

National Council for
Families and Television

(609) 921-3639
(213) 622-0349

November 14, 1984

Mr. Albert Shanker
President
American Federation of Teachers
11 Dupont Circle, NW
Washington, D.C. 20036

Dear Al:

Many thanks for your fine presentation at the NCFT Invitational Weekend, October 26-28, 1984 at the Ojai Valley Inn, Ojai California. And, again, thanks as well for the \$5,000 contribution from the American Federation of Teachers to help underwrite the costs of the weekend.

Response from the participants has been good. At the Sunday morning session, several concrete ideas for ways to improve the image of teachers in television shows were mentioned. I have high hopes for good results in this area on the television screens of America during the coming year.

A full report of the conference, including an article based on your presentation as well as a list of specific recommendations from the television industry, will be published in the Winter 1985 issue of Television & Children. A transcript of your speech is enclosed. The deadline for the completed manuscript is January 5, 1984.

You may expect to receive the \$500.00 honorarium in a few weeks.

It was good to see you again. I look forward to working with you on future NCFT projects.

Best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

Nicholas B. Van Dyck
President

Al Shanker

Maybe I'll start with a subject that Lee started with this morning and that is the changing status of teachers in this country and I think that perhaps one other factor he looked at that might explain what happened to the status of the teacher in recent years.

I grew up in a working class neighborhood in New York City in the 30's and, yes, teachers were really held high on a pedestal as were local public schools. Why? Mostly because the people, almost nobody in the neighborhood -- nobody in the neighborhood had ever been to college. Almost nobody had graduated high school. The one or two people graduated high school, they were the intellectuals in the community. A few people had been to high school for a year or two. To have graduated from elementary school was a mark of very considerable achievement in that neighborhood because an overwhelming majority of people who live there have not graduated elementary school, indeed a very large number of them could not write. I remember sitting out on a front stoop of an apartment building summertime and having people sit there and just ask somebody who did know how to write, would you write a postcard or a letter for me, and sit there and dictate it.

So teachers in a sense are victims of their own success. If you want to go to a place where the people still respect teachers, go to a third world country which

has not yet succeeded in educating the mass of people and see very very high illiteracy rates and teachers will still be up there. So the more educated our people are the more who go to college the more who come to college, but fewer people will be standing there looking up at this person who has greater educational attainments than they do and more and more will be looking straight at or even down at them saying I'm more educated than you are. If I weren't so busy making so much money I could do a better job educating my kids than you do, and that's what's happened within a very short period of time. It's open -- it's -- everybody going to high school, everybody graduating high school, and remember the teachers we respected so much in those days were not college graduates. They were mostly graduates of two year normal schools or training schools, whereas today the teachers that we don't look up at are mostly teachers with Masters Degrees and beyond that. So all this status difference is what happens when the rest of society catches up to a group of educated people, provided that those educated people haven't themselves really moved ahead. Teachers are not viewed as having a particular set of secrets the way doctors or lawyers or dentists or other people do, and maybe we'll talk about that a little bit later. Teachers have moved beyond just being people who are educated, but people who had this particular set of secrets that others didn't have, they would still have an edge there in terms of effect, even though it didn't remain the same as it was before.

I would like to use some of my time before we get to questions, talking about the yearly report, what this all means, what the opportunities are, what the problems are. First I would like to start by saying that these reports are not the usual kind of thing. We've had periodic temporary interest taken in the schools and usually this happens when there's a big baby boom and you have to find teachers and build new buildings, spend a lot of money. Well there's no baby boom last year. Or it happens when there's some dramatic event like Sputnik when we wonder how an unfree society in which people are not supposed to really learn how to solve problems and so forth can do some things before our own society does. Neither of those things happened. The reason we had all these reports last year, most of the commission staffed by governors, people from governors staffs and business people, is kind of a third wave of understanding. About seven, eight years ago we had all these front page articles about the deindustrialization of America, how we didn't rebuild our plants and how the modern plants in Korea, Taiwan and Japan and Germany, are killing us because we're still operating on the ones, and so we had this reindustrialization movement, we had to reinvest. And then there was the second wave that had to do with our crumbling infrastructure. Half our bridges have to be built, the roads, the harbors that we can't use and the amount of reinvestment that has to go

on in there, and these were both movements essentially on the part of both the political and the business community. It's talked about as big period of optimism that we had at the end of World War II when we felt that we were so far ahead that we could just keep doing what we were doing.

Now what's happened with education is really the third piece of this reindustrialization and rebuilding infrastructure and that is the understanding that if you don't reinvest in the human infrastructure you don't have educated people, you don't have brainpower that a large part of what's happening in terms of international competition of business demands that sort of investment too. And so we've had this series of reports and, while there are some big differences, the reports start with something and that something is that over the last 20 years or so something went wrong. We did a lot of things right, most of the reports give the schools praise for greater access, more people graduating, a lot of things, but they also said schools went wrong, that the schools became somewhat soft in a lot of things, and I think they're right. And maybe part of it was just a pendulum kind of a swing. Maybe part of it was a result of parents who had been immigrants, their children reaching a greater affluence and not feeling that they had to push their kids as much. Maybe some of it was the parallel of the child rearing practices, that is, you know if famous pediatricians tell you that you could have let the kids get above

the refrigerator and they'll automatically pick a balanced diet, why should the school operate in the same way -- anything your kid wants to take is what's good for him, anything you're trying to shove down his throat he's not going to be able to digest anyway.

At any rate in the 1960s, late 50's, 1960s, 1970s, we did give, provide an awful lot of electives, created a lot of room for choice, and these were schools that did not oppose the choice of electives. If you had a hundred different courses in English, all of which required you to do some thinking or to read something worthwhile to improve your own vocabulary, your own expression, nobody is saying: This is the book you must read or else you haven't had an education. But they are saying that those courses that said that you could substitute comic books or movie magazines or rock magazines or lyrics to popular tunes for literature, that that's not adequate and I must say that I agree with the reports. I think that one of the things reports said essentially is that we went too far. Maybe our schools are too rigid, maybe we force kids to take a lot of things that weren't that important anymore before that, maybe we did force them to sit there and memorize. And then there was the swing this other way which kind of said that we will not require very much and that not only were students not taking, they were not taking subjects that were difficult.

One of our problems with math and science teachers today is not just a problem of math and science teachers,

it's people, how many people took math and science. We step back and trace this problem a little bit. Since most teachers in this country were hired without any sort of testing and there was no requirement for instance that an elementary school teacher, there's no way of knowing what elementary school teachers themselves know, how to do fractions or multiplying or subtracting or dividing. I can tell you how you find out or get pretty educated guesses to whether they can. The State of Florida four years ago instituted an examination system and said that every prospective elementary school teacher has to take an examination in basics and anywhere between 15 and 35% of all prospective teachers fail sixth grade arithmetic tests. I mean sixth grade in the sense that these are the questions that in a sixth grade many of us used to get these as verbal warmup questions at the beginning of the period when the teacher would try to interest you -- they're all numbers that were divisible by 10, you know, nothing left over, nothing left to the , things which if you had some sort of an understanding, it was the kind of thing you just quickly grabbed, and the teachers were not being asked to do it .

Well, if -- you have to assume that those teachers who can't read, write or count are not gonna bother to go to Florida to take the test in the first place, you know. Since the other states don't require, why subject yourself

to one if you don't you can pass it. So probably Florida attracted some better teachers who thought they could pass the exam and yet a percentage of them couldn't. On the basis of those figures I would guess that approximately 50% of the elementary school teachers in the United States don't know arithmetic. Now that means that if you're a kid now, you're going through school, the chances are that every other year you've had a teacher who really never learned herself or himself, feels very uncomfortable with it, also feels that I made it and I didn't know arithmetic so what difference does it make if the kids know it. So now by the time the child gets to high school, you've had a child who has only had one-half of by that time the child is very far behind, really cannot enroll in traditional high school classes, feels that the arithmetic work which is now let's say fourth grade work the kid will be doing in ninth grade is very childish and it is boring cause if you don't learn some of these boring things early enough it's -- you do give up. So what we've got now is something that can't be turned around in an instant. That is, we have a large of number of high school -- a much larger number of students who are now in high school who are not equipped to do any mathematics because of the earlier problems in elementary school, and this is the problem that's gonna be solved now as a result -- may be resolved as a result of some tightening up process that's gonna be launched for second or third grade. It may not be unless

people do something that's kind of intelligent at the elementary school level. What can they do -- fire half the elementary school teachers in the United States? No cause there's nobody waiting that's any better to take their jobs. So that's not the intelligent thing to do. Probably the smarter thing to do would either be to develop something with computers or with -- that's mechanized. Arithmetic happens to be something that you can program mechanically and get kids to fool around with. Another thing to do is to allow a certain amount of movement of children so that two teachers who are next to each other, one of them is better at English, the other is better at math, you know let's have a little bit of semi-departmentalization even as low as the elementary school if you've got different talents. But unless something is done about that,

The reports. The reports basically said something like this: We the businessmen and governors of this country believe that education has been neglected, the nation is at risk, it's a disaster, it's an act of unilateral educational disarmament. They used all these military phrases to show how serious it was. They exaggerated a good deal but then they all kind of had some similar message, with the exception of Goodlad andSizer, the different types of books. These others are kind of political call to arms whereas a few of these are analogies of what goes on in school and really not reports in that same

sense. What was being said here was this: We the governors of this community are willing to invest billions of additional dollars in education because we know that education has been neglected -- billions. However, we're not willing to pay for the schools as they now are. We could not face the public and say billions more for what's there now. We will face the public and we will raise the money provided that the schools will tighten up. And what is this tightening up -- well, it's a laundry list, testing teachers before they are employed, not automatically promoting students from one grade to another whether they have attended or learned the subjects or not. Requiring students to take hard subjects and eliminating soft electives. Specifying the curriculum. Maybe putting in certain places where students are tested before they go from one level of schooling to another. Some of them had merit proposals for rewarding better teachers. Others had proposals for making it easier to get rid of incompetence. The Japanese have a longer school year. Some of them wanted to have a longer school year, or a longer school day. So that the whole list of things, all of which essentially say, we want things to be much tighter, we want testing, we want specified -- we don't just want a specified four years of math or four years of English or something like that, but the State of California is saying we're gonna institute examinations like the New York State Regents Examination where every student before graduating is gonna have to pass an examination showing that they have a certain knowledge in the area of something that's more specific.

Well, good or bad? I'd say for the most part this development is good, even if you disagree with some of the specific remedies. Why? Public education in this country demands -- cannot exist without support. In recent years that support has been very great until the mid-1970s and it's been very great because when we had the baby boom many communities had 55, 60, 65, 70% of the adult voters in that community had children in public schools. So they were the customers, and this was a very popular issue because every poli -- no politician could afford to turn to all these people who were direct consumers. Now because people are living longer at one end and having fewer children at the other end, we have gone to some communities that had 60% of the people to our direct customers down to about 22%, and so education has lost a tremendous amount of political power compared to what it had let's say in the late 50s and through the 60s. It's no longer the issue as it was at that time. It certainly cannot compete with problems of the service or our senior citizens, formerly a lost group.

Therefore, education desperately needs some outside support, support other than support from parents or teachers or members of boards of education. It's unfortunate that the public should feel this way, because actually people view education as a benefit for someone's child. If my child's going to school, I want the school to

be good, but the minute my child gets out of school, I don't give a damn anymore if I'm the average citizen because after all my kid's out of school now, what do I care? We have failed in this country by and large -- this is a bit of a caricature because obviously there are some people without kids in school who understand, but to a large extent we have failed to create a feeling in this country that the education of children is not an individual good for a family or for a particular child, but that those children are the future either inventors or criminals or drug addicts or taxpayers or welfare clients that providing an education. And that's the rationale for having everybody pay taxes. That's why we don't have each individual pay for the education. If it were merely an individual good, why should anybody pay taxes to educate my child. But we haven't gotten that across very well. So these reports are important because they reflect a source of support that's powerful and that's necessary at a time when the number of direct customers and people directly interested in education declined in both numbers and the influence. Furthermore, it's an important source of support for another reason, and that is that for the first time last year the Gallup Poll showed that a majority of the American people favor tuition tax credits, that is, they believe that parents who wanted to take the children from public schools and send them to private or parochial schools should receive some

government tax assistance to help their kids go to private school. And the end result of a program of tuition tax credit will be very clear. A poll was taken last year, I think sponsored by the NIE, which showed that if parents got between 250 and \$500 to help them pay for their child's education in the private schools, that private school enrollment would go from the current 10% of students in this country up to 35% of all students in this country. When you consider the facts that there aren't enough seats in private schools for all those kids, then the private schools will be selective as to who will be taken and you gotta ask yourself if you are the principal of a private school, would you take the kid that's behind, the kid who's handicapped, the kid who's difficult to educate, the kid who presents some behavior problems, or would you pick the best and the brightest kid. There's no question as to which kid would be picked by these schools, and as these kids move off to the private schools, the scores of the public schools will go down, these kids serve as roll models for the other kids. The parents of these children who are not fighting for better public schools and trying to get more aid for education next year, instead of fighting for more aid for public education would be saying why are you only giving me \$500 to pay for the tuition; it's unfair if you're spending 3,000 for a child in public school, why not give me an equal amount. So the whole -- we would end up with a

public school system in this country which would be for those children who could not afford to go to a private school or who went to private school and were kicked out, the public schools will become the charity wards, the equivalent of the hospital charity wards, and we would move over to a private system of education which would largely find schools kids going to Catholic school, Protestant school, Jewish school, Spanish school, whatever, and it would have a tremendous impact on the future of this country, its cohesiveness, the basis of public education to bring youngsters together to have them -- in addition to memorizing a lot of awful things, to learn, to have the experience of being with people of different races, religions and classes and so forth.

So we have a declining national support for schools, we've got these governors and businessmen saying: If you guys shape up we're willing to put up a little money. And then we've got Ronald Reagan for tuition tax credits. We've got the Supreme Court two years ago 5-4 saying that a certain type of tuition tax credit is constitutional. You might even have a Supreme Court who will vote that 9-0 pretty soon or 8-1 depending on the outcome of the election, so we have some rather strong reasons to change.

Now do these businessmen mean what they say? Well, let's look at California. California schools went way down after Proposition 13 and in the last two years California

schools have seen an increase of about 2.7 billion dollars together with a 140 piece page of legislation which tells the kids what to do and the teachers what to do and all sorts of things. How did they get all that money? Well, it wasn't the teachers or the school boards, it was the business roundtable of California that sat down, they hired an offshoot of the Rand Corporation, they sat for a year and a half with all sorts of papers just to -- they passed legislation saying that there is now a state-wide minimum salary -- they pay \$1,000 in California. No locality can hire a teacher for less than 18, I think it goes to 19 next year under law. They did -- they mandated curriculum, they mandated minimum teachers' salaries, they did all sorts of things and they bought a very reluctant conservative Republican Governor, , to sign the legislation two years in a row. The business community, and the reason it says -- we're gonna lose our industry unless we have talented people in the future. They went over the records of high school kids and they said these kids are not learning what we need, we gonna go down, we're not going to be able to meet the competition and they really treated this -- they didn't want the schools to become vocational schools, they didn't want anybody to learn the particular machinery. These were not narrow people saying: Hey, bring me a factory worker. No, they wanted people who read, appreciated English literature, learned foreign languages,

I mean they don't know right now what they're gonna need 7 or 8 years from now, but they know they're gonna need educated people. The same thing happened in Texas. H. Ross Perone, the leader of a commission on education, came out with a report saying that \$5 billion -- \$5 billion. Now he didn't get it, they only got 2.8 billion, but the State of Texas which was giving money away in the last 8 years because of their tax receipts, reducing taxes, had a governor that went to the legislature and, as a result of this report by Ross Perone and his business associates, raised taxes for the first time in recent years in Texas, and it was for the purpose of improving education by the amount of almost \$3 billion. The State of Tennessee the same thing. The State of Florida, the governor pulled the business community together. You know there they've got buttons: Education Means Business. And so what's happening is something that's very exciting. Will it last? I think it will. This is not a fad. This is not Sputnik. It's not the baby boom. These are very important powerful people who realize -- but I would give the analogy of the energy crisis a few years ago. Now we no longer have automobiles waiting on line for gasoline. As a matter of fact, the price of gasoline is going down, however, national and other policies, and the individual choice is still considered. But the experience of the energy crisis, even if we've got a temporary surplus of energy, is not basically -- we will understand the crisis hasn't gone away and that it could still dry up and

[illegible]

Well, I think the same thing has happened with respect to education. I think that this jolt, especially of people in positions of power and influence, there's a story, which I understand is a true story, told by one of the southern governors. Texas Instruments was looking around for a new place to build a plant in various southern states, and they were -- the interview committee was going around talking to governors of these southern states and the governors were all ready to answer what they knew would be the two major questions, and the two major questions were: 1) What tax abatements would we have if we move here and build? And the other one was: What's the union situation? Do we have a relatively union-free environment? And of the course the governors were asked those questions, but they were shocked because they were all asked two questions as well, which they were not prepared to answer. One was: What is the educational capacity of this State to turn out the kind of people we need to work in this business? 2) What are the

artistic and cultural facilities that you have which would make intelligent and social want to live in the community and relocate to this part of the world? The second two they could not answer, and so you have the interesting phenomenon of states that have previously neglected education: Florida, Mississippi, North Carolina, Republican governor of Tennessee coming up with what would be 1.4 billion dollars in states like New York or California on a one-year program. I think that somehow -- I don't know what can be done in terms of television with this, but a couple of problems that you ought to know. It's going to be very difficult for governors to sustain this. When a governor stands up and says: All right, I'm putting out \$2.8 billion, Mark White in Texas, \$2.8 billion to improve our schools, he's going to make all sorts of promises. There will be fewer dropouts, the SAT scores are gonna go up, kids are gonna start learning algebra, start learning foreign languages. Well, you know, maybe they will, but not next year or the year after that. I mean, if something is going to happen it's gonna happen 10 years from now. I mean, the high school kid who is not already not reading or writing or anything else, the fact that you pump billions of dollars in schools, is not gonna change -- the high school kids life and attitude is largely formed already. Maybe you can change a few. The real change will come about with the kids who are very very young in terms of a system -- if the overall system changes and improves, you can expect to see these things. But what governor can afford to risk his

political future on something that's going to happen long after he's out of political life? I mean, he's gonna be asked two or four years from now when he runs again: Look, you raised taxes, billions of dollars, you promised, what has happened? So somehow there needs to be a support system for this long-range investment. I don't know how many of you saw the report that came out of Ipsalanti, Michigan on this early child program. Any of you see that? We'll spend a second on that.

Sixteen years ago in Ipsalanti, they thought of an experiment. They had about 250-300 black youngsters, very poor families, I mean, the profile that you would get on a real, you know, very realistic program of what family life is like, what the economics is like, and everything else, and they took tests of these kids out of a hat, their names, and they put them into a very good Head Start type of program. On current dollars they'd be spending about 4800 bucks a kid a year. And then they took the other half of the kids whose names they didn't pick out of the hat and they didn't do anything for them. And these kids all went to the pretty much the same elementary schools, junior high schools and high schools, and they followed these kids for 16 years, so they're now 19 years old. And you know the wonderful thing about this is that if you are Mr. Scrooge, if you don't give a damn about children or about people, if all you're interested in is the almighty dollar, you

would invest in this, because what it shows is that more of these kids graduated high school, fewer unemployed, tremendous reduction in teenage pregnancies, and furthermore not only -- fewer in jail, etc. -- and by very substantial margins. So that the costs -- but now we have, by the time a kid graduates high school he is already made up for the money spent on him in those two years because all these other kids needed special education, special remedial instruction, so the actual amount spent on the education of the kids who got the two extra years turns out to be less than the amount -- I mean, it's a terrific case showing that if you invest early enough you get a payoff, both in social terms and human terms. Well, that kind of thing which is extremely important to get across to the American people, because the need for quick answers in education -- you know, invest this and next year the scores will be up and everyone will be reading Shakespeare, are ridiculous.

Let me now move to a related topic. So here we've got all this interest. We've got governors and businessmen saying put the money in. We've got legislation tightening up curriculum and so forth, and we are about to experience a terrible teacher choice. There is a very great crisis. And the crisis comes about for several reasons. One was somewhere around 1974-75, everybody saw that teachers were being laid off in New York and in Chicago, and that baby boomers left and school enrollments declined, there's a job loss so

that people -- kids who are in college and making job choices, the kids who were good at math, were good at science, were good at writing, were good at something else, hey, I'm not going on into a field where there are no jobs, and it was easy for them to go into some other department or other field, and that left only two groups of people who remained in the education schools. One were those whom the Lord Almighty had told this is the only field you should go into or you're gonna be unhappy, those who are called especially, you know, a few of us. And the other people are people who didn't know how to write or how to count, or how to do anything else, and so they couldn't get into any other field and so they stayed in this one cause it was easier. Those in education on a national basis really are at the present time rock bottom, and given entry standards in many of these institutions, rock bottom really means illiterate and unfit to teach, not just rock bottom by some ancient comparison, but very very bad. And it's not enough, not enough. Even if they took every one of them you'd have a shortage.

Now why is that? One reason as I just pointed out is that when the word goes out that there are no jobs who people who have options leave, leaving those who don't have options, but there's another reason too, and that is that in the past we have been blessed, public schools are blessed because we were able to get talented people because of mis-

fortunes elsewhere. There's a great depression in the 1930s; the public schools got a million teachers; they were great. They're now just about all retired. Then came the end of World War II we had military conscriptions. Well, if we taught in the difficult school you were draft exempt, so we got hundreds of thousands of young men who preferred to fight with the kids in schools than fight in Korea or Vietnam, and so we got a lot of talented youngsters who then, after they stay for 7 or 8 years, stay on many of them. Of course the biggest school account was women because if you were women you'd either become a teacher or a nurse and that's it, and so discrimination against women and job patterns was the basic way of finding talent for public schools. And now women of course are making a statement that a lot of them won't go into teaching because that used to be the -- was the only thing, so now even if it were all of a sudden improved and better, women are in every other field, I mean, the number of women entering is down, the number of talented women is down, so that here we are. For the first time public education has to compete with the open market the same as any business. It can no longer just wait and say: Ha!, Ha!, because of the draft or the depression or discrimination against women. We don't have to pay a damn thing. You people have no other place to go. Come on! We had some kind of wonderful situation where you were able to get people at a lower rate because they were being pushed in by other forces. Those pushing forces are no longer there.

And so the significance of the, you know, \$12,000 or \$13,000 starting salary as against -- I'm not gonna compare it, teachers, surgeons or lawyers, but let's just take the kid who goes to college as a liberal arts graduate and graduates and comes out with a C average. Well, I don't know about here, but New York City kids like that start at \$18,000 or \$19,000 as a trainee in a business firm. You know a starting place where you learn how to help do business forms, or some these are in computers and servicing. And you spend your first one or two or three years learning something. So there's about a \$5,000 gap just at the beginning, not to talk about what happens later on. So we've got salary is part of the problem, not the only. We do have the image question. The image of teachers is partly related to low salaries, but college professors get low salaries. There are others with low salaries. It's also -- working with children is not such a very respected thing now in our society, not considered that high of a calling. Just think of what happens when the last time there was a shortage of teachers back in the 50s and 60s. Now if there is a shortage of doctors they do not advertise in the local papers saying that anybody who has ever taken a biology course can get an emergency certificate in surgery or in medicine. Or if there's a shortage of lawyers they don't do that. But yet the routine way of solving a teacher shortage, and you're gonna see it right now, is that if you don't have an adequate number of teachers you just ask people

who have had a college education to come for an emergency certificate. So that you can routinely suspend whatever the qualifications you, that the state says there ought to be, because to a certain extent it's considered to be a child minding function, child minding. So we've got another part of the problem in terms of attracting and retaining teachers aside from the salary issue and aside from the status issue is the nature of the work. Being locked in a room with 30, 35 children for your entire life, it has it's great moments. It does. But the lack of relationship to other adults, with other adults, the isolation. I'll tell you something. In 1975 in New York City we had a unique experience and that is because of the fiscal crisis in the City, 15,000 teachers were laid off in one day. Now, you know a lot of people become teachers because they had good teachers in school and they're good at school themselves and they're a little afraid of the outside world, and they heard that teaching is a secure position even if you don't get a lot of money. So they -- a lot of people becoming a teacher is a way of staying in school which is the place you've always stayed, and not, you know, trying your hand at the outside which is kind of unfamiliar territory. And here they were, 15,000 of them were dismissed one day and then a year and a half later the City revived and got some money and sent letters out to these 15,000 people saying come on back. Out of the 15,000, 2800 came back and we wrote letters to the others, and we made phone calls to

find out why weren't they coming -- this was their chosen profession. And we have letters saying teaching is like working in a coal mine, they say. Like being locked in. We all have our summer vacations now, but wherever they work, whether they were making more money or less, some of them made less, wherever they were they felt they had been liberated. They felt that teaching was a very confined, narrow, being locked up with children, a lot of people have realized that.

Well, I just want to make one final point. One final point is one of the things we're trying to do is we're trying to do something on salaries, we're trying to do something on imagery, but the final point I just talked about -- think of yourself now you're a high school kid, you're about to go to college here in California and last year they put all this money into education and there's this famous report, but at the same time as you see all these good things happening, namely, teachers' salaries are going up and there's a lot of concern, you also see the legislature has now passed a 140 page piece of legislation and you got to say to yourself you know, they're not telling surgeons to cut a little to the left or the the right, they're not passing legislation telling dentists what to or hair-dressers, but every one of these states is telling teachers here's the subject you have to teach, here's the number of minutes, the number of this, the more the state legislature

does in a sense to improve education is sending another message out saying the people who run this are a bunch of idiots. We can't trust the teachers or the principal or the local school board or the superintendent. If members of the legislature don't pass 140 pages telling all these different people what to do, they're not gonna know what the hell to do. You're not gonna get very many intelligent people coming into a field where somebody from afar is telling them what to do. So one of the answers here is to move toward professionalization of the field.

Now doctors used to be like this. If you go back to the turn of the century, the training programs for doctors, their status, their salaries, lawyers at one time the same, that perhaps the only hope of getting a sufficient number of talented and bright people say, listen, you're not gonna be locked in a room with children your whole life and you're not gonna be told what to do constantly. That within this field will be experts in textbook selection that you yourself, through committees of your own, will help to decide who enters the profession in the future, will train people, will make decisions as to the allocation of resources within the institution, that in addition to the relationship with children you are going to exercise some power, you're gonna be viewed by the community, by the political structure, and exercising this power, and you're gonna spend part of your lives outside the classroom where you're locked in with

children talking with other adults and that this is a new type of life, a new type of image for teacher. I think that if we can move toward that we'd have hope of attracting some people from a different cut than the group we're getting now.

END SIDE ONE
