which our way of life becomes.

The question of our time is not whether all man are brothers. That question has been answered by the God who placed us on this earth together. The question is whether we have the strength and the will to make brotherhood of man the guiding principle of our daily lives.

Thank you.

DR. GOTTLIEB: Thank you.

Until recently, I have been privileged to say and I thought with some justice that I had the most difficult educational assignment in the world because of the complexity of my own school but when I contemplated more recently the task of Al Shanker as the leader of a great professional organization, I begin to assume a much smaller role in this whole educational hierarchy and I think we are all fortunate to have as head of our union in New York City a person who by background and experience has given me always a very high expectency of statesmanship, both in society as well as in education so I am very happy to introduce Al Shanker to you.

MR. SHANKER: I hope during the course of the short time that I have to be able to present a picture

which is free of some of the slogans which I think many of us, myself included, have been carrying on banners for a period of time and I notice that from season to season the slogans change a little but we are still looking for some type of easy, fast gimmick which will provide a solution to the great problems of massive academic retardation which exists especially within our ghetto schools.

Now, many years ago in ancient India a philosopher spent some time with a student and when the student asked the philosopher how was the earth suspended in space, the philosopher answered that the earth rests on the back of an elephant and when the student inquired further where does the elephant stand, the philosopher said, that is simple, the elephant stands on the back of a huge tortoise and that was the end. That was deemed to be an explanation.

Now, there used to be a time when we talked about good children and bad children or bright and slow but we have progressed a good deal and now understand that these distinctions do not really adhere within the child but are largely that children are victims of many circumstances and that, therefore, the discussion is shallow. And we used to talk about good

parents and bad parents but now we are so sophisticated enough to know that the parents are victims of circumstances and so we see them that way.

but it seems to me that some of the remarks that have been made here that where we understand the children are victims of circumstances and the parents are, we tend to view teachers as absolutely free agents who are not victims of circumstance at all and if only they could free themselves of a few attitudes and a few prejudices and a few something else, then everything would be hunky-dory and all the children would learn.

Now, sophistication in this area seems to me demands that we all see the teacher in a social setting and not view the teacher as a free agent and not take the simple view that if a teacher only changes a few attitudes everything would be fine. That is just as simple as saying if only the parents would do something, everything would be fine or if only the children would do something everything would be great.

Now, the topic here, teacher training, how
to prepare teachers to teach in our urban schools and
I think that at the outset if I did not say what I
am about to say, then we would be missing what is
probably the major problem and that is that within a

very short period of time, if we can't make the teacher the scapegoat and that is the latest hobby, there will be no teachers to train.

Now, I understand why the teacher among others is the scapegoat. There is tremendous bitterness frustration, hostility within the ghetto, most of it quite justified and a few whites who enter the ghetto, the policeman, the social workers, the shopkeeper and the teacher are the only ones.

They are the only white people going into the ghetto and, therefore, they are the ones against whom the hostility can be directly taken against and acted out. So I would say that is one problem and yet we have teacher problems with attitudes but we also are rapidly going to have a problem whether there are going to be any teachers to train.

There is a good deal of discussion about P.S.

125 and I.S. 201 about selecting and screening teachers.

Now, the process of selection implies that there are

going to be several hundred people who want the job

and then you interview and select from the several

hundred the 50 that you need to do the job, whereas I

think a realistic picture is that it is going to be

very difficult on any basis to draft a sufficient number

of teachers to merely staff the schools next year as a result of the conflict which is taking place let alone select.

Now, understanding an attitude, I maintain is not a substitute for knowhow and I am surprised to attend conference after conference where everyone is working on how to give the teacher and supervisor and anybody else a good attitude and everything will be fine.

Ed, let me be personal for a moment. I think Eddy Gottlieb has great attitudes. I think this is true of Elliot Shapiro and a number of other principals in our system but there is absolutely no evidence that the academic achievements of their schools are any better than in any other similar school in the City and I think that if we are spending all this time on attitudes that is good.

It is good for people to have good attitudes but it is very important that people with good attitudes have knownow so that the children come out knowing how to read and write and don't end up on welfare rolls or dropouts or criminals or addicts or something else.

Good attitudes are not enough, love is not enough, and it seems to me that we are not spending

2 enou

enough time on what is it that gets a child to read and what is it that doesn't and I think that there is ample proof that it is not merely a matter of attitudes.

I think that in order to discuss the problem of teacher training, we have to get a picture of just what it is that confronts the teacher. Most teachers graduating out of college today and universities get course after course after course telling them what their attitudes should be.

Most of those courses, I might say, were unnecessary because I think most of the people that go into teaching probably had those attitudes before they took the courses anyway and I think that in most cases the attitudes are not vicious and they are not hostile and they are not prejudiced and so forth.

viewed, the gal or the fellow who is about to graduate Teachers College or City College or Brooklyn College or any of these places, they are asked what they will do when they come into a school and they will literally pour forth with wonderful things that they are going to do and how they are going to lick all the problems at that interview, and the same teacher after four weeks in the classroom, see whether that teacher was

able to do most of the things that she said she was going to do and which she really wanted to do.

The chances are that she walks into the classroom the first day after having gone through two or three days of conferences with a principal and as the children poured into the room she tried to have them sit down to get some sort of semblance of order and might very well have taken up three or four hours to do so.

Here, she had gone to college for five years and inside of two hours a bunch of little kids made a monkey out of her and after two or three hours the principal who told her at the conference on Friday that this door is always open and to call upon him for help, he sticks his head in the door and called her over and said that is very bad, Mrs. Smith. You really have to get control of the class. I am afraid you are not properly motivating your students. Will you please drop in and show me your lesson plan book.

She tries and she plans and she goes into
the library and maybe she calls back her old professor
who may never have been in a school or taught in one
and she gets all this advice and very soon she drops
as a substitute for all of the teaching technique which

she has learned and develops other series of techniques of survival.

she finds through experience that recreational activities, taking the kids to the park or singing a few songs or doing something else tends to keep the kids in greater order than trying to give them a reading lesson for that period and since it is impossible to have 30 kids running all over the place, you do the things that make it easier to manage the classroom, and she finds that putting a lot of things on a black-board or asking the children to keep quiet also tends to keep order better than keeping the class and better than working as she had been taught in college.

I can go through a series of these different mechanisms of survival techniques which are substitutes for teaching techniques and because very few adults can admit to themselves that they have gone to school for four or five years and they are not succeeding, the teacher develops a view of the student, well, it is not my fault. I went to school for six years and I walked into this school and I did everything they told me to do and it didn't work so it isn't my fault.

It is the child's fault, it is the home, it is the economy, the society. It is all sorts of other

3

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

things but it isn't the school and it isn't me.

Now, what can we do about this? Well, in the first place, I think that we have to say that practically all of the valuable training of teachers for jobs, teaching positions within our urban schools are going to be the job training. I am not saying that the teachers shouldn't go to college for four or five years.

I think teachers ought to be educated people but they are not going to learn to be teachers. are going to be educated in schools but they are not going to learn to be teachers.

Secondly, I think that we ought to have learned after all of these years that a principal who walks in and out with a few observations and who stands in a kind of a boss relationship with a teacher because he is going to evaluate and going to rate her, that figure generally is too threatening to the teacher to be equal besides which the long absence of the principal from the classroom for many years generally leads the teacher to suspect maybe he never taught or maybe he doesn't remember how.

The important thing to build up within the school is the relationship among colleagues, that there

6

7

8

15

13

14

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

must be a way found to bring this new teacher who comes into the school into frequent constant contact with the more experienced teacher, with the teacher who has developed somehow ways of teaching rather than ways of surviving.

I think that we have not paid enough attention to some very, very little things. Take this picture that I presented of the teacher who walked in to take three hours in a really shattering experience to get the class seated and a typical experience. That is an experience that I would say almost a majority of our teachers, new teachers within our City schools had and yet we sit around talking about good attitudes and no one sits down and says wouldn't it help if that teacher knew the names of all the children the first day they came in, wouldn't it be a good thing if perhaps the week before school the children came in four or five at a time and the teachers met them in a different kind of situation so that the first day the children walked in it wouldn't be 30 children running out with a teacher frightened, she doesn't know a single name and she would be able to say John, you sit here and Sally, you sit there.

But we sit and talk about attitudes and

instead of talking about technique which will improve the relationship between the teacher and children.

I think also a good deal of the problem or I should say most of the problem comes from our failure in the realm of achievement. If that problem could be met most of the others that we are talking about would fall into place. I say that because if we are to ask teachers in any urban center what the number one problem is, I think that the overwhelming answer that would come back is the problem of discipline.

That is the answer that would come back.

The children won't listen, they yell, they scream,

they run around and they fight, they lose things and
so forth.

Now, there is a reason and the reason largely is the failure on the part of the children to achieve. Take children in our junior high schools, seventh, eighth and ninth graders who have been to school from kindergarten through the sixth grade and have not learned how to read or how to write, a great many of them, and then they are sent to another school to sit in another classroom in front of another blackboard with another teacher.

Now, those children know that another three

GC-130 of the tr

or four or five years of what they have already had for seven years isn't going to help them and what we are doing is we are going through a series of rituals year after year after year, we are putting children through a program through schools, through textbooks, through curriculum and series of things that did not work last year and the year before that and the year before that and we are going to do it again next year.

By the way, we have been giving courses on changing attitudes from at least the 1920's.

Now, the attitudes are made by this world of frustration and failure. The way to change the teacher's attitude is to come up with an atmosphere and series of techniques which will enable the teacher to teach and be successful.

It is that which will give the teacher a positive healthy attitude and you can have all the courses in the world saying be positive and be happy but if teachers can't teach and is frustrated constantly it is that situation that will create the attitude.

Let me finish on the following: talking about the training of teachers. I believe it is simple. It has to be largely on the job. It is largely on the basis with a relationship with colleagues.

I believe there

is no advanced division whereby you can tell who is a good teacher or what is a bad teacher. I don't believe an examination does it whether it is given by the Board of Examiners or the national teachers examination or anything else.

Finally, let me say this:

I do not believe you can determine it in an interview. I believe that you have to put the teacher on the job, give a teacher all the help that you can possibly give and then if you want a good school system, you must after an adequate training for the teacher have the courage to remove those people who are incapable after all the help that they have received, who are incapable of properly performing the job.

Now, there are two reasons why such people are not removed. One is that administrators and supervisors generally lack the courage to do so. It makes them unpopular and they want to be good fellows and so in the City of New York with 54,000 teachers I think something like 17 a year are found to be non-suitable which shows that we have a remarkably fine examination procedure.

I think secondly the reason that people are

not discharged is that principals are reluctant to let anybody go because they know that in exchange for somebody that they now have they will get nobody. There are now over 400 classrooms in the City of New York without a teacher, not a good teacher or a bad teacher or a substitute or regular but without a teacher.

And so we come to this whole question of supply and I would like to hear talk about these training programs that we were talking about, internships and training and the attitude and all sorts of things. I say that all this training is a waste.

If we know as we do know that the average life expectancy of a teacher is three years, she graduates from college and maybe she gets her Masters Degree and then we give her all this training and three years from the time she starts she is going to be married or pregnant or something else which happens and out she will be. None of these programs make any sense.

It doesn't make any sense from a social point of view. From an educational point of view, it means that as soon as a teacher has learned at the expense of the children, she leaves to be replaced by

another teacher who is going to learn at the expense of the children.

So I would advocate that we develop a new strategy in the recruiting of teachers and that is that we not primarily seek new college graduates who are coming out and whose life expectancy in the system we know.

I advocate that we try to go into other fields such as publishing, such as various social working areas, such as industry and other areas and try to bring in people who are 30 and over on the basis of attractive competitive salaries and conditions and benefits.

When you bring in somebody who has been out of college for ten years and who has gone from one job to another and another, at age 30 now wants a career and wants to make a decision and if you spend two or three years to train that person, you have someone who is going to stay for 30 years whereas when you train somebody who is fresh out of college at 21 or so, you have somebody for the period of training and that is all.

Now, I would like to conclude by coming to some of the remarks which Ed Gottlieb made at the

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

beginning and which I referred to at the beginning of my statement.

I think that this whole business of black power in the schools is not a radical philosophy at all. I think it is reactionary. I think there have been black schools throughout the country for more than a century and I still believe in integration and I believe that if we are starting to talk now about having black boards and black principals not because we should have a system which in the normal course does see to it that we have integrated staff but because we are going to select a particular place so that that is it and I say that is building in a system of apertheid and of balkanization which is precisely the opposite of what we have fought against when it happened in the south and just as reactionary when we talk about it here.

It is just as wrong to talk about parents making up a curriculum in Harlem as it is to say that the parents of Levittown have a right to decide whether the children will learn about United Nations or not or whether the John Birch Society somewhere will do that.

I believe not in professional control in a

24

25

narrow sense but I believe in a professional integrity which will mean that a teacher will have the academic freedom to teach a subject according to that subject and according to the truth and not according to the whimsy of a particular community at a particular time and this whole sloganizing that is going on right now --I understand it.

It is a reaction to the failure to be able to integrate but that doesn't mean that we should give up what is a proper goal which is integration and say yes.

No, we are going to accept segregation not only in the south, we are going to build it in the north and we are going to build a stucture here that will make sure that Rosemary Gunning will have her school districts in Queens and that will be white and another school district in Harlem will remain always black and not this is our kettle because a few frustrated leaders have come up with a particular slogan as a result of their failure to make progress.

I think it is dead wrong. I think it leads nowhere. I impathize with it. I think it is bad for education and I think it is bad for the children.

I will say one thing, I do believe that the

COMMERCE REPORTING CO. 150 NASSAU STREET, NEW YORK, N. Y. 10038 . WOrth 4-3567

23

24

25

community must be brought into the schools not because I think it is good for education and not because I think it is superior and not because I think there are not a lot of problems involved but out of necessity there are now white teachers walking from the subway to the schools in the ghetto being told by people the community as they pass by to get the hell out, they are not wanted and there are children coming to school being told that their teachers are coming in to destroy them and it is hard enough to teach children normally. It is impossible in that kind of a setting.

Now, in order to change this setting, I believe that the community must be brought into the school so they can see first-hand the problems that exist, so that they can share with the teachers this problem of discipline, so that they can, members of the community, go to other parents within the community and talk about the problems that the school faces.

I believe that the schools must bring the community in not because this is a most desirable thing. Generally when a community walks into the schools again, whether in Levittown or in Harlem, it interferes with education but education cannot be carried on as a kind of alien colony surrounded by

б

hostile people and the only way to eliminate this hostility is to bring people in so that we can share in the responsibility for success and so I will end on the note of approving participation not as a good but as a necessity.

DR. GOTTLIEB: Thank you, very much.

I would like to introduce the next speaker and I should like to preface my remarks with a statement to Al not to be joined but you know, that when we worked on the more effective school programs, some of us envisioned an involvement of schools not now with the community but with the colleges and I was glad to read in the recent issue of the Principal of a project of school involvement with the college which I think sets a new high in that regard.

I think, Thelma, you were associated with that project and I hope you have time to give us some insight into it but let us begin to move along in the direction in which those of us who work on the more effective school plan really meant for the college to actually come into the school on a partnership basis, so I give you Thelma Adair.

MRS. ADAIR: I feel a bit trapped being the last speaker. I think if I had not been delayed