, the notion that a simple cutoff point or a score on the old College Boards or something like that or the fact that a student in high school didn't take a language, that large numbers of students who could have done well and would have done well in college were excluded.

Now, what happened was that the idea of opening up
and giving students an opportunity to make it is a good idea unless you do what has been done very frequently, and that is change the level of the institution to the level of the students who are coming in and decide that that you no longer have an institution of higher education but some form of continuing education, and that's wrong.

MR. DALY: Can we hold for a minute? We seem to have lost the light at the end of the tunnel.

(MR. SHANKER: I agree with John Silber that open enrollment is basically a good idea. The old days when we wouldn't admit a student because he hadn't taken Latin or a foreign language or because he was one or two points below on a college entrance board exam, I think we've missed quite a few people who would have made it in college and would have made an important contribution.

I think the important thing is, is what happens once you open up. Do you maintain your standards or do you open up and then start moving your standards downward and downward so that you have social promotion in higher education as well.

And I think that's the disaster. I think the important thing is to open up, give everybody an opportunity, but
to have a set of standards which are real and which are high
so that everyone knows that when you have your degree, it
means something, which it doesn't in many places now.

DR. SILBER: This is not to overlook the fact that a university
or college is a very expensive place in which to engage in
that kind of remedial work so that if you could assign this
to high schools or to community colleges to do the remedial
work for the student who still had the ambition to go to
college rather than do that remedial work in college, I think
that would be better.

But I think it's far better to give the talented
and ambitious student a chance to make up for deficiencies
in his high school program than to deny him that opportunity
entirely.

DR. BELL: But another problem in academe is the trend, the
alarming trend of early specialization. Engineering schools
demanding sophomores to start specializing in the profession-
al areas.

So the professional schools and the universities are
forcing us there and so we're starting to neglect the liberal
arts and the humanities. We're learning more and more about
less and less as we narrow that speciality down, clear down
into the lower division now in many areas. We've got to move
away from that from where we've been.

CONGRESSMAN SIMON: And we do a disservice to those professions
in the process. We end up with people who are very narrow,
who have never been exposed to Plato or anything else. I
think that Al's statement about standards is, is basic here.

We have to maintain those standards. I favor the
open admission programs also. But again the softening up
phrase, if I can steal that from you, is extremely important,
that that is in fact what too often has happened, and it is
interesting that you can even--we were talking before about
foreign languages, you can even get Ph.D. in International
Studies, believe it or not, in the United States without
having had a year of a foreign language. It is just in-
credible to me.

MR. DALY: Well, it's fair, I think, to say from what has come
out of a discussion of primary, secondary and higher education
that basic responsibility for demanding excellence in education
rests in many corners.

AEI is doing a study now, Partnership in Education,
and it rests with parents, with school boards, local and
state governments, teachers and principals, deans and
Now, just what should the government role be?

Dr. Silber?

DR. SILBER: I think the Federal Government must recognize the importance of saving in human resources and not just saving in dollars, because when one saves human resources, those human resources that are then saved and enhanced through education end up being translated into dollars in terms of productive lives. They don't spend their lives in prisons or on welfare. They spend their lives in professions or in service or in gainful employment and ultimately help to make the country go.

So I think that in terms of, let us say, supply side economics, it is very important to preserve this, this emphasis on saving resources when it comes to the human factor. It's at least as important there as it is anywhere else.

And in the long-run, and this is the difficulty for Congress and for the Administration, because the long run is all of say 12 years, and that's three Presidential terms and a couple of senatorial terms and a half a dozen congressional
terms, the payoff will be obvious to this nation within 12
years, but it's not going to be obvious in two and it's not
going to be obvious in four.

So how do we persuade the government to recognize the
long-term effects of a policy that emphasizes savings in human
resources?

MR. DALY: Well, now, Dr. Bell, you have sent up to the
Congress a dismantling program which would reduce the Secre-
taryship of Education to, I guess, what? A director of a
foundation? And would actually dismantle what was set up as
recently as 1979, a Department of Education.

What benefits? How do you see this as any answer to
the problem of government's proper place in education?

DR. BELL: Well, the Federal Government's proper place is, is
one of offering assistance and capacity building to the
state and local entities in education.

We surely ought not be pre-empting the traditional
responsibility of state and local government to support
education. That doesn't mean that we don't have a important
role in that regard, and we feel that role can be adequately
played with less than a cabinet level Department of Education.

Indeed, we think maybe the propensity of powerful
cabinet agencies to regulate might tend to lead us away from
where we want to be in maintaining local autonomy, and the
autonomy of distinguished private universities like John
Silber's here.

So that's why we're coming at the change that we have,
but I don't think the shape and structure and pecking order
of the federal house of education is nearly as important as
these other issues we've been talking about, and the matter
of preserving autonomy and grassroots control and governance
of education on the level where it ought to be.

We surely don't want to have a federal ministry of
education, European-style in our country, at least I wouldn't
want to see it.

MR. DALY: Mr. Congressman?

CONGRESSMAN SIMON: I don't think anyone is seriously suggest-
ing that we should. I disagree with Ted Bell on that we should
do away with the Department of Education, but I don't think we
can simply say this is a matter for state and local govern-
ments. The Federal Government cannot provide leadership.

We simply have to. We have not been providing
adequate leadership, and with all due respects to Ted Bell,
and President Reagan couldn't have made a better appointment
than he did with Ted Bell, but we're reversing what we have
been doing in this country, and we are saying to the nation,
"Education is not as important as it once was."

And there is no question that we're doing that, and
that is imply not good news for the future. It is saving
money, as Dr. Silber has said, saving money temporarily. It
is costing money in the long run.

It's saving money like you build a house and don't
put a roof on it.

DR. SILBER: But we have to distinguish between de-emphasizing
education and terminating a Department of Education. It seems
to me the Department of Education came into existence as a
political payoff of a very obvious sort, and if it is termin-
atated four years later, I don't see that any great, great
loss occurs.

MR. SHANKER: I don't think the issue is the Department of
Education. I think the issue is the importance of education--

DR. SILBER: Right.

MR. SHANKER: --in terms of what the federal role is. I was
opposed to the creation of the Department. I would not be
sorry to see it die. I certainly would feel that a message
is being sent if once a upon a time it had some cabinet level,
whether it was in HEW or elsewhere and now it's going to be
moved to a lower position.

I think education should not be isolated by itself. I
think it belongs with the world of work, with labor. It be-
longs with social services and other things. I don't think
it should be standing out there by itself in a separate
bureaucracy, but I don't think that it's status ought to be
lowered because I think that's a message that education is
not as important in the eyes of the Federal Government as it
was.

And I think that's wrong because the two major issues
before our nation, one is the question of productivity and
reindustrialization and tightening our belts and putting this
country back together again, and the other is our defense
posture, whether we're once again going to be strong in the
world.

Neither of these objectives can be met without an
investment in education, and you cannot expect 16,000 local
school boards, as Ted Bell has described them, to sit there
with their budgets deciding on what the national interest is
going to be.

And the national--there are national interests which
will not be dealt with by 16,000 school boards. One of them has to do with children from very poor families, black, white, hispanic, Vietnamese, who are needed in the work force, who should not become the welfare recipients of tomorrow. They don't have very much political power. Many of those people do not vote.

If they are not taken care of by the United States of America, they're going to be a problem to themselves and to the country. These local school boards are not going to encourage people to take foreign languages and physics and mathematics. That's not the local problem in each locality. It's a national problem if we're going to reindustrialize, and it's a national problem if we're going to have adequate defense. And I think it is a terrible message to send to the rest of the world, and indeed, I don't know what—I'm in favor of increasing the defense budget.

But I'll tell you the Russians read our newspapers, and they read our national will, and if we say that all we're doing is building an MX and a B1 bomber, but we're not doing anything to create tomorrow's engineers and physicists and mathematicians and scientists, if we're not doing that, I think that they're going to know what we don't mean it.
MR. DALY: Dr. Bell?

DR. BELL: That's, that's the very reason why we're maintaining the programs that we have, and this Administration, contrary to some concerns and some alarms, is not abandoning the commitment to providing equal access to education.

And in these troubled times and with these budget deficits, we argue that we're still going to provide opportunity for needy students to have access to higher education. We think we're going to be able to take care of their needs.

We may not be able to fit all of their wants. We won't be able to provide federally subsidized loans for the wealthy like has happened in the past, and that's why we have after quite a struggle made the decision that we did to continue to support the aid for the disadvantaged and the handicapped on the elementary and secondary level.

And we've recognized the need for a leadership role on the federal level. We've recognized a need to maintain our emphasis on research. And recently as the President, in his State of the Union address, talked about the federalism and the devolution back to the states of certain responsibilities, it is significant that the major core of the federal education programs, after examining them considerably
for a year, are going to be kept and will be part of our new structure that we'll have in the federal house of education that we're proposing.

CONGRESSMAN SIMON: With all due respects to my good friend Ted Bell, I think we are taking a substantial step backward in providing opportunity. Under the proposals that are now before us, 1.9 million college students will lose their aid plus about 700,000 who are going to lose Social Security, plus about 600,000 graduate students.

That is decimating the future of this country to a great extent, and I just, I believe that Congress is not going to accept that recommendation and I hope for the sake of the country we do not.

MR. DALY: Dr. Silber?

DR. SILBER: I think there's another implication, and that is it's going to introduce federal ministries or state ministries of education on quite the German pattern. We won't have a federal ministry of education but we will have a ministry of education in each of the states, because, as we have reduced the amount of financial aid to each student, the only institution in which the middle class youngster, the child of the typical professional class, about 75 percent of our young
people can attend will be a state school.

We will end up destroying independent higher education and we will end up with a state monopoly on education unless we introduce some form of financial aid to higher education that can be taken both to the independent sector and to the state sector.

That is why I've advocated this tuition advance fund which is an advance from the Federal Government of the, say, $5- or $6,000 each year to help finance tuition but it seems to me that that proposal is consistent with, again, the supply side economics, because the student who receives that benefit is required to repay it as a 2 percent, 3 percent or 4 percent deduction on his income tax through his working life until he's paid it off.

Now, I don't know why the Federal Government no matter how concerned about, about free enterprise we are would be objecting to providing equal opportunity when the person who receives the benefit has to pay for it.

I think this is simply a way of, of saving talent, of saving energy, of saving opportunity. It says the Federal Government will invest $20,000 in a young person's education with a clear understanding that over the 25 years of a working
lifetime, that student will pay it back.

Now, that's far better, it seems to me, than simply saying, "We're going to abandon that," because if you abandon it you're going to see the destruction, the bankruptcy of one after another of an invaluable resource in this country in the form of the bankruptcy of our independent colleges and universities.

MR. DALY: Secretary Bell? Let Secretary Bell go first.

Mr. Shanker, I'll get you in a minute.

DR. BELL: We're not abandoning our support of our students. We estimate that there'll be 700,000 more students receiving students loans next year than this year. Now, admitted, Paul, because of the cutback in the basic opportunity grant which is the grant which is the handout not the loan--

CONGRESSMAN SIMON: Which is the handout to the poorest families in this country.

DR. BELL: That's correct, but we're still--we're cutting the size of the basic opportunity grant from $1800 down to $1600. Now, that's $200 cut. But we're maintaining the loan program.

We are asking graduate students to go on the alternate loan program and pay a higher interest rate, but let me emphasize that they'll be 700,000 more students next year in
the loan program than there is year year.

Now, we would concede that there will be a cutback in the number of students in the middle income area that can qualify for the basic opportunity grant, but the loans will be available to them.

And our proposals are just out, and there's been, there's been a lot of misunderstanding on, on the impact of this. I'm not trying to say that we have as strong a program as we've had in the past, but there isn't the wholesale abandonment of that program that I'm hearing my two fine panelists describe over here to your left. It's just not so.

MR. DALY: Mr. Shanker?

MR. SHANKER: Well, it certainly is a big step backward. Look, the greatest thing that we ever did as a country in terms of higher education was with the GI Bill of Rights, and that was—it was free.

DR. SILBER: No, it wasn't free. You had to put in some service.

MR. SHANKER: Well, you had to work. That's right, but as far as the economics of it was concerned, it paid off for the country, not just for the individuals. Where would we have been in the '50s and the '60s and the '70s? This nation today
is largely built on that investment that was made by the
people of this country.

And now we're taking steps backward, and I think it's
a disaster.

Now, these aren't the only cuts. In elementary and
secondary education, when you cut money to those schools,
those schools have to become more efficient. Now, how do
you become more efficient?

Well, it's very simple. You have to have 30 children
in a class, 32, 34, depending on the city you're in, ranging
from 30 to 40, 42 children in a class. You get rid of those
classes that are not full because they're not economically
sound.

Well, what classes are those? Well, I'll tell you.
French, German, Spanish, physics, chemistry, calculus. You
may have a high school that has 15 students that will take
a math class. You may have 16 that are taking a language
class.

You cut back--and this is a tremendous cutback. In
Title I if you take inflation into account, it's practically
a 50 percent reduction, and to cut that kind of money at a
time when we're trying to talk and encourage standards, to
force each school board to squeeze everything that it can out of its own budget, what it squeezes are the quality courses, because those are the ones that fewer students take. Very counter productive, very opposite to the quality direction.

DR. BELL: As we increase productivity, as we increase the tax base on the local level, as we reduce inflation, we're going to increase the purchasing power of the money where it's largely put up, and that's on the state and local level, and that's part of our recovery program.

CONGRESSMAN SIMON: If I may just point out, in '79 and '80, the basic opportunity grant was $1800. We are now, while tuition and costs have moved up, our assistance has moved down.

And it sounds great to say the alternative loan program is available to students. How many states now have and use this alternative loan program? Banks in how many states? Three states.

DR. BELL: But it's available to them. Why don't they get on the ball and get in it?

CONGRESSMAN SIMON: Because it is so structured that the banks just aren't going to do it, and second, these graduate students who can shift over there on these alternative loan programs,
when do you start paying that back? You start paying that back 60 days after you take out the loan.

Now, how many graduate students are going to be able to start doing that?

MR. DALY: Gentleman, I would suggest to you that we have wandered off into a thicket on the budget and the dismantling of the Department of Education without coming to grips with the issue of what is the proper place of government.

DR. SILBER: But I think that is right where we are talking, because we're asking the question of whether the Federal Government has an important and legitimate role in the provision of the financial resources that will enable its citizens to acquire the advantages of higher education.

Now, I think if the government decides to put an end to the, to the grants, to the grant program, I have no objection to that because I think that the people who receive the benefit can be expected to pay it back, but if we're going to terminate or reduce the grant program, then we must substitute for it something that our citizens can genuinely use, and they cannot use a loan program at a 11 or 12 percent interest that has to be paid back prior to graduation, because it will simply compound the interest and the interest will compound
the principal to the point that they could never pay it back.

I think that the GI Bill is the model. The GI Bill was not a grant to veterans. They put their lives on the line for their country, and in return for service, they were given an educational opportunity.

Now, we're talking about a group of civilians who've never done anything for their country, and what we're saying to them is, what I would suggest, is that we have something like a civilian GI Bill in which we provide the grant, we invest our savings in these young people and we tell them, "But now having received that benefit in advance, once you graduate, you're obligated to pay it back."

In the long run, in a period, as a matter of fact, of about 17 years, we would establish a national endowment for higher education that would be self-sustaining without any further appropriation from Congress, and the total cost of such a program would be no more than about $10 billion. In the context of a $700 billion budget I don't believe that is wasting money.

And I think that again I would expect a consistency from, from the supply side economists. This is supply side economics. You're investing in a human being, and you get a
payoff at the end.

This is not just a giveaway. It is an advance that
is an advance that is paid off in many times over. If you
want them to pay it off twice, I would have no objection to
that, pay it off three times.

The return that these highly productive people will
bring to the nation will certainly enable them to do that.

I wonder if the Federal Government recognizes that
our success right now with satellites depends upon university
professors. It was Professor McDonald at Boston University,
a physicist, who developed the high resolution optics that
enabled us to send, first of all, balloons over the Soviet
Union, then U2 over the Soviet Union and now our satellites
over the Soviet Union, photographing everything that's going
on from 50,000 feet in the air and 100,000 feet in the air.

Most of our missions in outer space have been, have
been making use of these high resolution cameras. That was
an invention by an ordinary professor.

And if we don't--I don't think we're abandoning our
research. I agree with Secretary Bell on that. We've simply
transferred it from HHW to--HHS to the Department of Defense,
but the research budget is still there, and we can do a lot
of excellent research work with it in higher education.

But where are we going to attract the graduate students, where are we going to attract the undergraduates who become graduates students if there is no way of financing their education.

They can make it on their own in the heavily subsidized state universities and colleges, but if you destroy 25 percent of higher education in the independent sector, there won't be enough places left in the state sector for it.

DR. BELL: Well, in all of our formulas with the basic opportunity grant and needs analysis for the student loan program, we've had the private institutions in mind. That's why we put no limit on tuition that can be involved in this. And there just isn't the wholesale abandonment of this.

Now, graduate students are going to have to pay a higher rate if interest, and admitted that that's going to be a bit of a burden, but they're not in school as long as the others. Many of them are working part-time while they are in school.

And they're going to be back out there employed in a very lucrative market quite soon, and so in the choices that we've had to have, we maintained the commitment to the
undergraduate students. That loan will be available. The interest rate won't be any higher than it was this year in our proposals. MR. SHANKER: We're going into a period now when the youth cohort is substantially smaller than the previous cohort. We're about to get into a period of talent and labor shortage in a very short period of time. And at a time when you really need as many of the people in this group from 16 to 24 or 25 years of age, first of all, we're going to fail to educate them in elementary and secondary in terms of the cutbacks there, and then we're going to create various disincentives compared to what existed before in terms of higher education. And getting back to John Silber's statement that the GI Bill had something to do with service to country, I think that maybe that ought to be part of the package, too. We ought to be thinking of higher education and the need for a program of national service and have them related. I think that's part of an education package, and it's part of a defense package for the country. MR. DALY: I think we have painted a very broad canvas. This is such a multi-facited question that we can get more in, but
I do think we can continue the discussion with the question and answer session from our audience of experts. So let me declare it's time for the question and answer session and may I have the first question, please? May I have the first question please? Yes, sir?

MR. BARTON: Paul Barton, National Institute for Work and Learning. We've had a considerable consensus about the need for standards and higher quality in terms of having gone soft on education which is somewhat surprising in terms of the degree to which one ordinarily has consensus.

I would like to ask the panel if there is also consensus on who should set those standards, who decides at the elementary and secondary level what students should know, federal, national, state level, legislature, school boards, community, parents, and it seems to me that that is part of the same kind of a question.

MR. DALY: Would you start, Dr. Bell?

DR. BELL: Well, I don't think the Federal Government ought to set those standards. I think they ought to be done within the frame work of state law and under the traditions of local control of education. So I think they ought to be done on that level. I
think the academic community ought to be broadly involved
and I think the school boards that I've been offering some
friendly criticism to ought to be taking hold of it and
setting them in response to the needs of the community and
the desires of the community in close cooperation with the
academic professionals that work with them.

MR. DALY: Mr. Congressman?

CONGRESSMAN SIMON: I agree with the Secretary completely.

MR. DALY: Dr. Silber?

DR. SILBER: I agree with what he said so far, but I think
there is a role for the Federal Government, and that is in
assisting the states to develop a standard national examine
against which local variations can be measured, because other-
wise we will lose the mobility of our people.

If a family are rearing their children in New York,
let's say, and then they are transferred to Idaho, they want
some assurance that the schools in Idaho are going to be
meeting reasonable standards.

Now, some national test that would not be compulsory,
but the development of a national test, something along the
pattern of the A levels and the O levels in the English
system, it seems to me, would be a very useful governmental
MR. DALY: Mr. Shanker?

MR. SHANKER: Well, I agree that standards have to be set at the state and local level, but that doesn't mean that we should not have very strong national incentives in areas of national concern.

And we had a national Defense Education Act when Sputnik went up. We don't have a Sputnik right now, but we may have problems that are even more serious. And while specific standards and state and local, I think that a very strong hand of the Federal Government where there's national interest at stake, and national interest is at stake when you've got the basic national economy, when you've got national defense and when you have issues of civil rights at stake, I think those are three areas.

MR. DALY: Next question, please? Yes, sir?

MR. ESKEY: My name is Ken Eskey. I am from Scripps-Howard Newspapers. I would like to direct this question to Mr. Shanker and Dr. Bell. We have a situation now in which many younger teachers are being laid off and many older teachers are being retained.

Now, some of these older teachers are burned out.
They're not as good teachers as the younger ones. Is there any way you can retain your better teachers regardless of age?

MR. SHANKER: Not without paying another price for it.

There's been a pretty good study—a number of studies done of this. You know, part of working in a school is a cooperative effort. If you've got a teacher who is stronger and you've got other teachers who are weaker, you'd like that stronger teacher to help out and give advice, be cooperative.

Once the teachers in a school know that when the point comes where layoffs are decided, the stronger teacher is going to stay and the weaker teacher is going to go, it would be the intelligent thing for every strong teacher not to help anyone else and not to have anyone look better.

You then set up a competitive situation instead of a cooperative situation. And I also wouldn't assume that teachers who have been there for a long time are necessarily burned out whereas younger people aren't. That's very uneven.

Some of the people are there for a long time because they don't get burned out, because they're very involved and very committed and very good, and there are people who are burned out after a very short period of time.

I just don't think that you can raise—there isn't a
simple answer to that question of can you let people go on
the basis of merit rather than on the basis of seniority
without just stating the point that I made that there's a
price to pay if you do it that way, and that is you get rid
of cooperation.

DR. BELL: I would say that the Federal Government doesn't do
many things very well, but one of the things that we do have
now, as a provision now when we have to lay people off that
individuals who have an outstanding rating give some preferen-
tial treatment for that.

Maybe something like that could be worked in here
somewhere. It is a tragedy that we're laying teachers off
at all right now with all the demands that we have and the
need for learning.

That might be--

MR. DALY: Dr. Silber?

DR. BELL: --that could be looked at.

MR. DALY: I'm sorry.

DR. SILBER: I think that the question is a very good one.

This question of whether, whether seniority is going to take
priority over competence can be answered in ways that don't
necessarily involve the destruction of cooperativeness, and
that is by not worrying exclusively about the testing of
students and begin to test the professors.

It seems to me that at least once very five or ten
years any teacher in high school whose teaching science ought
to take the freshman level test, examinations in the subject
he's teaching, and if the teacher can't make an A in freshman
chemistry that teacher is not qualified to teach chemistry
in high school.

If they can't make an A in algebra or geometry or
trigonometry, they shouldn't be allowed to teach those subjects.

I think the easiest way to make sure we don't have
this conflict between seniority and competence is to have a
periodic testing of teachers.

MR. DALY: Yes.

MR. SHANKER: Let's start with a beginning testing. We don't
even have that in most places.

CONGRESSMAN SIMON: If I can just add, the problem is a real
one. If, however, you simply give the complete and unbridled
authority to, to an administrator or a school board, what
you will find is that the younger teachers and the older
teachers all leave because they have acquired enough seniority
that it costs a little more to keep the older teachers.
Another point I would make is that there is really not a surplus of teachers, but we have failed to see the opportunities in this nation. For example, we have 10 to 20 million functionally illiterate adult Americans, and we largely pretend they do not exist. They are—they retard the productivity of this nation. They are a great liability who could be turned into an asset. And one of the ways we could do it would be to take teachers who can't find jobs elsewhere and teach people how to read and write.

MR. DALY: All right. Next question, please? Yes, sir?

MR. SANTIAGO: I am Ramon Santiago from the National Association for Bilingual Education, and Dr. Silber mentioned that equal opportunity for an education is crucial. He further said that investment in education is a savings plan essentially.

There are a lot of resources, both cultural and linguist existing in the United States today. I would like to ask the panel to indicate how they feel that this resource could be saved in a way that it could be an asset at the defense level, the military level, the industrial and commercial level in the United States.
MR. DALY: Will you start, Mr. Congressman?

CONGRESSMAN SIMON: Yes, the gentleman is absolutely correct.

What we too often view as a liability is, in fact, a tremendous resource. We can have young people who grow up, whose mother tongue is English. We can, in a structured way, encourage them by, in a class situation to pick up Spanish, and we should encourage the Hispanic or Vietnamese or Chinese or whatever the ethnic background of the individual to, of course, acquire English but also to retain the culture that that child has.

And we need, as a nation, to be doing much more.

Al Shanker mentioned national standards. We simply cannot tolerate our deficiencies in other languages which we now tolerate.

Eighty percent of the American businesses that ought to be exporting are not exporting, and in part that is because we have not learned the fundamental lesson you can buy in any language; you can't sell in any language.

MR. DALY: Mr. Shanker?

MR. SHANKER: Well, I think there's no question that if you have, as we do, many people who have another language or perhaps don't have English but have another language that it's
important for both them and for the country to preserve that and to keep it. They've got something which is so difficult for the rest of us to get.

But I think it would be a mistake to ignore the fact that the United States of America went off on a terrible tangent in trying to impose a single method of teaching youngsters who have a different language, that is, a single method to say that the only way to teach the non-English speaking child is that the Federal Government mandates that that child must be taught in that child's own language.

There's no evidence that that's the only way or the best way. It may be, when the truth is found, it is. But there is certainly no reason why, with an absence of any research findings that that is the single and only method, that that ought to be mandated. And--it's a method.

And I would hope that, in the absence of a good deal of knowledge in this, that there would be considerable room for experimentation, provided that there is an obligation to do something special for the youngster who does not speak English.

I think that obligation has to be there, but the--they're ways of reaching that, and I think the other thing is
that we were also during a point in our recent history when we went so far to the giddy side of things that we started saying that America should become a multilingual society, and it's not so important if people learn to speak English here. I think that's a disaster. I'm glad that we moved away from it.

There are societies which, through history, are bilingual. Most of them have many problems associated with it. I know of no nation that has inflicted that on itself in the way that we almost did as short period of time ago. We ought to keep the culture. We ought to keep the language. We ought to insist that people function within our society, and the best way to function is to learn the language of the land, and we ought to recognize that we don't have a single answer.

I think that's— that would be my approach on this issue.

MR. DALY: Next question, please?
MR. ROBB: Yes. My name is Graham Robb, and I'm with the National Coalition of Independent College and University Students, and I would like to ask the panel how, since all of you have spoken of attaining equal educational opportunity for
all, how can we possibly obtain that at a time of rising tuition costs when the Federal Government plans massive cuts in the programs which are aimed at all students including those that are very needy?

DR. BELL: Well, in spite of the reductions, I don't call them massive cuts. I say that we are trimming back abit because of the pressure on our budget. But in spite of those reductions, there is still an enormous amount of aid available to a student, one that wants to attend an independent institution.

Let me tick off a few for you. First of all, you can get a guaranteed student loan for up to $2500. We'll pay the interest on it all the time you're in school and for a year after you're out, and then you start paying it back and making your payments, but even then we subsidize the interest after that for another two years under our proposal.

In addition to that, there's the auxiliary loan where you can borrow another $3000. So that brings you $5500. There's a college work-study program, and in spite of all of all of our cuts, we're holding that up there pretty good.

It's trimmed a little bit. The other campus-based programs will be out of the way. So you can pick up another $600 there
or more.

And then if you're very limited income student, on top of that you can get a $1600 basic opportunity grant, if you're adding all this up now as we talk about it.

If you are with an institution that has some National Direct Student Loan capital available—we're not putting any more capital into that this year under our budget, but you can get up to $1500 in the National Direct Student Loan.

At one time I added all of this up and it came to $9200, and so I'd say—now, that's for the student who's very limited in income. So I'd say there's still a substantial amount, and that's the federal aid.

That doesn't talk about scholarships and state assistance and so on. So in spite of the cutting back that we're doing, and I'll admit that we're cutting back and the cutbacks are painful and they're going to be significant, but in spite of that, we haven't emasculated the aid program, and there's still going to be a considerable amount of assistance available to you next fall if our proposals are there.

The thing I'm trying to do is dispell the opinion that keeps coming out in this panel that we've destroyed the student
aid program. It just isn't so. It isn't as strong and as posh a program as it was, but there's still a lot of assistance there.

MR. SHANKER: Well, those of us who believe in the forces of the free market and in economics believe that if you offer financial incentives, you're going to attract people into a field, and if you offer disincentives, there are going to be fewer people. I mean, there's just no question about that, and I think that's the basis of the President's program in a whole bunch of fields.

I don't know why he should believe that you'll encourage businesses to do certain things and you will encourage savers and spenders and that everything can be done but the only thing that isn't going to be affected is if you take money away from students and colleges it isn't going to have an effect.

It is. It's going to have the same effect as taking money away and the disincentives do in other fields. There will be a large number of students who are now going to college who won't go. Otherwise, economics doesn't work.

MR. DALY: Mr. Congressman?

CONGRESSMAN SIMON: Yes. The Secretary's aply described the
program as not as strong as it was before after this passes.

It is—there is still a program, but you're talking about

very massive overhaul that is, that means basically a one-

third or little better reduction.

The guaranteed student loan program was mentioned by

the Secretary. In that $9200 computation, incidentally, if you

look at that computation, you have to be an awfully fortunate

student to be able to qualify for everyone of those things.

But he neglected to take off that $250 that you're

going to chop right at the start. Auxiliary loan, it's there

in theory. Three states out of 50 states out of 50 states

have it.

College work-study is down. Direct student loan

program is down. The graduate student program is there, this

auxiliary loan, and as the Secretary said, you get these

lucrative jobs after you graduate, lucrative jobs, for example,

if you get a Ph.D. in English literature and you get to be

associate professor of English literature, maybe you're lucky

if you get $15,000 a year at that kind of a job.

And all the Social Security programs. We have said

to the sons and daughters of the widows of the United States,

"Sorry, we're taking you off the student program." That
really is—when you put it all together, it doesn't exactly encourage higher education in the United States.

DR. SILBER: It seems to me—I want to be as understanding of the Secretary's position as possible. I believe the Administration is right to say that a balanced budget, that a strong national defense and that control of inflation and employment, and enhancing employment are the most important priorities we face.

And I don't mind putting the parochial interests of higher education in fourth position behind all of those.

On the other hand, it seems to me that, that we're talking about a very small part of the $700 billion national budget.

And I believe a proposal to stop the automatic indexing of salary increases and benefit increases in, in the section of the national budget would save maybe 50 or $60 billion over the next three or four years and, and enable us to overcome this, this radical cutback for higher education.

Again, I don't mind seeing the termination of the grant program if a reasonable loan program that doesn't have that very high interest rate that's payable immediately is put in its place.

But simply to cancel grants and to impose loan
programs that people will not be able to afford to use is not going to answer the problem. It is going to lead to a state monopoly in higher education. We're going to see the consequences of that played out, and I believe it will be contrary to the philosophy and to the objectives that the Administration itself holds.

Dr. Bell: But you see we're not cutting the grants out. We're reducing them by $200, from 1800 to $1600. That's what the adjustment is.

Dr. Silber: I understand that.

Dr. Bell: And on the loans, we're—for undergraduate students, they get the loans. We'll pay the interest all the time they're in school. They'll still be able to get the loans they had before.

Now, there's been a 5 percent loan fee and we're proposing to raise that at 10 percent. Let me tell you that we're not through yet. This is our proposal. Congressman Simon is a very persuasive advocate of the student aid up there.

And we have to lean against the wind a little bit here if we're going to have anything like a balanced budget. I want to emphasize that as we come here with our budget for
openers right now.

MR. DALY: I think we have time for one more question.

Yes, sir.

MR. HAWKINS: Bob Hawkins from Sacramento, California, from the Sequoia Institute. I have a question primarily for Mr. Shanker.

It seems to me two issues have been raised here this evening. One relates to the question of quality and standards, and the other relates to organization, how we organize educational activities.

And it seems to me that the panel and the consensus of most experts is that we have a system of perverse incentives.

Now, one remedy of that has been the voucher system or to create competition to public schools.

Mr. Shanker has argued eloquently against that position, and I'd like to have some of his ideas on, on what kinds of remedies, organizational remedies he sees for overcoming some of these perverse incentives.

MR. DALY: Mr. Shanker?

MR. SHANKER: Well, I don't know that I see perverse incentives. I think that what we've experienced is, as I've indicated before, we've very rapidly come into--it's the post World War
Two period where so many of our people went from, you know, being immigrants or farmers or workers with a small amount of education to a point where they can be critics of education.

I think that one of the other things that happened is we went from a period where you had standards very rigid and sometimes unreasonable. I don't know that I would want to go back to a system where, if you didn't have Latin, you couldn't go to college or a lot of the other standards that we had.

Well, what happened, of course, is that we went from a set of standards that were over rigid and that probably should have been modified a little bit to the student rebellions of the late '60s and the one where we abandoned standards largely and where we also changed the curriculum, testing et cetera.

These aren't perverse incentives. This is just a cultural tide that went from a set of rigid and perhaps somewhat outdated standards to one of a destruction of standards. And I think that we're moving back in a very healthy direction right now.

I think it would be a terrible shame if at a point when there's agreement not only here but I think that there's
national agreement. I think that if you look at the Gallup polls in education year after year, I think if we stiffen the backs of some of these school boards, as Ted Bell has said to go out and represent the majority of the people who elect them, who want to see these changes, I think that we can get these changes very rapidly.

Now, what we've got is this side issue right now. Well, if you don't like the public schools, let's give people a way of getting out. I think if you do that, you'll never change the public schools.

If that happens, we will go over completely really to a system of private education, and the public schools will become the place for those students who are not accepted in any private school and those who were kicked out by private schools.

The one major incentive for change is that most people can't get out. It's a public institution. It's free. They can't afford to go elsewhere. There aren't that many private schools out there.

And I think that's wonderful because they're going to yell and scream at their school boards, at their superintendents, at the state government. And with the help of
a lot of us, they will bring the public schools back to where
they ought to be. But start giving them $500, $800, $1000, and you
say, "Mr. Jones, if you don't like the schools, you can
rescue your child and let the rest of them stay here and
suffer," if you take out the people who are most dissatisfied
in terms of the lack of standards and give them a place for
their own children so that they stop being politically active
in the process of improvement, that's the end of public
education in the country.

MR. DALY: Mr. Secretary?

All right, this concludes--

Did you want to say something?

CONGRESSMAN SIMON: I'm just going to add one comment. If
you take out the area of funding where we've had slight dis-
agreement here this evening, there is remarkable agreement
here in moving in the direction of standards and improvement
of quality of education in the United States.

And I think that the four of us coming from very
diverse backgrounds, in fact, represents public opinion to a
a great extent. And this very fact of public opinion is
there and has that feeling, I think is a good omen for
education in the future.

MR. DALY: All right. This concludes another public policy forum presented by the American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research.

On behalf of the AEI, our hearty thanks to the distinguished and expert panelists, Mr. Albert Shanker, Secretary T. H. Bell, Congressman Paul Simon, and Dr. John Silber, and our thanks also to our guests and experts in the audience for their participation.

Good bye from Washington.

End