

TRANSCRIPT OF THE OCTOBER 22nd MEETING
OF THE DAY CARE ALLIANCE,
NATIONAL COUNCIL OF ORGANIZATIONS FOR CHILDREN AND YOUTH

JUDITH HELMS, Executive Director of the National Council of Organizations for Children and Youth, introducing Albert Shanker and Carl Megel: Albert Shanker, who is the newly elected President of the American Federation of Teachers made it an order, while he and Carl Megel are here, for us to say that we appreciate the privilege of meeting in this room. We hold many meetings here and they have always been very gracious to let us come and use their facilities and, of course, Mr. Megel has been a great help to the board of NCOCY.

Mr. Shanker, I'm going to say to you that you know who most of these people are, I hope. You know about the group. We would like you to (inaudible) if you would like. If I make a mistake, let me know. (Inaudible) entertaining questions, or whatever suits you best.

ALBERT SHANKER: The best way, I think, is to entertain questions. What I've done, in terms of writing or what I've been saying in recent weeks is well known and instead of responding to what I think you want to know, why don't you just raise questions and I can use the time that I would have used in an initial

statement to make a lot of short speeches instead of one long one. Who is first?

WILLIAM PIERCE, Child Welfare League of America: We just had a somewhat heated discussion about standards for children's services. Would early childhood education services as you put them forth under the responsibility of the public schools meet all of the standards, especially child staff standards, which are in current legislation?

ALBERT SHANKER: Well, the answer is a very simple yes. If you don't legislate these standards, and make them very hard, then you don't fulfill the purposes. A great part of the problem that you have, especially in the earlier grades, is that we have a factory model with the public schools, and once you take one adult with 25 or 27 or 30 or 32 or 35 children, and you pack them into a room, you almost automatically dictate the kind of situation you're going to have. It means that you've got to have a situation where the question of control becomes the major problem.

How does one adult make sure that there isn't pandemonium? Well, it means that the kids have to sit still, it means that they have to be quiet, and it means that the child who can't sit still or won't, or won't be quiet, is defined as sick or disruptive, and represents a challenge to the adult who is going to be evaluated or rated on the quantity of

of silence and noise. Almost everything else flows from that kind of situation.

Now, not only that, but if you think about it in human terms, any of us who would take a child that age and sit the child down, let's say, at home during a vacation or on a Saturday or Sunday and have the child sit still and be quiet from 8:40 in the morning until, let's say 3:00 in the afternoon except for a lunch break and one trip to the water fountain and another one to the toilet, why there are organizations that would come after us--societies for the prevention of cruelty to children. It's the normal, typical pattern if you have no standards that are better than the ones that exist in most public schools at the present time.

This really defeats the whole purpose, which is, I would say, one of the major purposes of education during the early childhood years--to provide a bridge between the kind of care a child gets in the family, which is oriented toward the child as an individual: Johnny can do this because he is a certain age; Mary can do that because she has done it before. The family doesn't generally operate in terms of certain laws and rules or a set of 15 regulations or something like that. It is individual.

Part of what happens in schools now, when a child reaches the age of five or six, is rather traumatic. The child goes from a situation where the child is treated as an individual

to a place where the child is part of a highly developed, bureaucratic, rule-oriented, impersonal situation. The child who demands some sort of a connection between the home and the school, some individual concern and attention, is considered the disruptive and the deviant child--the problem child. I would very much hope that not only would such standards be legislated--more than hope, I would say--that we would oppose legislation that would not provide for such standards.

Beyond that, I would hope that we would then get the grades that are now in existence in the public schools to create a gradual transition from the point where the child is treated as an individual to a point where the child can function in a group and is largely autonomous. I don't want to be misread on this thing. I am not one of those educators who believes that all through life, we can have within our mass society a place where every person is always treated as an individual and doesn't get to operate independently or within groups, or anything like that.

One of the functions of public education is to take the child from the family and to a point where the child becomes mature, and can live in the world, so that school has to do that. Right now it is just too abrupt--from family to school and from school to the outside world. I would hope that having early childhood as part of public education, that we

would visibly be able to see that you take a child who has been accustomed to having, let's say, seven or eight or ten or twelve or fourteen, or a relatively small number of children with an adult, and then, all of a sudden, you take that child and put that child into a group of 30--that that's just wrong, it's just too abrupt, that we would then develop standards also for kindergarten and first and second and third grade which would provide a gradual movement towards independence and group work rather than this immediate kind of thing that is done now.

CLARA MARTIN, Minnesota Children's Lobby: Mr. Shanker, in child care now we have some alternatives. There are different kinds of care, depending on the needs of the kids and the parents' choices and things like that. Sometimes it's in-home care, sometimes in centers, and I'm sure you're aware of all that. How do you see alternatives as we know them in child care now, being transplanted into the educational system?

ALBERT SHANKER: Well, you haven't really listed a series of alternatives that I could deal with, but I would just say . . . and if you want to specify, I would go into some of the specifics that you have raised. I don't see any reason why the public schools can't have alternatives. They do. There are schools in this country that are organized on very different teaching styles; they're organized on different philosophies. There

are some that specialize in certain areas. I think that in England, you have publicly supported schools, where parents have a choice. They can go to one place and talk with the principal who has a rather rigid, traditional type set-up. You can have another where the headmaster is particularly interested in the development of the arts, and there's a different structure there.

I don't see that the question of alternatives necessarily implies going out of the public school system. If the alternatives are valid, we have to provide them within the public school system. If they are not valid, I think that we ought to be prepared to say what is wrong with a particular way of doing it.

CLARA MARTIN: Okay, now you are saying that there are alternatives within the public school system. How are those alternatives determined?

ALBERT SHANKER: They are determined by politics. That's another name for democracy. It means that the people, through their elected representatives, get a chance to determine it. How do you determine it, if you don't do it through politics? The people elect school boards; they elect mayors; they elect congressmen; they elect governors . . . And what goes on in the field of education--these are part of the issues on which they make their determinations.

Generally, the broader the level of government in which education is included, the greater the participation in the decision-making process. That is, in cities where, let's say, a mayor is the main person involved in education on a city council or a board of aldermen, the participation in a mayoral election can be anywhere between 50 and 75 percent. Education is one of the main issues in that campaign. On the other hand, school board elections throughout the country bring out only about 15 percent of the people. When you go to anti-poverty OEO elections, and you get two percent out--that's a tremendous participation. In some cases, it's one-third of one percent. So, it's done through a democratic, political process. That's how it's done.

NANCIE PALMER, Day Care Council of New York City: Day care has been so traditionally a community-oriented and participated in-service by allowing citizens living in the neighborhood but parents living in the neighborhood, whose children are or have been or may be going into a day care program. I think that the political process is fine (and I think it is devoutly to be wished that more people turn out at elections of all kinds) but day care has been so much a neighborhood thing, where parents can go and discuss this or that and affect small changes, without going through the ballot box, which many people, either rightly or wrongly, feel that it is not theirs.

that it is not open to them. One questions whether the real belonging that a day care center has in a small community can be preserved under a much larger and more remote-seeming umbrella.

ALBERT SHANKER: Well, if you're dealing with a small community, you're still going to be dealing with that same small community. What makes you think that a parent can't walk in to any school now existing and talk to the teacher, the guidance counselors, the principal, and other people and, where there are some complaints, bring about some changes? Sometimes they succeed, and sometimes they don't. But I imagine you have parents coming into day care centers, and some of their complaints result in changes being made, and others being viewed as not appropriate or proper, and they're not. I don't see that there is any greater ability of a parent or a person in a community to go into a day care center than there is to walk into any public school in the United States of America.

Generally, the teacher doesn't want a complaint brought elsewhere, and if you have a complaint, the teacher makes an effort to do something about it. The principal doesn't want it discussed with the superintendent; the principal doesn't want it brought up with the school board. People in these positions are probably more frightened than they should be, but I don't see that what exists now in day care

in terms of access to people, are any different from what exists in the public school system.

NANCIE PALMER: But actually in day care today, the governing board of a day care center can meet next Monday night, and alter the entire curriculum right then and there.

ALBERT SHANKER: Who picked the governing board? How were they selected?

NANCIE PALMER: The parents and the community itself.

ALBERT SHANKER: Well, what do you mean by "the community"? Was there an election, let's say, and the parents of Hartford, Connecticut, or some other city, picked it? We're talking about huge expenditures of public money. The people in the United States are not going to give money away to a governed structure over which they have no control. People in that community are now going to be paying taxes to the United States government to provide equal access for all children who want to, or whose parents and families want them to be enrolled in such a program.

Now, I would say that where there are public monies involved, there is a public responsibility to see to it that you don't have a semiprivate system. By the way, the public provides this money, not just to provide it to please the parents. It provides it, because it has been determined that it is good for the public policy of this

country--that it does something for the country. It's the people who pay the money, who ultimately have the right to make the decisions. We're about to move from the old-fashioned notion of the library, where a couple of wealthy benefactors decided if there would be a library, and then you had some sort of charity and a few volunteers went out to pick some books, and there was an awful lot of community involvement, and it was very, very nice. But there weren't many libraries in this country. At a certain point, most places decided that it would be a very good thing if people had access to libraries, if the government is going to spend the money. They started setting standards for librarians, and they started to spend the money, and they also had the control.

There is not going to be a huge infusion of federal or any other kind of money in this program. I think we're just kidding ourselves to think that billions of dollars are going to be put into something just to give to community groups to do with as they wish, without federal standards, and without some sort of democratic or public control. It is not going to happen.

JOHN HIMELRICK, National Association of State Directors of Child Development:
I'm John Himelrick from West Virginia. I suspect that there are a number of people there who probably differ with you

somewhat on their ability to walk into a school and make a change.

ALBERT SHANKER: That's undoubtedly true of some day care centers in this country; it's true of some anti-poverty agencies; it's true of every institution you'll talk about. But as to the quality of individual human beings who are in those institutions--I don't accept the portrayal that the public schools are uniquely set up as bastions of insensitivity, but every other institution is oozing with love.

JOHN HIMELRICK: I don't either, but I went through the school system, and I know something about how closed it is.

ALBERT SHANKER: So did I, and I know something about how open it is.

JOHN HIMELRICK: My comment, or question, is that I would like you to clarify a bit for me on what you mean by children's services in the public schools in terms of age and the kinds of services. For instance, are you talking about (inaudible) program, are you talking about zero, prenatal? Does it include early education only, or does it include all the needs of children?

ALBERT SHANKER: It includes all the needs of children--education, recreation, day care, relationship to other institutions.

JOHN HIMELRICK: Are you talking about prenatal clinics in the public schools? Is this correct?

ALBERT SHANKER: That is a question that I do not have, and the organization does not have a hard position on, and I think that we ought to talk about it. When we get to, I'd say, two and a half to three years of age, we're beginning to talk about programs that have more of an educational and group component rather than purely appealing to the individual's social needs. That's where our position gets pretty tough.

JOHN HIMELRICK: At two and a half, for instance, would that include health, dental, screening, art?

ALBERT SHANKER: Yes.

JOHN HIMELRICK: How long do you anticipate it would take, given the nature of the preparation of educational personnel and the rather slow process of changing colleges and programs and so forth to prepare people within that structure or to get people within the framework of public education to handle these kinds of things which are totally new kinds of programs as far as preparation is concerned?

ALBERT SHANKER: We could discuss that question, but it's going to take us the same amount of time, regardless of what the governing structure is of this program. In other words, if you're talking about a million people who might be necessary for this program, it's the same million people. We're really just talking about whether they're working for a public

school or whether they're working for a private company or whether they're working for a community group--they're the same people.

JOHN HIMELRICK: Private companies can hire people today, whereas the schools can't.

ALBERT SHANKER: But they wouldn't necessarily meet any standards. We can hire people tomorrow, too, if all you want is bodies, but once you determine what type of preparation you want, then those standards are determined. Whether it's privately operated or publicly operated--that isn't the issue. The issue is the question of whether we're going to have standards or not.

I do not accept the idea that standards are whether someone, individually (in his own head) thinks that someone is wrong or simpatico, because that varies. Each of us could have a private interview with a bunch of people and, I dare say, that with the exceptions of maybe the extremes at one end and the other, we might agree on some outstanding person or we might agree on somebody who is totally out of it at the other end. But, when it comes to all the people in-between, there would probably be all kinds of differences.

Standards can't just be an individual judgment as to who is warm and who isn't. I still don't understand your point. Whatever standards we decide on, they'll be the same

standards, and it will take the same amount of time to prepare and to train one million people, regardless of what kinds of governments they're going to work under after they worked through.

JOHN HINELRICK: It will probably take ten years to change the certification standards in the public education system to hire the people who are already trained into the system. Get the formulas changed, and get them paid. It's ridiculous to say that private industry cannot hire people now to do things or other governing bodies that education can't, because education has standards, regulations, and certification.

ALBERT SHANKER: I know some of the standards that some of these private outfits use. They get out from under the health codes, and they get out from under the building codes, and they put children into dangerous facilities with a bunch of teachers who wouldn't pass a psychiatric examination anywhere, and, I might say, we represent some of those teachers. I've been through this thing. Let's not kid ourselves.

Sure, once in awhile, you'll find a nice, little creative experiment somewhere, with three or four beautiful people doing something wonderful. But for every one of those marvelous things you can point to, I can point to a place where somebody is making an awful lot of money, and hurting children, and putting them into dangerous situations, and

isn't meeting any requirements at all except bringing in whatever bodies they can bring in for the price that they are willing to pay.

I'll match you better than school-to-school on each of these things. Sure, private industry can do it, because they're not interested at all in the child, and they have no public accountability or public governance. If the balance sheet at the end of the year shows a profit for Kentucky-fried chicken, that's all they're concerned with.

MARY KEYSERLING, National Child Day Care Association: I can see the schools moving slowly into the pre-kindergarten programs as the community demands a larger expenditure of funds than the standards and all the rest, but this is going to be a slow process. There is something happening immediately in which the AFT could exhibit far more leadership than it has.

I don't mean to make a speech. I'm putting a question mark at the end of each sentence. Our birthrate is going down. The school population is going down. You will have fewer children in the schools. There are at least 12 million children between the ages of six and fourteen now, whose mothers work, and who should have after-school care--before and after.

MARY KEYSERLING: We have none. The number of children in the school system who get after-school care can be counted on a few fingers.

The buildings are there; the teachers are there; the budgets are opening up. If we really put our minds to it, we could, in a very short time, build a perfectly adequate after-school responsibility into our school system, if we put the pressure on. There are a few communities that have done it. Out in Arlington, we have an after-school care program, because a few people in the community pushed the school anyway.

ALBERT SHANKER: New York City has done it on a very extensive basis.

MARY KEYSERLING: We have five programs in the city of Washington, a number in New York. There are a few thousand children. I made a study and have the records, and it isn't a lot. There are five classes in the city of Washington. I'm not going to argue New York, I'd like to believe that it is as large as you encourage us to think, but what leadership could AFT give in speeding the process of the schools' acceptance of this responsibility in the here and now?

ALBERT SHANKER: Well, we can give it some widespread publicity and support and urge our locals to develop alliances with parents and labor groups and others within their communities to press for this. I would say that probably there are two directions here that ought to take priority, and yours is one of them-- mainly providing for extended, all-day, complete facilities for the children who are already in the care of the public school systems for their education.

The other is beginning to extend the age downward, which obviously can't all be done in one instant, but would have to be done over a period of time, would have to be done gradually. I suggest that you may be getting those answers without limitations because you may be asking questions in a certain way. I would say that there are over 12,000 professionals involved in after-school, evening, and Saturday and Sunday programs in the city of New York.

MARY KEYSERLING: I'm talking about the little kids who need recreational facilities until Mom comes home.

ALBERT SHANKER: Yes, that's what I'm talking about. I'm talking about 3:00 to 3:00 p.m. and I'm talking about 6:00 to 9:00 p.m. and I'm talking about beginning with first grade and going all the way through junior high school. In high schools we have much less. There are community centers, but they are not school-based as much. There was a very extensive program before Title I. When Title I came in, a huge number--I would say that there is hardly a Title I school, and that's more than half the schools in the city--that does not devote a major piece of the Title I budget to a series of programs.

One is that all of these schools have tutorial programs at the schools, which are available to any student who wants them. Secondly, they all have recreational programs. These are nonathletic recreational. These would include a

photography club, some musical activities, or just a gameroom that is open, where there is not hockey, or where there is free play, either outdoors, or indoors. The third is athletic programs, but not of the usual team-type. It involves a huge number of people. I'm not talking about adult education now; I'm not talking about evening high school. I'm talking about programs which fulfill the purpose that you're talking about--the 3:00 to 6:00 program.

MARY KEYSERLING: The 12,000 teachers, not necessarily the students . . .

ALBERT SHANKER: . . . Teachers.. Then there's a ratio of at least . . . There are a number of cases where it's under ten students involved for every teacher.

MARY KEYSERLING: So many of those are for older children who want recreation and their vocational training and that kind of thing. I'm talking about the 6- and 7- and 8-year olds.

ALBERT SHANKER: I agree with your point. On the national basis, there is still a lot to be done. There's more there. It may be listed in somewhat different ways in the budgets, and when you make a survey, you may not be getting all the responses, but we know who it is that we represent, and we negotiate their salaries and their conditions and their sick leaves, and we know that when we sit down before the board of education, and we say that we're going to raise the salaries

of people who work the following hours, well then, they say this is how much it is going to cost. And we sit down, and we have the numbers of people involved and how many hours they work, what their functions are, and everything else. I'd be glad to send you information on the extent of those programs. Nationally, I agree with you: we aren't even starting to do what ought to be done.

WILLIAM PIERCE: I hate to go back to standards again, but the current standard for school-age programs for reimbursement under the federal interagency day care requirements is \$110 per kid six and over. Would you accept that for school-age programs?

ALBERT SHANKER: Sure. We've been trying to get standards into the schools for a very, very long time. I remember when I started as a teacher in '52. In '59, I started working for the American Federation of Teachers. After I worked for the organization for just a few weeks (and I was stationed in New York City at the time) we were trying to enforce certain class size regulations. We went to the Buildings Department, and we asked whether there was any building code that was affected. Almost any other building you go into, you'll see regulations as to how many people may be in a given room. There were none. Then we went to the Fire Department, and said that in every theater and in other places, there is always a posting stating the maximum occupancy by order of the fire commissioner.

Why not do that in schools and classrooms? They said that schools were exempt from the fire code with respect to occupancy.

We went from one code to another, and we finally found that the Health Department code said that there had to be a minimum of 15 square feet of floor space for each student, exclusive of furniture. I then went to a number of schools with a tape measure and a health inspector, and found that there were mass violations. Then the courts ruled that in schools, seats and desks did not constitute furniture. I don't know what they expected--four-poster beds or something like that.

That case goes back to '59 and '60. We have been trying through legislation, we have been trying through collective bargaining contracts, and we will be very, very strong on this. We have no problem with it. We only hope, as I say, that what is done in this area will be extendable and expandable to areas of education that are not now covered.

WILLIAM PIERCE: The kinds of programs that Mary is talking about in terms of Arlington and here in the District are programs where the kid must check in, where the child is absolutely accountable in terms of the parent knowing the child is there under the continuous care and/or supervision of an adult for a given number of hours per day. That may differ from the kind of a

tutorial program or recreational program where they don't have to check in.

ALBERT SHANKER: That's true. That's a basic difference.

WILLIAM PIERCE: What Mary and I are talking about is more of the check-in, guaranteed-that-you-know-where-the-kid-is--whoever is in charge. They can still go to Scouts, have a job, or go to tutorial, but whoever is in charge will always know precisely, if the parent asks, or if anybody asks.

THERESE LANSBURGH, Maryland Committee for Day Care of Children: It's not just knowing if anybody asks, it's the child's feeling that somebody is responsible for him and cares about him. I think this is the thing that is a very serious problem, not only to the parents, but also to the (inaudible) in the city. We are told by the housing authorities that the crime rate and vandalism and that sort of thing goes up tremendously when school lets out. So there is the dual thing of providing something for the children to do and also giving them the feeling that somebody cares.

ALBERT SHANKER: Well, we don't have any problem with the notion that there should be more structure than this. I could go back to New York and say, "Why don't you register and enroll students and keep attendance and let the parents know when the child doesn't come and assume responsibility for full blocks of

time on a regular basis?" Almost all of these programs are now under the jurisdiction of the 32 community school boards. Some of them do maintain this type of program, but most do not. Most of them come out of the old days when the child comes in and goes when the child sees fit.

THERESE LANSBURGH: There was a very good program that was done like that, where the schools hired a special superintendent for the hours after school closed, whose special responsibility was what happened to those children during those hours. I come from Baltimore, which at this time, is probably one of the two most public spots in the country.

ALBERT SHANKER: Yes, the AFT, also.

THERESE LANSBURGH: In a situation like that, for those of you who are not aware, Baltimore's school board tried to fire the superintendent and didn't succeed, and that is presenting a real problem at the same time that the city is supposed to be desegregated, or at least increasing the desegregation. Teachers and principals are dropping out like flies--some from one, and some from the other cause. The children are getting the short end of the stick. What happens to the day care situation? Granted, it is an extreme one, but it is happening.

ALBERT SHANKER: Well, what would happen if you had a conflict around day care? After you have day care of the proportions we are considering, it's going to be huge--it's going to be like higher-education-America, like elementary school education, and it will have its share of conflicts. The more people involved, the greater the conflicts. You'll have conflicts surrounding that. Some teachers, some principals, some parents, and some professionals are going to get hurt in those conflicts. It's going to happen.

JUANITA STEELE, 1707 Local 1205, New York City (AFSCME): Going back to the early childhood part--from birth to five years of age, you are saying that this is a possibility. I would like to know if it goes into the public school system, would these children have the same care that goes on daily in the day care centers?

ALBERT SHANKER: Sure.

JUANITA STEELE: I have another question. I'm concerned with Local #5 in New York, which has most of the employees unionized there. What's going to happen to all these people? Will you be bringing in people from your list, or will these people that are already working in these centers continue working?

ALBERT SHANKER: There is really a small number of people in the field, compared with the number of people that will be in the field, if we are successful in getting good legislation. What you

provide in a situation like this is some sort of "grandfather clause," which blankets in the people who are there already or which provides, if you need civil service, some closed exam, whether it is an exam or an examination of record, but you don't throw out the people that you have in order to create something new. We've always operated on that basis.

Once upon a time, you could be a teacher in this country if you were a high school graduate. Well, today, in most places, it takes a bachelor's or a master's. We didn't throw out all those people who didn't have degrees and start all over again. We just said that beginning tomorrow, the following standards apply.

The standards, in spite of your statement, always had some flexibility and they were always related to supply and demand. The standards were raised during the periods when there were always a lot of people around. I imagine that the standards will be raised now that there is a supply of people out there. When there is a shortage of teachers, while the standards may have been kept on paper, there were thousands of so-called "substitutes," so-called "temporaries," or they were given three-year time extensions to fulfill their requirements or five-year extensions or ten-year extensions.

Basically, standards are related to supply and demand, but your question is, that it would be my position, as it

always has been in these situations, that people who are now involved should not be displaced, that there should be a "grandfather clause," and maybe, later on, the system would want to create incentives for those people who do not meet the new standards, to help them meet them. Then, they provide a basis for those people who are now in, to return for some education--paid for. They provide a career ladder for salary--incentives that would be there for meeting the requirements. Certainly, people who are performing a job should not be displaced.

HOLCOLM McKELVEY, 1707 Local 1205 (AFSCME): I came through the New York City school system, and the experience I had in the public schools was very unpleasant in my early years. It was due directly to the lack of communication between myself and my teachers. One of the most important parts of day care centers is that there is not that insensitivity to the needs of the child, because very often, the staff of the day care center lives in the community. I think that is one of the most important parts of the day care centers.

Now, what I hear you say is that in expansion, there must be a greater amount of people from outside the community due to the very real fact that the training of a person would take place outside of the community. It would seem to me that that would mean then that we must sacrifice what I think

is the very special sensitivity of the day care centers for an education. I think that an education is what is learned, not necessarily what is being taught. It is more important that the child believes in what he is being taught. I don't think that it is necessary to expand at the expense of the child, and I hear you saying that. Maybe I'm hearing you incorrectly.

ALBERT SHANKER: Well, I don't think you heard me say that. The only way to keep the adults in the program in the community is to pay them a low wage. This is true. As soon as someone who lives in (inaudible) Hall, makes a lot of money, they do the same thing as anybody else who has a lot of money-- they like to get a better apartment or buy a nicer home elsewhere. That's exactly what we strive to do, not just for teachers or people working in child care, but that's exactly what we should be doing for everybody who lives in a slum or a ghetto.

Now, we had exactly the same problem when we organized paraprofessionals in New York City, who were earning \$1,600 a year. When we negotiated them up to \$5,000 and \$6,000 and \$6,500 a year and got them into college, the big argument by the so-called "liberals" on the board of education, was that now the paraprofessionals would be making so much money that they would move out of the community, and they

wouldn't relate to the children anymore, which is a great argument for permanent starvation. Now, if you want to build a school system on a bunch of permanent grapepickers here, and have a grape clause, it's terrific, but let's stop kidding around here.

Part of what the children in areas like this are supposed to learn . . . They're supposed to learn the language and the culture that's outside of the immediate. That's part of their problem with the world. And you can do that several ways. You do it by having a certain number of people who do come from the outside to present such models and to have such language. And you also provide career opportunities with college educational and training and everything else for large numbers of community people to work within the program, which provides not only education for the children, but also provides a program for thousands of people who would otherwise be stuck and not going anywhere.

But you don't turn around and hire them and tell them that it's terrific that they're going to get a low salary and they'll forever be in the community and that's going to be the great educational advantage that the children are going to have. I just don't accept that.

HOLCOLM McKELVEY: Dealing with the last part of your response: Wouldn't it then seem that the best place to begin would not be in the day care centers, but in the high schools and colleges, and

and perhaps even in the grammar schools? In other words, to prepare the personnel who are going to be doing these things before jumping into the scene? It would seem to me from what you said about the college education for those in the community, that you are perhaps under the impression that the day care personnel don't have those qualifications, but they do. Their qualifications are quite high--especially for new teachers who in New York City or anywhere are eventually required to achieve a master's in early childhood.

ALBERT SHANKER: And how much do they earn?

HOLCOLM McKELVEY: They earn roughly the same thing that the public school teachers earn.

ALBERT SHANKER: And they continue to live in Bedford-Stuyvesant, right? Some of them do. But when you get large numbers of people in that salary bracket, for the most part, they live in other areas where people are in that same salary bracket. Let's not kid ourselves.

HOLCOLM McKELVEY: That's not necessarily true. That's only true because there has been a lack of education for those persons, and they they achieve their education in areas outside of their community. They were educated to believe that they needed to go outside of their community in order to achieve the successful life that they were taught that they needed. That

has been the flaw, but that's another point.

The question in my mind is not what's happening outside of the community, but what will happen inside of the community--and not necessarily a ghetto or a slum--any community. The point to me is that you preserve the good points of any program, and I think that what you see as expansion and a greater good, I see as a downfall of the very educational system that we are trying to rebuild in this country. I think that getting away from the one-room schoolhouse was one of the greatest failures in the American educational system.

BERT SHANKER: Well, I like to read utopian fiction, too. If we would all give up the comforts that we now have, and go back to little towns, and get rid of automobiles and mass communications, and everything else, we can portray a picture of the good old days that were great. I suppose there were a few things about it that were great, but there were an awful lot of things about it that were not great at all. People lived half the lives they do now in terms of age. They were sicker. They were much more ignorant.

I think it's all right to paint that sort of picture, but let's face it--it's not going to happen. We're not going back to the little corner grocery store, and the A & P is with us to stay, and so are the big oil companies, and education isn't going back to the one-room schoolhouse,

either. It wasn't all as great and nice as you would like to think.

Just remember that very few students got an education then. To graduate from an elementary school was considered to be very well educated, and high school was to be part of the intellectual elite of the country. I'm sure that the school system then wasn't concerned with educating mass numbers of people. It was an elitist operation for a very few people, and it pushed out, or didn't accept, or didn't make itself convenient to the masses of people--and you find great beauty in that. I don't find beauty in that at all.

You can't have that nice little closeness, which you view as a positive value and which I do, too, without having the negative aspects of all that went with it, also. Its smallness was based on the fact that it rejected the overwhelming majority of children who needed an education and who needed help, and it decided to take a few--that was it. It was elitist; it was racist; it was aimed at certain groups within our society. Of course, you can go to some nice little group that pulls itself together for its own limited objectives, and say that that's wonderful.

But that's not what we're talking about. We're talking about universal accessibility of education to all children within our society wherever they are in terms of their needs

and their problems, and not a little schoolhouse where the school says if Johnny is willing to walk five miles to school a day and walk back, and buy his own books, and then be in one room with eight different grades, and the teacher can find the time, and you have the itinerant teachers going back and forth, and their particular level of what they were able to do wasn't that great. Once in awhile, you'd find in the books a teacher who was outstanding--that's fine--but read the reality of the literature. The mythology of the public school is about as good as the mythology of slavery of those days. You look back, and people write all sorts of wonderful books about what great institutions these were. I'd rather take what we have today rather than what we had then.

MARGIE SIEGEL, A.F.S.C.M.E.: You were talking about career ladders and standards and I was wondering what you perceive as a stepping pattern. You talked about career ladders later on in terms of . . . as standards develop, then perhaps we would be retrained. One of the things we have been very concerned about has been the constant process of career ladders within different kinds of institutions, where people are not stuck in dead end jobs, and they have the opportunity to move up continually.

ALBERT SHANKER: Well, I agree with that--I wouldn't do it later; I would do it right away. Not all of the adults who will be involved will have to be teachers or college graduates or specialists. There can be large numbers who can start; who do not have any college education; who don't have high school; who can be working in a program and assisting at the same time they are given help . . . (End of this side of tape.)

. . . and then we sought their admission to college, then we got the employers to give them both time and money--and stipends--during their summer vacation period. By this June, we will have 2,000 out of 10,000 who will have college degrees.

Now, this program started in 1967, and this isn't any kind of Mickey Mouse program. They receive no credits for their time on the job. Everyone who's earning a degree, is earning the same degree as everyone else does, because the City University of New York is . . . Nobody is ever going to say that if you are a paraprofessional in New York City that anybody gave you something for nothing. It's going to be a degree that will be valid wherever they want to take it.

We are now working on legislation that we hope to pass in the state, which will give preference to these paraprofessionals in employment in teaching jobs and on the basis of the actual practical experience that they've had working

in the classroom all this period of time. So there has been a career ladder in terms of educational opportunity and now we hope there will be a career ladder in terms of preference, in terms of job opportunities.

KLAUS MAY, La Causa Comun: Mr. Shanker, going back to an issue that was raised before--insensitivity. I worked at the National Council (inaudible), a Chicano organization, and occasionally, the farm workers, a bunch of "grapepickers," and some Puerto Rican organizations in New York. I'm sure you're quite familiar with the needs and interests that have been espoused by the Spanish American parents and others concerning this whole area of education and (inaudible) and other areas.

How would you advise them in terms of responding to bicultural, bilingual needs from New York City and throughout the country--all the needs of metropolitan areas? How would you advise dealing with that issue, especially considering the economic pressures and limitations that we have in terms of federal budgets, federal monies, state monies? At the same time recognizing that there is an increased involvement by parents, by the Spanish communities--Puerto Rican, Chicano, and other Spanish as well.

The number of services for Spanish Americans is rather limited, and the issue of Spanish Americans acquiring services for child care, or other early vital services--

kindergarten, and so forth--an education. All of this is coming to a head.

KLAUS MAY: The average age of a Spanish American here is about 18--10 years below the national median age. So, we have a particular child and youth problem. Were I to offer a recent Supreme Court case (inaudible) Mrs. Nichols. There is a similar situation in terms of Chinese children, where 2,000 Chinese children in San Francisco received virtually no education because they couldn't speak English. Now, we have that kind of situation in a number of other areas, mostly metropolitan, since 85 percent of Spanish Americans live in metropolitan areas.

I'm concerned with how we are going to develop that capability, or utilize that capability that we do have in our communities, in terms of getting bilingual professional staff and setting up those services that these children in the barrios also need. I was wondering how AFT and you could address that question so we can effectively move ahead.

ALBERT SHANKER: Well, the extent to which it is being done anywhere . . . the paraprofessional programs that we already have--about 35 percent of the paraprofessionals there--are Puerto Rican and Spanish-speaking and are in schools containing large numbers of Spanish-speaking children. Now, let me say, that we very strongly favor, and have from the beginning, bilingual

education if, by bilingual education, you mean certain things. I'll distinguish in a minute a few of the things that I don't mean, because we may have some differences on where we want to go on this.

There is no question that there are very large numbers of children who come into school and can engage in no communication with the teacher and the other way around because they just speak different languages. Carl Megel, who is standing behind you, shared with us an experience here last week. I didn't realize I had had the same experience, but both of us started school without speaking any English and were thrown into situations where we were quite terrified by being in an environment like that and being in a large group of children where we were isolated. There was no one else with whom we could communicate.

That's just a matter of simple humaneness and common sense--that you don't place an individual into a situation like that, where you have large numbers or, in fact, where you have an individual child who can't speak English, the obligation is to make that child feel at home and comfortable, so the child needs someone at the school he is able to communicate with, and the other way around.

Now, the second aspect of it is that there may be a development of evidence--this has not yet been shown, but it is a hypothesis that's worth testing--it may very well

be that children who speak another language should, for a certain period of their lives, be continued in their education in that language rather than engage in a shift or change in languages at a time when the child is about to read or write or count or do something else.

Now whether that is true or not, whether that will help the child in both languages and help him learn in general, we don't know. Certainly, what we have been doing hasn't been successful, and that's worth trying--it's worth trying on a large basis. I noticed that there was a piece on that this morning in the Washington Post.

Now, a third aspect of bilingualism is that where the child has the advantage of having another language, there is absolutely no reason for us to destroy, or try to eradicate it. That the old notions of immigrants who were somewhat ashamed of their background--and part of Americanization was to lose all trace of one's past--we've gotten way beyond that, and we realize that is foolish for us to spend thousands of dollars trying to teach American youngsters a second language, and here we have large numbers of youngsters who could be helped to retain this advantage as they learn English, and we don't do it. So these are aspects of bilingual programs which we would support.

Part of the problem is that there are few (if you're going to talk about any kind of educational standards with

college degrees at the present time)--there are still very few students graduating colleges who are bilingual and who would be available in the very near future as certified personnel, whether they are certified according to one set of standards or another. So, this is certainly an area where large numbers of people who are not certified and who work in some other capacity but because of their ability in the language of the child, should be employed, and through a career ladder should be given the opportunity to be certified over a period of time.

Now where our differences, at least my differences, with some people who call themselves bilingual, bicultural supporters, come in are in two areas. I reject the view that the adults in any program have to be of the same ethnic background as the children. I reject that view. I'm an integrationist, and I want to see classes of white children with black teachers and Spanish-speaking teachers and vice versa. I want mix; I want children of all backgrounds to be able to have that experience, and to see, in positions of respect and authority, people of all other backgrounds, and not to create separate school systems. That's one thing that I feel strongly about.

Secondly, what I feel very strongly about is that I reject the notion of some people who are extreme in this area that there is no need to learn English--that if a child

comes with another language, that that other language is enough and that the school should just retain that other language, and that we should develop three or four or seven or eight different official languages. I think that that is part of a utopia also.

Part of what the parents of these children want, unless they are members of some extremist political groups, they want their kids to make it in our society. They'd like them to earn a living; they'd like them to live a good life; they'd like them to have the good things in life. In our country, that is not going to happen unless the person learns English, and is fluent in English as well.

Those would be my differences with some, but otherwise, we have apparently no difficulty with bilingualism, but we would insist, where there are children who do not speak English, that that must be a component of the program.

JOYCE GOLDMAN, Day Care and Child Development Reports: What legislative vehicle do you see for achieving all that has been debated here, including the early childhood education equivalent of public schools, and what about political realities?

ALBERT SHANKER: Well, there is legislation that is sitting there, that isn't what we want it to be, and we're going to seek to introduce new legislation or modifications in what exists there. I think the politics of it are pretty simple. I think, as

in any program, that there are two elements--there are elements of self-interest here. Obviously, every organization represented at this table has some self-interest. Obviously, the American Federation of Teachers does, also. It has a relationship to public schools, it has a relationship to jobs, it has a relationship to certification standards of teacher supply, budgeting. There is a whole series of things. That's true of everyone here.

So, you might say that there is an educational and an idealistic aspect, practical aspects and aspects of self-interest. I believe very strongly that in this fight to, first of all, get funds, and secondly, to see to it that standards, proper standards, are written into law, thirdly, to make sure that the public schools and the program that is operated through the public schools . . . the AFT, the NEA, the school boards, and all the school supervisor and administrator organizations, as a start, and I believe also that the labor movement will be on the same side. I don't think that any legislation can pass against the opposition of that coalition.

JOHN HIMELRICK: Are you saying that you feel that the school boards, the school superintendents in America, are ready now to accept responsibility for five, four, three, and two-and-a-half-year-old children?

ALBERT SHANKER: Do you mean today?

JOHN HIMELRICK: No, no, to begin . . . that they share your view.

ALBERT SHANKER: Well, today they don't share my view, but they will in a few weeks. It's not modest at all, but it's not immodest, either. I'm just dealing with the facts and political realities. Look, there is absolutely no question that the NEA will adopt a program that is identical or similar, for a very simple reason: namely, there are self-interest questions as to what's going to happen to large numbers of unemployed teachers. Therefore, the NEA can do little else than say that any large expansion of education should be within the sector in which it operates. That doesn't mean that I exercise power over the NEA. It just means that I have an understanding that their self-interest and the AFT's in this area are the same.

The same is true of school supervisors. As you start getting cutbacks, and everything else, they will suffer cutbacks in their own ranks. They will suffer a diminution of ability to transfer from one place to another, or to advance or to do other things. Forgetting now what is right or wrong, and talking only in terms of self-interest, the day after tomorrow school supervisors will realize that their position is threatened by the current economic situation, and their position is aided by an expansion of public education.

There is absolutely no question that school boards, faced with the problems of a constricting, declining regular school population, and asked which schools should we shut down in order to consolidate, and faced with parents who are screaming that they don't want to take their kids out of the school that is more convenient to them and close down and move to another one, and also faced with which supervisor will get fired, and which administrators in the central group get fired in order to take care of the consolidation, and faced with huge numbers of unemployed teachers waiting outside to be employed (people in that community who have gone to college and prepared for jobs) and they have to start taking on fights as to who in the present system gets pushed out to make room for others who are waiting.

Faced with all that conflict surrounding them, they're going to find one very simple answer: that an expansion of education can put them into some sort of positive stance of building education, rather than deciding who gets pushed out the window, or which group of parents to take on--and I could add to this list.

I'm just saying that there are practical gut problems that are being faced by a lot of groups that are going to lead them into a strong alliance. I don't see movement or anything against a group, which includes all school boards, all supervisors, and all teachers in this country, especially

when you consider the new political clout that teachers are showing us.

Now, in the labor movement, there are a number of unions that have negotiated their own day care programs. There are some that have received some funding, and they will be concerned about their own programs. But, when you take a look at what happens with day care throughout most of the country--don't look only at the finest examples, look at the entire (inaudible)--I think that the general thrust of the labor movement is to say that public services ought to be developed through public institutions.

The AFL-CIO opposed vouchers, opposed performance contracting, so that anything that smacks of something similar . . . It opposes a health care program that is based on a purely private insurance company approach. It is a consistent philosophy in terms of what the labor movement does, in terms of how public services are to be delivered. So that's one aspect of it.

The other aspect of it is the fact that there is a tremendous amount of exploitation of people working in these day care programs, and to the labor movement, it's going to mean the development of a whole new vast work force of low paid and unrepresented workers who . . . You have to go into one little place after another to try to pull them together and get the . . .

By the way, there was a decision by somebody just a few weeks ago that people who work in day care under 20 hours a week aren't even covered by the minimum wage. So, you could have a development here of a million people working at wages that are lower than those that are complained about in terms of agricultural workers and others. There will be an aspect to that.

I just feel that the politics of it are that there is a need in terms of the service. The arguments are really not about whether there should be such a service. The arguments are elsewhere--in terms of where that service should be provided. I think there will be, within a very short period of time, based on self-interest, but also on the basis of experience.

I think that the public schools will be able to turn around and say (regardless of some of the negative books that have been written about public schools in recent years) that there is no experience that shows that Job Corps, which, for instance, private companies will use to supposedly train dropouts, a pretty miserable failure: very high in expense, very low in retention rate, tremendous scandals as to the use of the money . . .

Whenever you create a new series of agencies for the delivery of a public service, you've got a period of shape-up for at least five or ten years. Look at the fantastic early

scandals of OEO, which after it finally shaped up, it was too late in terms of the reputation with congress and everything else, as a result of which a good part of the war on poverty was destroyed because there was no way of administering it until there was a shape-up on it.

The other strong argument is that if you go out and create something new, there are one or two things you can do if it is not in the public school. You can take public money and say that if anyone wants a piece of this, go ahead, in which case, you are taking public money without any kind of public governance, which is not the kind of thing that is going to happen in a democratic society. People are not going to be taxed, and say, "Go ahead. Do what you want with it."

The other possibility is to let the money out, and have some sort of agency carefully monitor it. Well, if you're going to have an agency carefully monitor it, why not have the agency that is legally doing it now? What makes you think that the next bunch of bureaucrats you set up are going to be better, more sensitive than the bureaucrats who are there right now and have a lot of experience? It's the way it's going to go.

Unfortunately, I think the fact that there's some conflict on this may very well delay, for a period of time, the enactment of some such legislation. But much more

important, when legislation comes, it should be right and it should come one year earlier.

MARY KEYSERLING: You don't mean to suggest, do you, that you wouldn't support legislation that didn't put the total flow of early education money into the school system?

ALBERT SHANKER: That's exactly what I mean.

MARY KEYSERLING: You are saying that?

ALBERT SHANKER: Yes.

HERESE LANSBURGH: Could we state a case? It seems to me that a bill like the Mondale bill--some of us would advocate far more money for early education than the Mondale bill proposes. Most of us sitting around the table were advocates of at least \$2 billion in (inaudible), when this legislation was in an earlier stage in 1969 and 1970, and many of us still talk in these terms and we see it flowing into the communities, and schools, as well as non-profit organizations, being eligible.

ALBERT SHANKER: No, we would oppose that very strongly, and we intend to mount a national campaign on that. We do not intend that every community in this country engage in a competition, which is so destructive, between the local welfare agencies, anti-poverty agencies, parks departments, child welfare departments, education departments. We have enough conflict in this country without that.

Now, the function of education belongs where it is.

If we don't like it, let's change it to the public schools as well, and let's set it right. But that is what's there now for education in this country. The worst thing you can do is to throw out a sum of money into each community and allow all people, who should be fighting the same battle side-by-side with each other in terms of state and national funds--it's exactly the Nixon kind of strategy in the revenue sharing thing, where you underfund, you throw things, and you get all the people who ought to be a part of political coalition fighting each other over a limited sum of money and over who is going to get it. No. That's going to be determined in the legislation.

MARY KEYSERLING: The school system has not yet moved into kindergartens. A third of our states have no kindergartens.

ALBERT SHANKER: Well, if they don't provide the funds, they won't, either.

MARY KEYSERLING: But let's fight to get kindergartens established for every child of five, which is his entitlement. I would suggest that the AFT should use its strength to see that every child of five or six has the opportunity of this early education. About half of our children don't. There are after-school programs that are already able to do that.

The schools can't move into infant care; they can't move into toddler care; they can't move into three-year-old care. If you move into five, and do a good job there, then in five or ten years, you can show the real capacity to do an early education job--which the schools have not. Then I could see the schools moving as a whole, as they have in California, from five-year-olds to four-year-olds, and then possibly into third, and leaving the choice to parents as to the kinds of institutions they want to choose.

ALBERT SHANKER: We don't give them a choice in other public institutions--why should we here?

MA KEYSERLING: But you haven't started to do the job which is your responsibility now. To have a war at this stage over services for three- and four-year-olds, would be just simply fatal to the future of early childhood education.

ALBERT SHANKER: There is no war over services for three- and four-year-olds. It's just a question of whether the educational function is going to remain with the school systems or whether it's going to be thrown out to competition, whether that competition is totally within a series of different public agencies, or whether it is public vs. private. I would say that's one of the main issues, and you know where we stand on this.

DOREEN BROWN, National Council of Jewish Women: This is where you are totally massing early day care, which is what Mary Keyserling is talking about, with an educational--a public educational--program.

ALBERT SHANKER: Well, if you're talking about very early day care, that, as I said, we would talk about. I was talking about when you get to the age of two-and-a-half and three; I was talking about the point where the individual care component moves away to something that is more moved toward an educational component. There is probably a point where there should be a dividing line, and that we'll have to think about.

DOREEN BROWN: So that you don't see two day care systems.

ALBERT SHANKER: That may very well be. Maybe.

JOHN HIMELRICK: Let me make an observation on a statement you made earlier, Mr. Shanker, about the lack of money being the cause of the lack of kindergartens, at least I understood you to say that.

ALBERT SHANKER: Personnel, also, and space in recent years.

JOHN HIMELRICK: I would suggest that none of those three is really the reason that states haven't. States haven't, because educators haven't chosen to move in that direction. I would offer as proof of that--West Virginia moved from no publicly supported kindergartens in the fall of 1969 to a fully funded program

in 1972, not because educators wanted to, but because a strong governor and a few people who had an interest in young children forced educators to do it.

ALBERT SHANKER: All right, but why didn't somebody do it in 1965? I mean, 1969 is fine, and there is movement on it all across the country, but the reason there wasn't before is very simple. Almost every major city in the country had children on a double session in their regular schools. Schools opened at the beginning of the year with 500 teachers missing, 1,000 teachers missing, 2,500 teachers missing, and until the space developed, and until the personnel developed, the whole thing is a pretty academic question. There were school systems that were not providing a day of instruction for first, second, and third graders.

Now I grant you, that even after the space is there, and the people are there, somebody has to push it, somebody has to move. But you didn't even have that option until 1969 or 1970 in most of the communities.

Even now, the places where space is being developed--schools in New York City, when you go to older, middle-class neighborhoods, you go to Bayside, Queens. They're going to have to shut schools down there because you have people who bought homes years ago--their children are grown-up; they haven't moved out of them; there are no children in the

community anymore; there are a lot of adults there.

But when you talk about ghetto areas, you're still talking about areas where there is tremendous overcrowding, tremendous overcrowding within those schools. The school construction program in those areas has not kept up. Many of those schools are incapable of putting in many of the programs that they want on the basis of space requirements.

HOLCOLM McKELVEY: Al, excuse me. You mentioned that you would not support legislation that Mary Keyserling is referring to. Does that mean that you would support a kindergarten-aged child of four years old being subject to the kind of legislation that has authority over the public school system, like, for instance, busing of small children? Would you support that?

ALBERT SHANKER: What's wrong with the busing of small children?

HOLCOLM McKELVEY: I asked you if you would support it.

ALBERT SHANKER: Three-year-olds? Sure. I don't advocate it, but it's being done all over the country. Three-year-olds you're busing now?

HOLCOLM McKELVEY: I guess that you're a product of your environment, also.

ALBERT SHANKER: Maybe I didn't understand you. Would you repeat the question?

HOLCOLM McKELVEY: I thought I heard you say that you would not support legislation that would provide funds for private day care centers

or day care centers that were not of the public nature as in the public schools.

ALBERT SHANKER: Yes.

HOLCOLM McKELVEY: All right. I asked then if that would mean that you are supportive of the public day care institutions that would be subject to the same laws that regulate the busing of children in public schools.

ALBERT SHANKER: It would be subject to those laws anyway, whether they were in the public schools or not, because you're using public monies.

HOLCOLM McKELVEY: You mean that a day care center . . .

ALBERT SHANKER: I mean that a day care center that has been financed by U. S. tax dollars is not going to evade the law just because it happens to be run by a different city agency than a school system or because it is run by a private agency.

HOLCOLM McKELVEY: I'm not talking about that. I'm talking about the busing of three-, four-, and five-year-old children--that's what I'm talking about. I'm talking about children, Mr. Shanker. I'm not interested in the laws or in the teachers. I'm interested in the children. There are some of us who are still interested in them.

ALBERT SHANKER: Yes, but you stated that they were being bused to fulfill some legal order, didn't you?

HOLCOLM McKELVEY: That's right.

ALBERT SHANKER: Well, if there is a legal order, it won't make any difference if it is a public school or some outfit contracting for public funds and using public funds--they will be subject to the same law. If you don't like the law, change the law, but it's not an argument for moving out of the public schools.

HOLCOLM McKELVEY: My question to you was whether or not you would support day care being mandated by those laws, and you said, "Yes." I just want to make it clear.

JUANITA STEELE: Do you mean you would support a law that would support the busing of small children from one area to another?

ALBERT SHANKER: There is no such law.

JUANITA STEELE: Look, let's use the incident that's happening in Boston now. You would take small children and do this to them?

ALBERT SHANKER: Do you mean that the court's going to order that?

JUANITA STEELE: Yes, this is what--this is the public school law.

ALBERT SHANKER: No. There's a court order and in each situation the court takes into account patterns of intent, of segregation.

It also takes into account the age of small children. I don't know of any place where small children were ordered to go great distances. I don't know of any judge who did that. I suppose that if some judges did that, there would be some congressional action.

But I have been opposed--this has been the AFT--to any congressional restriction on the courts in this matter because we have not believed that the courts have gone overboard. If the courts do go overboard, we'll have to deal with it in some legislative way. At the present time, I think we're just raising a strong (inaudible) on this.

The point is that if the courts so order, it won't make any difference what the governance is, and that's a totally separate issue. Now, you're asking the question up to what age do you think or would you go along with children being bused. It isn't germane for this discussion.

CLARA MARTIN: I think it is. Earlier you said that you are an integrationist.

ALBERT SHANKER: Yes.

CLARA MARTIN: What we're saying is germane to this discussion because how are you trying to achieve this? You want to take away what is now established as a community base. You have said little or nothing about children in this discussion and what they need--it's only what the system needs to fear. That's what we're really talking about, Mr. Shanker.

You identified yourself as an integrationist and what you're saying is that you're going to move an existing system into another system and that it will be subject to the rules and regulations of that. You have yet to tell us what you see as good in the child care programs as they are now. You have said nothing about parents; you have said nothing about the needs of kids.

ALBERT SHANKER: I would appreciate it if you didn't distort what I said. I said that I was an integrationist in the context of responding to what is meant by bilingual, bicultural education, to which I said that I don't think that children should only have around them adults who are of the same ethnic group--that I don't believe in that philosophy. Some people do.

. Now, to jump from that, to draw a conclusion from that that I favor having exactly a certain quota of children in every classroom in this country, regardless of where they go or where they come from, or anything else is, I would submit to you, a very unfair conclusion to draw.

Now I have put forth certain self-interests that our organization has out, and if we had the time this afternoon, I could point out that certain of you who make purely idealistic statements, may have your own self-interests, also. You may want your own little private schools in your own communities to deliver a particular privilege to a certain

group, and you'd like the taxpayers to pay for it. That's one kind of privilege.

There are also other governmental agencies that would like to see to it that people in their agencies don't lose jobs and when they talk about the children and idealism, they're not talking about idealism at all--they're just talking about which group of people is going to get the financial action. Let's be adults here and stop talking about one side only having self-interests in this. There isn't a person sitting here who doesn't have some ideological hang-ups one way or the other, some interests, some questions as to where the control is going to be, who's going to sit on the board, who's going to make the decisions, and everything else.

We're not sitting here, one side having purely the children on their minds, and the other side purely interested in money and jobs. That's nonsense. Every organization that is involved in this has certain interests that are selfish and certain other interests that have to do with where they want certain public policy to go, and there's nothing wrong with it. The only thing that I dislike is when you try to place the argument in a onesided and uneven manner. We all have self-interest in this thing--it's not just onesided. It's just that some of us are more willing to admit our self-interest, whereas other people would rather keep them hidden.

MARY LOGAN, AFL-CIO, Department of Social Services: I have an ideological hang-up. I have always thought of day care as being the replacement for the function of the family and not an extension of the school system. It bothers me to think, as you use the term, that day care is bridging the gap. When a two-year-old has to be in a (inaudible) there you're willing to talk in terms of a separate function that is now performed by the school system, when you talk in terms of a . . .

ALBERT SHANKER: Yes, I think that day care should start at an early age, being exactly what you said it should--it should be in the place of the family, and it should start with an almost zero schooling function except in so far as the family itself has a schooling or educational function. It should move in tiny, almost imperceptible steps toward becoming more of a replica of a less protected and more worldly environment over a very, very lengthy period of time.

My feeling is not that that should happen very quickly in early childhood, as a matter of fact, I think I pointed out that moving the child away from the family happens too rapidly even now. It should not move that rapidly in kindergarten, first, second, or third grade. The earliest age it should be . . . family types, home types, care types, individual-type settings with this very, very slow movement, not really making a break towards anything even resembling a

current school until maybe the fourth or fifth grade. I think even then--at the fourth or fifth grades--to expect children to sit and listen, to get lectures, to have (inaudible)--that we ask too much, too early, within our schools. What we're doing is a factory pattern and it's cruel.

MARY KEYSERLING: You haven't said that. It just seems to some of us, far more concerned with children first, who have no institutional ax to grind--and there are many of us around this table who are in this position . . . What is troubling me to the point of terrible distress is your statement that you would oppose any legislation that wouldn't provide money solely to the school system for areas of this type of care.

Another thing that has disturbed me acutely is that you stated flatly, although I don't believe you really think this, that what is pushing you into day care is not so much concern with children as the maintenance of jobs for teachers who are being displaced.

Now, I, too, am concerned with jobs for teachers as the school population falls, but I would think that the AFT would concern itself with getting the ratio of children lower for children in the school system. If, instead of having 1:40 children, or 1:35 in our school system, we set out to have 1:20 and 1:25 so that teachers could do truly teaching jobs,

you could keep all of your teachers fully occupied for a good many years in the school system.

I happen to agree with you, that ultimately I see the schools moving to a universal kindergarten and into some type of education for four-year-olds. But to say that you would block the flow of money now, which is desperately needed to improve and expand these more family-type, non-educational day care centers, many of which are good . . .

Now, you spoke of the very bad day care. We all know that a large percentage of private enterprise day care is very bad but an enormous percentage of publicly supported day care in the New York schools, here in the District, and our revenue sharing, and all around the country, in your Minnesota day care center, a very large percentage of your publicly supported, child-oriented day care centers which are not highly educational (they have educational components, but the major thrust is developmental) is family-substitute, is shared from the home toward the educational institution.

Right now we want more time to talk with you, urging you not to block a flow of money into non-profit day care centers which meet standards, which do a good job, which can be publicly monitored, and which can work more closely with the schools. It isn't an either/or. I think we want to change your mind about not blocking legislation which can

be good for the school system, good for day care, and good for kids.

ALBERT SHANKER: Well, you raised two points and I would like to respond to them. I would use the analogy with respect to blocking money for a purpose which is good--that exactly what the AFL-CIO did about a year and a half ago when President Nixon insisted that there be a subminimum wage for students and the analysis of the labor movement was that since the students would have a lower minimum wage than their fathers, that this would create an incentive for companies to fire the father and hire the son at a lower rate.

Even though millions of Americans were at a starvation level, at a minimum wage that had not been raised in years, the American labor movement insisted that there not be a subminimum wage for youth to undercut existing standards, and millions of Americans had to wait another eight months before Nixon was finally compelled to put through a minimum wage bill that did not contain all the loopholes that were in the original Nixon proposal.

Now, I say that there are so many problems connected with development of this outside the public school system that even though it's for a good purpose, putting this money in the hands of parks departments, other city agencies, and everything else, while it will provide a flow of money

immediately, maybe it will provide it a year, a year and a half, or two years earlier than the way we are trying to get it, that the quality of what will happen--the conflicts that will be within each city and community as to who gets it, and who spends it, and how it's done, and what the standards and controls are, that I would personally be willing to spend a little additional time getting the right legislation through . . .

MARY KEYSERLING: We are starting to . . .

ALBERT SHANKER: I'd like to complete this. Now, the second item, that the purpose of this is only for jobs--I didn't say that. I've been very much involved with early childhood education for a long time. As a matter of fact, even when we had a shortage of teachers and a shortage of space, we wrote into our More Effective Schools Program a decade ago all-day programs. We wrote summer programs in, and my own son, when he was three years old, was bused into a program from Flatbush into Bedford-Stuyvesant and a More Effective School (301), an excellent program that was there. We wrote those in. We later wrote a child care program which brought back teachers with their children into ghetto schools with community children. These are programs . . .

MARY KEYSERLING: They've gone out of business.

ALBERT SHANKER: That one did go out of business, and it was one of the best programs. That's right. Now, our interest in this has been there for a long time. What I was referring to was not our interest in it. I was saying that the fact that there is now self-interest involved is going to mean that there is going to be a large number of groups and organizations such as those that I referred to which, in addition to believing that it is a good thing to do, are now going to be more involved because there are now matters of self-interest involved.

We all know that when you have self-interest in addition to things that are on your program, people move much more-- they move much faster, and they're a lot more active, and I was merely pointing to a political reality. I think that probably all of these organizations that are involved in education have had points in their programs, some of them like our local which was involved in earlier stages in developing such programs. But now, for the first time, you're going to have three million teachers in the country who, in addition to thinking that it's a nice thing, are also going to know that it has something to do with their own economic future.

I was talking about the political dynamics of it. I'm not saying that that is the way it should be done because that is their self-interest, but when you're talking about

what is likely to happen in terms of political reality, you've got to take that into account as a force that moves people.

WILLIAM PIERCE: Turning back to legislation. You wrote a column in the Times a while back and I got a different impression there than I've gotten today. Correct me if I'm wrong. My impression from that column about the Mondale Child and Family Services Act (and I think you said it earlier when you were talking about modifying legislation)--you're concerned with that legislation primarily that the schools should be the prime sponsors or that they should be the only sponsors?

BERT SHANKER: Well, it depends on your definition of prime. If you're asking me whether I'm absolutely sure that some centers that exist outside couldn't come under--sure they could.

WILLIAM PIERCE: Let's take the old OEO bill. For a long time the old OEO legislation said that the community action agency was the presumed prime sponsor for programs and there are some built-in safeguards in the child development legislation in that there must be ongoing programs--like a lot of ongoing Head Start programs have protections built into them. Would AFT oppose a Mondale Child and Family Services Act that had the school as the presumptive prime sponsor as long as there was protection built in for existing Head Start programs?

ALBERT SHANKER: I favor that. Not only that, but you would also want protection for school districts that might not want to, for various reasons, go into this area. You would then have to provide for a community alternative to receive such monies. If the school system turns it down, the community should not be deprived of such services. There would be alternatives. I would say that your formulation of the public schools being the prime sponsor is a correct one.

WILLIAM PIERCE: That's what I said.

ALBERT SHANKER: Yes.

WILLIAM PIERCE: Not necessarily exclusive sponsorship.

ALBERT SHANKER: No. The programs now in existence that are outside--there would be no effort to dismantle those programs. You might want to take the southern districts that would not want to provide such a program, even if it meant the loss of money, then somebody else ought to be able to pick up that money to run the program.

WILLIAM PIERCE: Would you subcontract services to profit-making private enterprise people?

ALBERT SHANKER: No.

MARY KEYSERLING: There are about 500,000 children in publicly financed non-profit day care centers now and not all of them would want to be, nor

would their parents want them to be transferred to the schools. They must not only be protected, but there should be an opportunity for expansion of non-profit centers that respond to the choices of parents. To block the opportunity for growth of this type of center that does meet the standards, which does have a response to parental choice, would be an appalling development.

ALBERT SHANKER: Why don't you provide choices within the public sector and give the child or parents more than just the choice of the neighborhood school or a neighborhood facility? Why not open it up within the public sector?

NANCIE PALMER: That's what the Mondale bill is trying to do--provide alternatives.

ALBERT SHANKER: But they don't have to be alternatives in terms of sponsorship. They can be alternatives in terms of the program.

MARY KEYSERLING: No. I did not give parents the choice for money at the school level, because the school is a compulsory program. I do not see us at any time, and I hope you share this view, talking of four- and three- and two-year-olds being in a compulsory educational program.

ALBERT SHANKER: No. We're not talking about that.

MARY KEYSERLING: This is voluntary.

ALBERT SHANKER: Yes.

MARY KEYSERLING: This is a very big difference--a voluntary program, elected by parents, respectful to different needs. The stake of the state in compulsory education for all children over the age of six, and that makes the difference. I'm totally in disagreement with people who advocate a voucher system or a choice at that point of public education system. It's a public education system with a public stake in it and that is quite different from voluntary choice of services. That makes all the difference in the world--when it is voluntary and where you have a special group of parents who are involved.

JUANITA STEELE: Mr. Shanker, are you saying that elaborate facilities that interest students in different non-profit groups would be closed and that these children then would have to go into the public school facility?

ALBERT SHANKER: The development, at this point, is not huge. I indicated a minute ago that the legislation could be developed in such a way that existing programs would not be dismantled.

#