

*Edo Ropavolisa*  
*Julia Shaker*

ANNOUNCER: Welcome to this program recorded at the American Educational Research Association's 1985 Annual Meeting. Our topic is, Mandated Assessment of Practicing Teachers: The Policy Perspective.

Now to our Moderator, who will introduce the program.

MODERATOR: We in educational research could complain about the fact that there was no apparent relationship between research and policy; between the life of the mind and the lags of practice and decision-making and governance, but while we complain there is I suspect a certain sense of comfort in living in a kind of impregnable ivory tower. For while it might occasionally have been lonely, solitude was comforting as well.

I find that we have entered a new era in educational research, and that era is one in which suddenly educational research is being taken seriously, so seriously that questions of policy regarding teaching, regarding the organization of schools, the allocation of resources to them, are at least apparently being based upon the results of research, and for many of us, that ends up being a good deal more frightening

than it was to simply be ignored.

There is probably no more important area in which this conjunction of research and evaluation on the one hand and of policy on the other has and is occurring, than in the field of teaching, the evaluation of teachers, certification of licensure for teachers.

It is in the context of one state's developing policies in this area that we are going to be discussing the mandated assessment of teachers this morning. We are quite fortunate to have three participants in this panel discussion.

On my left, Albert Shanker, President of the American Federation of Teachers, Vice-President of the AFL-CIO; a native New Yorker, a graduate of the University of Illinois whose graduate work was at Columbia University, of course in that field that all labor leaders must know best; philosophy, a Gaelian at heart and probably in mind as well, who has been masquerading as a labor leader all these years while truly a philosopher himself.

He is the only member of AERA who has ever been specifically referred to in a Woody Allen movie -- was it *Sleeper*? Yes. I have to paraphrase, but the scene was one in which the character played by Woody Allen was trying to describe

what had caused the atomic holocaust that had ended either New York City or the world, I'm not sure which -- class inclusion; the world is a little smaller, but not much -- and he said, You see, there was this man named Albert Shanker, and he got ahold of the bomb. I must say these were the days of a much younger Albert Shanker, who was militant and dangersous. Now we have a mellow Albert Shanker, who is militant and dangerous.

On my immediate right, Governor Bill Clinton of Arkansas, who is currently in his third term as governor, to which he was elected in 1984. In 1978, he was elected to his first term, then the Nation's youngest governor. Two years later, the people of Arkansas gave him a brief opportunity to be the Nation's youngest ex-governor. But not taking that too seriously, he immediately came back in the next election, and has been governor again since 1982.

He has become noteworthy to this community because of the centrality of matters of educational standards to his conception of the conditions for the future development, especially economic development of the State of Arkansas, and for that reason has made educational standards with special reference to teachers very much the centerpiece of his administration's activities.

He has introduced bills to raise new standards, has succeeded, not without difficulty, in getting tax increases passed in Arkansas to support the raising of the standards, and it is one part of those standards, namely the mandated assessment of teachers that is the focus of our work today.

I think we should also recognize that he is a former member of a higher education academy, having taught in the law schools of both the University of Arkansas at Fayetteville and at Little Rock, but I think we also ought to treat him with a certain gentleness and kindness this morning, because in the words of my adolescent children, he's rather bummed out this morning; he is a graduate of the Georgetown University Law School, and doesn't wish to see anyone from Villanova for at least 24 hours.

On my far right, the distinguished past president of this association and one of the real statesmen of our profession, John Goodladd. John has actively assumed leadership in this field for many years, ranging from his earlier contributions to our conceptions of non-graded schooling to his most recent, very important volume, "A Place Called School" which summarized many years of intensive study of America's classrooms rather than intensive rhetoric which we so often get in place of careful research and analysis.

He has repeatedly been dealing with the questions of, What ought schools to be? What are they in fact like? and Under what circumstances can we help them emerge from their present condition, the conditions of the sort they ought to resemble.

He is a native of Western Canada, got his Ph.D. in this city at the University of Chicago, where he also taught for a number of years; he then spent many years as Dean at UCLA, and is now Professor of Education at the University of Washington. And if you can see a pattern there, you can see that he is coming full circle; getting closer and closer to a return to, sounds like Western Canada again, John.

We have set the following ground rules for this morning's discussion. Each speaker will begin with an opening statement. That opening statement will last no more than 15 minutes. If it lasts more than 15 minutes, John Goodladd is going to leave the podium, unless John is the one who takes more than 15 minutes, in which case the rest of of will leave the podium, because we want to leave as much time as possible for dialogue among the members of the panel.

My role will be to moderate, which means to keep time, to call on panelists if they all want to talk at once; to

maintain order and discipline; to provoke, if things get a little bit too agreeable; and to moderate in the unlikely event that things get too hot and nasty.

We would like to begin with a description of the Arkansas program, the circumstances which led to its development, and the governor's sense of where it is and where it's going.

Governor Bill Clinton.

GOVERNOR CLINTON: Thank you. Thank you very much, Lee. Ladies and gentlemen, I would like to use my 15 minutes, or I'll quit whenever John stands up. If he stands up for 15 minutes I guess it will be because he has to excuse himself, but we've all promised not to be too long-winded.

I think it is important, though, to give a little background to the Arkansas teacher testing law and the controversy which it has generated throughout America. Our state will be 150 years old next year. For most of its existence, it has been one of the poorest states in America. Very rural, very dependent upon the farm economy.

Education has always been an avenue of individual exit from a cycle of poverty for both whites and blacks in my State. I grew up in a family raised by a stepfather who did not

have a high school diploma, for example, and I was always sort of raised to know, you know, that I had to have an education in order to do better. There is some dispute in my family about whether I have, with my education.

That has always been part of the ethic of America, and it is certainly part of the ethic of the poorer states in our country. In the last ten years, when America has gone through a set of wrenching set of economic changes with significant percentages of Americans actually suffering a decline in their real living standards and the number of poor people escalating to its highest percentage of our population in the last 20 years, it is becoming increasingly apparent that states which have relatively undereducated workforces and citizenries are going to be on the bottom end of the economic ladder, perhaps permanently, as long as the jobs which are growing in number depend upon a core of reall well-educated people.

That is nowhere better illustrated than in the comparative unemployment rate of states, month in and month out. My state, for example, has an unemployment rate 2 percent above the national average. The state with the lowest unemployment rate last month was Massachusetts, with an unemployment rate 3 percent

below the national average. It is no coincidence that Massachusetts also has the most well-educated workforce in America, in spite of the fact that its tax rate is more than twice the national average, economic prosperity seems to be everywhere in evidence there.

So in 1983, in the aftermath of the Report of the National Commission on Excellence in Education, which swept the country and struck a responsive chord in people's deepest feelings all across America, I think it is fair to say that the Southern States responded more quickly and more comprehensively in part because of our heritage of poverty, our deep recognition that for our individual citizens, education was often the only way out, and our dawning recognition that for the economies of our state and their futures, education might be the only way we could ever achieve a standard of living and an unemployment rate that at least were equal to the national average, if not better.

I had a history of activity in education which went back to 1979 in my first term as Governor, which I think is important to summarize very briefly so you get some feeling about how this teacher testing law came about.

In 1979, without a tax increase but with ample



state revenues, we allocated enough money to public education to give our school teachers the biggest pay increase in the history of the state. We also became the seventh or eighth state, I think at that time, to pass a law requiring teachers to pass an exam before they could be initially certified, and to require teachers who were already certified, but who wished to add to their certification, to pass an examination.

We then decided over the next year what that examination would be and basically, it was the NTE in the appropriate subject area. In 1980 we began to give the test. The test was given in '80, '81 and '82 on a more or less experimental basis, and then in '83 for the first time it was given on a pass-fail basis.

In 1983, at the beginning of my second major session of the legislature, we improved the fair dismissal law to try to provide more job protection for teachers from unfair terminations; strengthen the contract protections for teachers, and passed a law which set up an education standards committee to review all the educational standards of the State and come back and recommend changes to upgrade education.

I appointed my wife chairman of the committee, and a

distinguished group of Arkansans went throughout the State, had hearings in every county in the State, and came up with a very comprehensive and I think quite innovative system of new school standards, which included more requirements for graduation than traditional things; more requirements for what the schools had to offer in order to be certified as schools, and a rather innovative system of student testing and remediation for inadequacies in basic skills for students.

We had the report, and I was thinking about calling a special session to raise the sales tax for the first time in 26 years. It was obvious to me that one of the things that came out of all these hearings was not being addressed, and that was the whole question of teacher competence.

Throughout the State, which then had the lowest teacher salaries in America because Mississippi had just raised taxes and salaries, and the lowest per capita tax burden in America, throughout the State people would come into these hearings or write us letters, literally thousands of letters, and say: You know, it's okay with us if you raise taxes, and we want the teacher pay to be raised, and we want to put more money into schools, but you have got to address this problem of teacher

competence, which is not a majority problem, but is a problem that affects a not insignificant number of our teachers.

We looked around and recognized that the vast majority of our teachers had not been part of this entry level test process, which we had only begun in 1980. So before we called the Legislature into session, I kind of developed, in concert with some of our staff people, this idea that we ought to do an inventory test of the basic skills of our teachers and our administrators; because both have to take the test, and have.

So I presented a bill to the Legislature in a special session that did provide for an inventory test of basic skills of teachers and administrators who were already certified, and the law provides that they have to pass the test in order to be recertified. We don't interrupt the present certification, however long it lasts, but in order to be recertified, the basic skills test has to be passed.

Anyone who fails it the first time will have his or her score kept confidential by the State, and must participate in one of a number of remediation programs which will be offered and during a two year period might take the test again as many as four times. But if the test is not passed by the end of the two year period, then that person cannot be recertified.

Anyone who passed the test that was given a couple of weeks ago -- the first time to 25,000 teachers -- will automatically go into our evaluation system, which has been simultaneously developed; a new state-wide system of standards for classroom evaluation and will, if the law remains as it is now, stay in the evaluation system for the remainder of their careers.

There are several questions which have been raised by this whole process. Because Arkansas became the only State ever to require already-certified teachers to pass the competency exam in order to be recertified, as you might imagine it has met with some opposition. I had the dubious distinction within the space of about six weeks of being the first Governor, Democrat or Republican, ever to be publicly condemned by the NEA, and then about six weeks later the NEA published their annual statistics on teacher salary increases, and Arkansas was ranked first in the country in the percentage increase of average teacher salaries.

The two things in my mind were interrelated. First of all, because 40 Members of the House of Representatives signed a letter to me saying that they wouldn't vote for a sales tax increase unless some form of teacher testing or teacher competence legislation passed; and secondly and even more importantly,

because I became absolutely convinced that we had objective evidence that justified this process which we are now going through.

One of the questions we have to answer is, do you believe in competency testing at all. If you do, do you take the position that somehow it is only legitimate for people before they enter the teaching profession, and it's terribly wrong once you certify them initially; because somehow that gives an entitlement to a teacher never to be tested again, no matter what evidence exists in terms of basic skills problems.

No matter what impact you think the whole testing process might have on the ultimate education of the children, which I think we too often lose sight of.

Do you believe we shouldn't do it if there is likely to be a racial disparity in the pass-fail scores the first time the test is given?

Do you believe we shouldn't do it if in this organization it might be interesting; if we sort of have to fly by the seat of our pants when we first do it because there is no educational research to justify the decision to do it or not to do it.

Do you believe that we should do it or should not do it based on certain ancillary impacts of the process, the most

important of which is that at least in our State because we had a bitter fight over it, there was obviously some significant damage to teacher morale, as a consequence of this whole long fight.

Those are some of the questions, it seems to me, that have to be answered. I have answered those questions in my own mind in the affirmative; I believe very strongly in what we did, and I hope the conversations today will help to clarify why.

Thank you very much.

[Applause.]

MR. SHANKER: In dealing with the issue, I would like to deal with it in part in terms of the examination just given to teachers in Arkansas, and I would also like to deal with the issue in a broader sense; namely, should something like this become policy in other states or indeed across the country.

Since I have been accused of being a philosopher, I think I will start with a quotation by George Santyana, who at one time said that "Fanatacism consists in redoubling your efforts after you have forgotten your goals."

Now I would like to start by asking the question, just what are our goals? I believe that our goals are common. I think that there is, as a result of the concern expressed

through all of these reports, and the concern created publicly that we understand that we not going to improve public education in America without also maintaining standards of teachers, and we also know that we are about to go into a period when the recruitment of teachers and their retention in adequate numbers is going to be a major national problem. We no longer have the victims of the 1930s Depression who staffed our schools and did an excellent job; we no longer have those who are trying to avoid military service and will accept the teaching; they will rather fight in our schools rather than overseas. And of course we no longer have a crew of talented women who feel that this is one of two professions that they can enter.

We also have, generally, a smaller cohort graduating high schools and going into colleges. So the question is, how do we attract people? Now, I could understand if we had 30 or 40 or 50 outstanding applicants waiting for each one of these positions that we might put up a system of screening and examinations which would be very tough, perhaps even for those here now. You might say, here we have a long waiting line. Many years ago we might have had a poor procedure and might have been compelled to employ people who indeed are not qualified. But we are not about

to face that; we are about to face a very great shortage.

Therefore, one of the things we have to ask ourselves is whether the imposition of an examination like this, even if it does find that X number of practicing teachers shouldn't be practicing, and even after they take the test a second, a third and fourth time or whatever it is, we finally by general agreement would say the following people should not be teaching.

What other consequences will flow from this action? Will the imposition of such an examination on practicing teachers be something which is likely to have no effect on those who are now making up their minds to enter the profession; will it have a positive effect or will it have a negative effect?

My view is it will have a very negative effect. One of the phrases that the Governor used, "if the law stays as it is now," an interesting phrase. Now I know that perhaps he was saying that maybe the NEA will get to the legislature two years from now and this will be undone, but also people who are now about to go into teaching are thinking of something else. What if I meet all of the new test requirements and all the new rules and regulations? And I am going into an occupation which is not a particularly good job; the prestige is very low, the pay



is not good, the conditions are poor, and 15 years later some other governor and legislature come along and decide that the examination that I took then was not good enough, or the times have changed. That in addition to all of the other negative features of the job, I now have one other, and that is that from time to time I must place my job security in jeopardy, and also suffer a certain amount of public humiliation.

I think that that is something that has to be very carefully weighed. I myself am very sympathetic to the Governor's point of view, and not just to the point of view that I have just been stating. I do not believe that if somebody made a mistake 15 years ago, that the children of Arkansas or any other state have to live with that mistake for another 15 years.

I do feel, however, that the State comes with dirty hands. The teachers didn't hire themselves. They were hired under a process that was legitimate in the state, and I think the state owes them even more than two chances. It might even owe them some other job in state government. You might have a few jobs that don't require reading, writing and spelling. He just nodded; I hope everybody noted that; I'm still negotiating.

[Laughter.]

I also think that a few other questions have to be raised in terms of the legitimacy of the examination. One has to do with whether teachers are being singled out. There are other professions licensed by our State, and my guess is that we probably have a much more dangerous situation with doctors than we do with teachers. Not that doctors didn't go through a much more rigorous training program in the first place, that did, and took an examination. Well, if one looks back to the thalidomide scandal, for instance, what you find is that in the process of practice that the usual doctor is very, very busy; does not have very much time to do a good deal of reading, gets much of his education from the pill salesmen who come along and say "try this."

The thalidomide scandal, a major part of it was that the doctors didn't even keep records of which women got the samples, so that they had to advertise on radio and television warning women who had pills of a certain color or size to bring them in.

Now much more has changed in the world of medicine in the last 15 or 20 years than has changed in the world of elementary school teaching or English teaching or math teaching.

I happen to think it would be good public policy to require recertification in many fields, and then I would feel much more comfortable. But if we had indeed fields in which there has been tremendous change, and in which we have strong evidence that there has not been any retraining or reeducation, and we single out only one of those fields, I think that we are sending a message.

I would like to raise a few other questions, as to how serious the State is in this certification/recertification process. I think for instance, it is important that we know not just that the NTE, or an examination is being given to all new teachers. In most states, that is a very cruel joke. It is not giving an examination that counts; it is what the cutoff score is.

There are many communities that are now giving the examination; it makes them look very good to the public -- They're testing our teachers. But they are hiring people who are now certified illiterates instead of people who are not known to be illiterates, before they took the examination.

So I think it is legitimate to ask the question whether Arkansas has in some way opted for a fairly high cutoff point.

I think the second question I would like to raise is, have any districts in the State experienced shortages last year? Will any experience shortages in any field this coming September that that school opens? And if District X finds that with the salaries it pays and the conditions it has and the reputation it has and is unable to find 5 or 10 or 15 teachers, will the State permit them to employ teachers who are not regularly certified, as emergency or substitute or other teachers.

If you are allowing that to happen, then giving practicing teachers the boot, the examination then the boot while bringing in new people who cannot meet any standards, it seems to me adds insult to injury. What penalties will be applied to any local education agency that violates such a regulation?

I think that along with such a certification process or to go, some legislation that provides stiff penalties. We do not, if we have a shortage of doctors, go about giving emergency substitute surgeon's licenses. Or lawyers or dentists' licenses. Real estate, hold firm on this.

I would like to ask another one: That is, do you have any secondary schools where you have English or social studies teachers teaching mathematics, chemistry and physics?

If you do, what does that say about requiring everybody to take an examination and then after they take the examination, let's say in their field, you have them teaching in some field in which they could not pass an examination, because you need them, because you are not willing to pay the salaries and provide the conditions necessary to attract the people that you want.

I think we have here not one simple issue of, do you test people and find out who it is that can't read, write or count. But has the State really made a decision to have a strong element of professionalism, to demand competence, and is this merely the first act, a painful one in a transition from the old world to a new world or was this a popular political shot which had to be made in order to get more funds and to get the votes to get the taxes in which teachers had to pay a price and in which the increase in funds and the improvement and the economics of education will be a plus, but the demoralization of the singling out of teachers will be a minus, and perhaps the whole thing will be a wash.

DR. GOODLAND: The original design of this symposium, as I understand it, was to have either one or two speakers and then a discussant who was to be Tom Greene; he is not here

and I am his substitute, given his philosophical background and your philosophical background, I am sure that he would have done a much better job than I in relating to this discussion.

So I have been trying to get myself up to speed very quickly, particularly in view of the fact that I spent some time in Fayetteville, Arkansas three or four weeks ago, where I received an enormous amount of misinformation. The Governor in particular has corrected me in regard to that misinformation, and now I have to decide which body of knowledge is the misinformation and which is the correct body.

The one clear thing is, he has put it out in public and the information that was given me was given privately, and that may make a very major difference, so I am more inclined to take the Governor's word for it than the several sources who tried to inform me while I was in Fayetteville.

I am also convinced, after my opportunity to talk with both Governor Clinton and Albert Shanker last night, I am absolutely convinced also of his desire to improve schools and learning in the State of Arkansas. So what we come down to really is the question of the degree to which the actions being taken will result in that.

In view of the fact that I am, I do have reservations about this particular test in relationship to experienced teachers at the time it is being given, I think I should make my position clear. Let me make that point clear. I am not questioning the test itself in relation to what it is trying to do. A very first rate professional colleague was heavily involved in the preparation of that test; a person who is very demanding of himself and others, and I am convinced that the best possible job and the state of the art at the present time was done in relation to that particular test. So again, that is not the issue either.

My position is that in order to enter the teaching profession there should indeed be examinations designed to determine the competence of teachers in a whole variety of areas. These examinations should be separated from the program preparation process and should be separated from the inservice process subsequently.

In effect, I am identifying a licensing procedure which calls for a professional licensing board. The teaching profession has been slow, glacier-like, in moving in this direction, but I would endorse it heartily. In order to check

this out some years ago, during the time that I was Dean of the Graduate School of Education at UCLA, I did talk with deans of other professional schools, and I recall in particular my conversation with Dean Warren of the law school in regard to this issue.

I said, "What do you do about the bar exams?" He said very little. "We provide the very best possible curriculum we can for the preparation of lawyers, and then they go about taking the bar exam. I believe that about two of our courses have content that we try to direct more or less to these examinations."

In the process, as you know, you have got all kinds of institutions emerging which promise that you will pass the bar exam. The important thing, however, is that you were Class of '86 at Harvard or you were Class of '82 at Stanford. That is the thing that is important; whether or not one passed the bar exam and all that is connected with that, is unknown.

I am impressed by the efforts that have been made in Arkansas to try to keep the examination that is being given a confidential matter.

Let me say on this point that I think the education



profession has been negligent, very negligent in the selection of those going into teaching. It is a hit-or-miss kind of business in many of the teacher-preparing institutions I know. A student shows up, takes a first course in education, takes another course in education, and nobody really knows who is in the teacher education and who isn't until one arrives, perhaps at the student teaching point.

Rather than being a clear admission point, clear requirements for admission, and general education requirements having been met, and a person is brought into a socialization process wherein the idea of continuous learning is stressed as much as possible, and the lifetime learning process of the professional begins. That is almost completely lacking in our business.

So I just want to raise at this point the question of the role of the executive and judiciary branches of government in licensing and testing. I am not at all sure that it is a responsibility of the executive and legislative branches of the State to get involved in statewide testing programs for students. And the statewide testing program is simply paralleling all of that, and that is a whole set of issues that lie there.

I think it is entirely appropriate for the executive

and legislative branches to get involved in setting up and arranging for a professional licensing board. And with the board in place and with a continuing to try to improve the process, then Governor Clinton would not have to worry about going out of office and another governor overturning what he has already done.

Now the next question is, why this test at this time? Albert Shanker has raised several penetrating questions in this area. I am not yet clear what the test is for. Now, Governor Clinton made it very clear; he talked about the test and higher teacher salaries, and then he went on and perhaps he will clarify this more in our discussion, with some beliefs he has about the work of the process itself apart from that obvious political point.

Is it to get rid of poor teachers? Is it to get teachers to straighten up and fly right? Is it to improve schools and learning? If that then we would have to conclude that the relationship between the test and that objective would be very weak indeed.

Then why test these experienced teachers? One of the things that has been said in the State of California is that we need 100,000 new teachers I think by the year 1990.

Last night, Governor Clinton made some observations about the need for new teachers in the State of Arkansas because of an aging teaching force. Now if it is an aging teaching force, they can take the examination four times in a two year period. They are not out of teaching until their present license expired, perhaps six years later. My guess is that large numbers of these teachers will have retired before the apparent intent of the test takes place.

So I wonder why this was not done as a formative evaluative process rather than what appears to be a summative evaluative process with opportunities, then, for remediation.

At this point I would have to raise the question: One of the things that, you know, we are very fond of saying is that we want better role models in the classroom in regard to the ability of teachers to talk, to write, to spell. And it is very popular kind of stuff. Admittedly, we all cringe with some of the experiences we have had in this area, and we know the deficiencies.

Yet we also know that there is in the United States a very large illiterate population. We do know that in the international studies of educational achievement, it was concluded

that the school was least influential in the language area; most influential in math, science and literature. But least influential in the utilization of the language.

I am wondering, given all the movement toward home-based education, the notion of parent selection of teachers and the like, whether or not our efforts would be better directed to engage in a literacy program for those adults who are bringing up the children in the home and therefore are perhaps having the greatest impact on children, particularly at an early age.

So we are getting into the question as to whether or not, if teachers are to have these tests at a certain point in their careers, parents should have these tests at a certain point in their careers. I do not have that question facetiously. I think it will have to be addressed more and more as we move to other forms of delivery systems for young people.

Now, I wonder also one of the strong things I have heard about this program is the enormous enthusiasm for it. That is the immediate, obvious need for this sort of thing. What I have to ask is, what alternatives might have been considered. Were I asked as a citizen, is it very important for teachers to be good role models in regard to their language usage for example?

I would immediately reply: Yes, and everything you can do to improve on that would be all to the good.

But on the other hand, in our studies, we discover that only 56 percent of the parents of the elementary school children opted for the academic objectives of schooling first and were far more -- the remaining 44 percent were far more concerned about some other considerations.

So I am wondering about whether or not there might have been a clear choice of what some of the alternatives might be. For example, I am concerned about teacher quality, but I am more concerned about the quality of teachers having a negative effect on the ecology of the school and on the marginal learner, and indeed on the self-concepts of learners which may not at all correlate with these tests, no matter how carefully they have been prepared.

Gregg Anrich, President of Educational Testing Service, presented a paper at AACTE in which he said, we are not yet able of such testing.

And so I come around again as to why not a pilot program first. Why not a careful study of those who refuse to take the test? For example, I wonder in my own career, when I

resigned from teaching after three years of experience, my salary had gone from \$700 the first year -- not a month; a year -- \$700 the first year to \$800 the second year when I got an enormous promotion to \$1,016 a year as an elementary school principal.

I resigned that position out of frustration, just as our teachers in our sample say the major reason they will go out of teaching is frustration. I wonder, when I reentered, because I was offered a job after having resigned at \$1500 a year, I wonder, and it was very difficult to make that decision go back. What my decision would have been in regard to taking that test. I could have passed the test then; I was very close to my secondary schooling, very close to my normal school preparation; it would have been a breeze to pass that test, but the idea of taking it would have been noxious to me, sufficient to turn me away.

So I would like to look at those taking it and not taking it. I would like to look at the effect of the ecology of the school in regard to the morale of the teachers. I would like to know the correlation between those teachers who should leave as a result of this test and the judgments of parents regarding the quality of those teachers.

Are you sufficiently pleased to give a \$2 increase?

Sufficiently pleased to give a \$100 increase, or so displeased that you would want to give the school a bill for your disappointment?

I think we must remember that when it comes to the real core of education, we have to ask the question: What is the impact on that interaction within the school environment, and what is the impact on the school ecology?

So I would have pleaded for a pilot test. We desperately need social experiments. Educators cannot create those social experiments alone because of the resources it called for. I would hope that our utilization of research in the future would be social experiments related to public policy.

GOVERNOR CLINTON: I would like to respond to what the two speakers said. First of all, with regard to Dr. Goodladd's comments. He said he wasn't clear what the test was for, and maybe I am just inarticulate, but let me try again.

The test was designed to take an inventory of the basic skills of all the teachers and all the administrators presently certified who wished to be recertified. To identify those who have serious problems, based on the passing score of 70 percent, adopted by the Board of Education on the three tests

developed by Dr. Poppin and Ochs, and I do think they did an excellent job.

To identify those who have problems, and then to require them to do better if they are going to be recertified. There are all kinds of ancillary benefits. I do think that the testing process will increase the public's esteem for the teaching profession, and will increase the teacher's esteem for the teaching profession. I will say more about that in a moment.

The main purpose is to do that partiucular job. There is a question I guess, as a matter of policy, about whether the Legislature should have adopted a detailed bill requiring all this rather than letting some professional board do it. We have done our best in our State to let as many of the particular decisions be made by the Board of Education as possible, and let the Legislature do the enabling; the Legislature enable the development of the new school standards, but the Board got to adopt them and to make various changes in them when appropriate.

The Legislature passed enabling legislation for new standards on teacher education and certification and evaluation, but the Board of Education adopted them and can make modifications as appropriate. Very frankly, if you think any Board of Education



would have taken the heat I did to do this, you haven't been fooling with politics enough.

So there are some things that if they are going to be dealt with, have to be dealt with by people in the political arena.

Thirdly, let me say that you can make all these arguments about what we should have done, and how we should have done it, and how we should have experimented with it, and we could have followed around with this thing for four or five years and let the organized opposition build up and let four or five more years of kids' educational careers pass before their parents' eyes, and we would have wound up with nothing, in my view.

So I tried to do this in a way that would involve a professional testing organization and also in the event of an error, give everybody who didn't pass two full years to improve. But I think the time to act was now. Once in a great while, you get the attention of the country or a state or a community riveted on a problem, so that there is a consensus sufficient to provoke fundamental change. That is what happened in this country after the issuance of that national report.

It seems to me that we could have said, "Well we

had better not do it until we study it for four or five more years; the likelihood is that we would have had more "business as usual."

I would like to respond to a couple things that Mr. Shanker said, and Dr. Goodladd said about this whole question of whether this test will make prospective teachers more reluctant to get into teaching and will essentially turn off really dedicated, independent rebellious sorts like Dr. Goodladd.

Let me tell you first all I can give you is personal experience, an anecdote. There is no survey on this, but we have gone, my wife and I have gone to several colleges of education around the state and polled students now in the colleges of education about whether they agree with what we've done, and in no case has there been less than 75 percent support among the students who are going to be teachers, for this test.

Why is that? Because they know they are going to have to take this entry level test, which is harder than the basic skills test, and they know that somebody is going to be keeping them from getting the job who may not even have functional skills unless we do something about it.

The way they view it, because they have come up

through our public schools and they know there is a problem there; what we are doing is nothing but right and nothing but fair and it has increased the desire of bright young people to be teachers, not diminished it.

My wife and I do a reception every year for the valedictorians of all of our high schools, and when they go through the line, hundreds of them, we always ask them: Where are you going to school and what are you going to study? And I can tell you -- again, this is just anecdotes -- last year we had more kids saying they wanted to be teachers than we have ever had in the five years we have been doing this.

Because they think it's hard to get in now because they think it means something, because they think there are some standards and some direction and some energy. My five year old daughter and I were at a restaurant the other night having a late night desert, and the waitress came up to me and she said, "I moved here from another state. I got out of teaching, and I want you to know that I am going back in because of that test. I am glad there is some State in America which is trying to put some minimum standards into education, and I am so thrilled that I am going to have to take this test, and I am dying to take it,

and I can't wait to get back in."

I have had teachers, in the space of about 10 days once last year, I had seven teachers that had been teaching more than 30 years come up to me, still teaching, between 30 and 41 years, still in the classroom and say that they were so pleased that finally somebody was going to do something to make sure that people like them that had these skills and that have shown dedication were going to be given a chance to prove that they were good and that others were going to have to do better or leave the classroom.

So it is a function of attitude. I am sorry that there are a few really gifted teachers that have the attitude that Dr. Goodladd has, because if somebody says, "Why me? How can you do this to me? I have been killing myself in your school system for 20 years and I have made lousy pay and now you are going to load me up with this? It's just an insult. Goodbye."

I have no answer to that person, because if that is your perspective, then what the person says is absolutely true. But if you say to that person, "You're free to take that attitude and if you want to leave, you can," but teaching is not a right, it's a privilege. And if you take that attitude in the face of

overwhelming evidence that not only in our state, but in every state in the country, there are serious basic skills, deficiencies in the teacher corps as a whole, and that evaluation systems have not succeeded in rooting them out, and if you are going to give a test you certainly can't go around exempting this teacher or that teacher or that school district or that one, or somebody that has been here more than 10 years or somebody that has been here more than 15; the only fair way is to include everybody.

The good teachers who support this test support it because they say, it's a waste of a half a day of my life, because I could pass this thing with my eyes closed; but if it helps to upgrade the profession as a whole, I will be more than happy to spend a half day of my life to participate in a process where I can make the top score.

That is a function of attitude and experience. I am sorry that some people are turned off by it, but it's worth it. If you were a parent in a school that had a child come home -- we talk about the ecology of the school. It's due to the ecology of the school. If there is just one teacher, just one, that sends notes home with the child with misspelled words in it, and that teacher makes the same salary as every other teacher in the school

and all the other teachers know about it, and your kid is the most important thing in the world to you, and you know what one year in that child's development can do.

I am sorry, but I think all these objections are academic, and not very important when compared to what is right for a kid. You just think about your child, and you think about all these objections and you put it against how you would feel if your kid was in a classroom with a teacher that sent you a note home that was 20 words long and 4 words are misspelled. You would want something done about it, and you wouldn't want some bureaucratic, long, drawn-out, ten year explanation about how it had to be done.

Let me say, I agree with everything that has been said; I am very upset about the morale problem in Arkansas, and I am in a blue funk about it. If I can figure out what to do about it, I promise you I will. But I don't think it will be this bad in Texas when they give the test next year, because we had the roar in Arkansas, and it was the first time. I think the right side won, even though it's not over.

I don't think it will ever be this bad again in other states. I agree with Mr. Shanker that if we were to have

periodic, regular recertification tests for teachers, it would only be fair to do it for others. Our system contemplates that recertification tests will not be needed in the future because of the entry level test, and because now everybody will be part of the same system. But if we do it for one profession on a regular basis, I agree with him, we ought to do it for all.

Probably what we ought to have is a mixed system, saying that if for example you don't keep up in certain areas, or if you've got a six year teaching certificate but you leave for five years, or if you're like me, if you're a lawyer but you are not really practicing and you leave for four or five years, maybe you ought to have to take a test to get recertified.

But I agree with him; I think the teachers should be treated like other professions on that issue. I agree that the State does not come to this with clean hands. The toughest argument to answer is the teacher who looks at you and says, "You are doing this to me and all these other teachers. What does that say about your institution of higher education? Why aren't you testing the college professors? They are turning us out and giving us passing grades and saying we did just fine." What Dr. Goodladd said is right about the bar exams, because some

of the finest law schools in the country turn out people whose education had no correlation with what's on the bar exam, even the multistate bar. That's true. But not necessarily true with colleges of education, at least it's not supposed to be true.

And our predominantly black institution, the University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff, has just joined the ranks of about a half a dozen colleges in this country which are now giving a warranty along with their education degree. Saying, if we don't teach you what we promise to teach you in the first place, we'll stay with you for three more years. And if you don't pass that test the first time, it is our responsibility to make sure you pass it, if you have problems in the classroom in the first three years, it is our responsibility to work with you to help you overcome it. If we don't do it, we are violating our contractual obligation to you.

I suggested last night in our conversation, I think on the teacher test anyway, that every state that has got an entry level test, if a student graduated from a public institution of higher education in that State with acceptable grades, let's say a C average or better, then failed the entry level test twice, I think the student ought to be entitled to get



his or her tuition back. That would slow down some of this grade inflation, and this sort of, you know, pretending that somebody is getting something they're not.

Educational fraud is just as objectionable in higher education as it is in public education. So I agree, there are all kinds of objections. This process, I am sure, is imperfect; I am sure it has faults, and there are lots of objections you can raise.

Here is what we decided: You've got to start someplace, and it seemed to me that the most important starting place was the point of contact, where the magic is supposed to occur between the teacher and the child. So I think we started in the right place, and I hope we can do all these other things that they say we ought to do. Thank you.

[Applause.]

MR. SHANKER: It's hard to disagree, and I don't. I still would like an answer to the question of what happens when there's a shortage next September, whether standards are going to be relaxed. If they are, then I think you'll have a lot of people to answer to. I hope your answer is that you do have a, that you mean it, you put this system in place and that

there aren't going to be any exceptions, and the teachers will be teaching in license, and the district isn't paying enough money to hire qualified teachers, you are not going to let them hire teachers who are not qualified under your current standards.

I think the second point that needs to be made is that what is happening here and what is about to happen in Texas, even if there weren't other good reasons underlines the need for a professional board such as the one John Goodladd has talked about and which I called for a few months ago, and I would go further and say that we need a national teacher examination, not one sponsored by the government but one put together by such a board, because I think we need to be able to tell the public and the members of the profession that these standards are not going to be superelastic on the basis of supply and demand, and I think that just as businesses move from state to state on the basis of a number of criteria, I think one of those things ought to be, one of the questions that ought to be an open issue is, what standards does the state have? Do they conform to some national standard, or do they require something above that?

I think if we don't have that, what we have seen here is likely to be repeated elsewhere. I think the speech that

Governor Clinton just made was so strong, so appealing -- I must say that when it was first announced that in the New York Times what you were going to do, a bunch of people came into my office and said, "Aren't you going to blast that?" And I sat there and gave almost the speech you just gave to them.

I hadn't heard your speech, but it makes an awful lot of sense, and we have all had that experience, and this will not stop in Arkansas or in Texas. I would hope that in some places they would say that our teacher turnover is going to be so great in the new future that we will do it with new entrants, and that we will have a system where people are observing teachers in the classroom, will find those who can't spell or can't count.

I think that one of the things that I find very disturbing in this is that I think that it's very important that teachers and their organizations be seen as acting in the interests of their client. We are not going to move from where we are now, which is sort of a factory model, to a new professional model unless the public develops some trust and unless teachers earn that trust.

Every confrontation of this sort which puts a teacher organization into a position which is against the public

interest, is one which delays the time when the public will trust teachers to take responsibility for their own profession.

Now I put that forward not just as a desirable ideal but as something which in this next period is absolutely necessary if we are going to have the kind of schools that we are talking about. We have in a very short period of time come from a time when a teacher was a relatively uneducated, training school graduate; very educated compared to the general public, to a time when the entire public is very well educated and demands more, and teachers are very well educated. We are not going to get good people coming to work in our schools and be treated the way they are treated now.

I am not just talking about reexamination. I understand that is a one-shot process. What I am talking about is the way they are treated with rules and regulations. You are not going to get a person who thinks of himself or herself as a mathematician or chemist or an expert in English literature; you are not going to get a person like that who is going to be supervised in the usual sense.

One of the things I would like to know is what your continuing evaluation process is. You are not going to get people

who are not allowed some discretion. You are not going to get people, and if they see the legislature -- not just in your State but in California and Texas -- passing 150 or 300 pages of rules and regulations telling them which textbooks to use, what materials to use, how much time to spend on it; they are going to say "Gee, nobody does that for any other field. They think we're a bunch of idiots."

I can understand that if you hire people for \$12,000 a year, you had better watch them closely; I would.

[Laughter.]

DR. GOODLADD: I wish we had more time, because your last statement puzzles me a little bit; just before that, and that is, it seems to me as I look back over this past hour, we're absolutely agreed on goals. Absolutely agreed on goals. I could only nod my head in agreement in regard to your impassioned rhetoric about the need for better teachers, better schools and all of that.

I mean, it's great. It flies in Arkansas, it flies here. I have no objection to all of that. I would like to have made that speech. And I think you may miss my point. I am not calling for a lack of standards; I may be calling for higher

standards than you are, but I know you'd agree with me.

So let me repeat: I am talking about getting people into teaching and looking at their academic records from the beginning, and then with a rigorous program, having them to confront a separated kind of licensing procedure of the kind that Al Shanker is talking about.

I would go further. It doesn't bother me, Al, to contemplate a teacher shortage. It might be very, very useful if indeed we were going to let that shortage exist and not simply proceed to give certification temporarily to people perhaps by passing the test. It happens in history over and over when those shortages occur.

Supposing instead we were to say, We're not going to admit you into a teacher education program unless you meet the general education standards and other standards to be determined. Secondly, we are not going to admit you to a teacher education program unless a clinical experience that we are prepared to certify is available, because we know that teachers in their student teaching placements are repeating the conventional methods of teaching because they do not encounter alternatives.

But supposing we said, every teacher is to have exposure to at least a half dozen pedagogical procedures. I would

be willing to say, you don't let a teacher into your teacher education program unless you can provide that kind of placement. That is where the emphasis has to be.

Now then, if you take the Governor's rhetoric, my theory is simply, is there going to be the payoff in terms of attracting better people and the like, any greater than the payoff on this other alternative. I am also saying it is an addition, because I think you're saying and I hope you're saying this is a transition; this will go out; and we will move to this other kind of structure.

If that is the case, I think we have to very much avoid getting caught up in the particulars of a procedure presumed to produce quality that is not eliminated from the record. Because the states are now laden with designs to improve a whole variety of things in education, and those bills are still in place. Some of the gathering of data and procedures are still going on. Bundles of paper are coming into the Capitol still from past bills.

So perhaps one of your enactments in going out of office would be to put that out of business and put in the alternative that is being proposed, which is designed to fulfill your purpose.

I would like to come back to the notion of social experiments, and maybe that is a misunderstood phrase. Or Ebran from Brenner and Arfield has been proposing it for years, because he says "We can't find out significant things until you have natural settings which you can study in transition."

A good example of this was the utilization of student tests in Ireland. Ireland had never had any testing at all, and so the expertise of the United States in this field was dumped on Ireland in order to see what would happen, if youngsters were given achievement test scores, now that we are able to actually conduct that kind of social experiment.

What I am talking about in a social experiment is not messing around for four or five years. What I am talking about is doing precisely what you did with a random sample of teachers asked to take the exam, and making sure you've got the full diversity in that random sample. I don't think many would have refused, particularly with the confidentiality involved.

Finding out what happened over a relatively brief period of time; two or three years, which about covers the history that you have been interested in this. You would have resolved your morale problem in that kind of thing.



Now the other thing that troubles me a little bit when you talked about this messing around period, is that the opposition might have been mounted, and nothing would have happened. I envision, rather, a dialogue. What do we do in a democracy? We talk. We talk.

If indeed the result of that talking resulted in your not being able to introduce what you would introduce, I would say that the democratic process had worked. Instead, it sounds a little, and this bothers me that you are afraid of such a process, and people at your level have to act quickly before we find out what you are doing.

So I worry about the extent to which, and maybe you are suffering a bit from the fact that this is coming on top of so many other enactments.

I was in Georgia in December, addressing the Georgia School Board's association, and following that my wife and I spent a lovely weekend in Savannah, Georgia, and I didn't have any indigestion until the Savannah Daily News arrived with the morning coffee, and it was reporting the Governor's initiative in Georgia which had just been presented to the school boards at that same conference I had attended on Friday.

The heading said, "Georgia Ranks 9th in School Reform." I read on, and I didn't know whether to laugh or cry, and you I think have given the right response -- [laughter] -- and then I read a little further and it said, "Colorado, with only two enactments, ranks at the bottom." I read on and I discovered that Secretary Bell -- it was Bell at that time and his colleagues -- had identified 20 reforms that were commonly agreed to in the commission reports. They had then done a quick study of legislative action in the 50 states and had discovered that Georgia had passed 14, I think it was, and ranked 9th in school reform.

Colorado, where they have been trying desperately to go slow on legislative action, had only two, so they are ranked at the bottom. And then I read on a little further and it said, "Of course, we don't know what the consequences of these reforms will be; we don't know the quality of them" -- but that was just a kind of a throwaway in the rest of the article.

[Laughter.]

I was a little surprised when my good friend, Calvin Frazer, the state superintendent for Colorado, on my telling him about this. Incidentally, when I reported that in Colorado, reported that they were on the bottom to an audience

of educators, they cheered.

When I reported to Calvin Frazer, and his responsibility in the State, while Calvin recognized what I was talking about, nonetheless to be at the bottom in anything was very disturbing, and that disturbed me.

So I think perhaps part of the heat you're getting comes because of this extraordinary array of enactments from 165 commission reports, 3 or 4 per state, being dumped, as Al Shanker is saying, and leaving us wondering what the impact of all of this -- and how many of these will be unlegislated at some point when we discover that they're not doing what they were intended to do.

[Applause.]

GOVERNOR CLINTON: I would like to respond to two points that have been made that I haven't responded to; one involves this whole business of experimentation. I suppose that it appeared that I was being a little too hard on Dr. Goodladd's suggestion, and then he maybe was a little too hard on me; he may even have gotten the better of that argument, I don't know, but you'll have to vote on that.

Let me try to say again why I decided that an

experimental exam was not appropriate. We had eight months worth of hearings, and accumulated an enormous amount of evidence which indicated to me that there was a basic skills problem that should be addressed by this exam, and I didn't think the experimental approach would have been particularly productive; and it seemed to me we were going to have to give a remediation period if we gave the exam.

Let me also say something that I feel very strongly about: If you are dealing with basic skills, with any reasonable passing score, whether it should be higher or lower than we have or whatever, most of the people; the overwhelming majority of the people who don't pass will not pass because they lack the capacity to know what is being measured on the test, but because they themselves have had deficiencies in their own educational background; and that's why I think this remediation period is so important.

That is why I also do not accept the inevitability of a significant racial disparity, either. I think that is not necessarily true. If you have a period of time where you give people the opportunity to realize their capacities.

But, on the other hand, I fully agree with him

about the experimentation point generally. For example, we have not followed the lead of Tennessee or Florida or some other states, to rush into this career ladder business, not because I don't think it's a fine idea; I think it is a fine idea.

We have not done it for two reasons: One, we need to get our base pay up before we get into the career ladder business; and two, it seems to me there are several different models you can adopt and if the teacher's don't have confidence in it, you really are going to have this ecology of school problem, because if somebody is getting a higher salary than you are that's been there no longer and has no more responsibility, it's going to drive you into a deep hole unless you understand the process by which the salary was set, and probably unless you participated in the process in some way.

So we are going to have, for example, a career ladder commission and a two year experiment, and we are going to have to set up six different models in six different school districts, and, Mr. Shanker, the process by and large will be dominated by teachers at the local level and on the commission, because unless they like it, what's the point of doing it? Unless they have confidence in the process as a group, why should we do it?

So I agree with that.

Let me respond -- just say one other thing, too, with regard to the question of whether this testing process will aggravate the teacher shortage, which in Arkansas will perhaps exist because of the new requirements for science and math courses to be offered in all school districts, and I'm sure that will be true even in states where there's not otherwise a teacher shortage.

We have not done what you suggested, but we have done what Dr. Goodladd suggested is a bad thing. That is, you can get an emergency certificate in Arkansas in a shortage area if you pass the test, and you don't have the education courses, for a limited period of time as long as you undertake the education courses during that period. It seemed to me to be a reasonable compromise.

Given the commitment our people have made to higher teacher pay, to make it more attractive, and let me just tell you what that commitment is. When I took office in 1983 we had the lowest per capita taxation in the country; we had the lowest teacher salaries in the country and the next to lowest investment per child in the country. We raised the sales tax for the first

time in 26 years; gave all the money to education; 70-plus percent to public education, about 30 to higher education and vocational education.

We then required for the first time that a fixed percentage of both state and local aid be devoted to teacher salaries. 70 percent of state and local aid. Since that time, in March of '84 and March of '85, we have had 350 millage elections. In March of '84, 111 school districts, the largest we had in a month of Sundays -- of 360, 111 had millage elections and almost 90 passed. In March of '85, 239 of our 360 districts had school millage elections, and 176 of them passed. 70 percent of 350 school millage elections passed in a state that has the next to the lowest per capita income in the country, and has historically been militantly anti-property tax.

So I think you can see that our voters do not foresee this testing law as being anti-teacher, and they are not anti-teacher, because they know that 70 cents on the dollar of the money they just raised would go to the teachers.

So I think that there is a way that at least with regard to the taxpaying public, we want to support this sort of move toward quality, that we can deal with the teacher shortage.

I think we have to make them pass the test. I agree with Mr. Shanker; I don't see any way out of Dr. Goodladd's problem. I don't see if you have a teacher in a shortage in a subject specific area and you want the subject to be taught by someone who is at least academically qualified, who can pass a test, it seems to me to be a reasonable compromise to let them come in for a year during which time they have to make plans to undertake the educational curriculum that we would expect of them to do.

I can't think of any other way to solve the problem. If somebody's got a better way to solve the problem, I will be glad to hear it.

One other thing I want to say before I get off this platform, because I try to say it everywhere I speak, and it almost never gets in the press; even when I say it at home. I am absolutely convinced that our problems in my State are not unique nor are they worse in any other State. If student test scores are any kind of indication, we are at least in the middle, which is remarkable considering our heritage of low investment and low teacher pay.

So I think on balance our teachers have done a



remarkable job given the handicaps that they brought to the task as a group. I did this -- all that we have done has been done not because I think Arkansas teachers are worse than other teachers; in fact, given the handicaps they have labored under, they are better as a group perhaps than the national average, and in many other states.

This is a national problem. I think it deserves people all over the country in the laboratory of states responding as they see fit, to the best of their ability. I wanted to say that because I think sometimes, one of the things that happens to our teachers is that since we were the first, people think maybe that their governor thinks that there is something wrong with them as compared to other teachers.

The evidence is that nothing could be further from the truth. Thank you.

[Applause.]

MR. SHANKER: I think we have got to reflect for a second, and see what kind of a sad state we are in. Not one State, but the state in education when we look at a process where an examination is given to thousands of teachers. I guess it is probably about pass maybe at something like the sixth grade level,

or close to that. A little higher? Seventh. Well, in Florida it's at the sixth.

A large number of teachers may fail it; not maybe a large percentage, but a large number. Then a group will take it the second or third time and confidence in education will be restored in a couple of years when the public knows that thousands of people, after three or four tries, have proven that they are at the seventh grade level.

I would like to comment on the point about the teacher-dominated process of evaluation. I certainly want teachers in it; I even think it ought to be teacher-controlled, but the fact that it is teacher-dominated and teacher-controlled won't necessarily make it a good process. It will only be a good process if it is based on knowledge.

What is missing in an awful lot of places is, the question is: Who does it? Is it done to teachers, or by teachers? Is it done by administrators? Actually, it could be done very well by almost anybody, provided that they know what they're doing, and merely turning it over to teachers if the teachers themselves have not had an opportunity to learn what it is that evaluation is about, and what is the process by which

improvement takes place won't mean very much.

Which leads me to my third point here, and I think that one of the unfortunate aspects of this is, not just this particular retesting item, but much of what is happening under the name of reform all across the country, there is a dominating emphasis on one issue; and that is on teachers, quality of teachers as measured in some way or another.

Now if you think of some other fields, the quality of personnel -- and I certainly would not argue against the idea that we ought to have highly qualified teachers. But if you look in other fields, if you want a payoff in terms of improvement of the system, the amount of improvement that you get in a system by improving the personnel in that system is very limited.

If you look at the last 40 or 50 years, people live a hell of a lot longer than they used to. Now what percentage of that increase in longevity is due to the fact that doctors and nurses are better trained, as against the fact that we have better food inspections, health and safety, occupational safety laws, and a whole bunch of public health measures?

Public health improvement probably accounts for 85 percent. And the improvement in medical education, about 15

percent. My guess would be that the amount of improvement you will get in education by doing all sorts of tricks with teachers, and I'm not against them; I think whatever improvement you can get you ought to get. But we should not lead ourselves down a path of thinking that this is the critical element that is going to lead to some great improvement in the school system.

On the contrary, emphasizing only the business of selecting teachers and testing teachers and retraining teachers and supervising teachers and evaluating teachers, has led us to give almost no consideration to changing the structure of the way education is delivered, should we be organized on annual basis.

What does that do to a student in terms of expectations? What does it do to a teacher? Can you really not promote children X number of years? What does it do to your planning. What is the proper use of technology? A whole series of issues.

Or you take John Goodladd, after looking at thousands of classrooms finds that 85 percent of the time or something like that is spent in imparting information; kids are sitting there, trying to stay awake. And by the way, a lot of this evaluation that we are putting in there really assumes that

that is what a teacher ought to be doing, and the evaluators are coming in to see whether the teacher is imparting the information 85 percent of the time, a little better or a little worse, and not asking the question: Is that what teachers ought to be doing, and is that what students ought to be doing.

So I think one of the underlying issues here is that we may be spending 85 percent of the time fighting about something which may have 10 or 15 percent of the impact.

[Applause.]

DR. GOODLADD: I just want to pick up directly on those remarks, because I think they're right on. A number of members of this association have engaged in inquiries into what has been happening in regard to teacher's decision-making space in recent years. Myron Atkin, Arthur Wise and others have looked at the constantly decreasing room to make decisions.

We know from studies in business and other fields the great importance of being empowered to act in decisions that go beyond the didactics of the classroom. We are inclined to believe from looking at Donna Kerr's excellent summary of research, showing the academic differentials between people entering teacher education programs, entering teaching or not, and then staying there are really very, very disturbing.

And then if we add to that factor, and much of that coming about for the reasons analyzed earlier pertaining to the changing demographics and so on. If we add to that the clear evidence of declining teacher decision-making space and at the same time are deeply concerned about teacher salaries, we have to be very sure that we are not paying poorer teachers more money, which could be a consequence of that.

And so I would like to take advantage of this opportunity, Governor Clinton, to point out that if we are going to improve and change schools profoundly, reconstruct them as some of us believe they must be, so the teaching is different, so we don't have the alienation of five or six or seven periods a day for junior high school youngsters, an organizational structure where anybody knows anybody, where the students don't feel known, and the like, it would seem that teachers have got to have not only decision-making space, but time.

If we are going to employ teachers 180 days a year or thereabouts just to teach, I don't think we can anticipate significant changes in our schools. And I would like to suggest that if you look at your resources, limited as they are, and if you look at the whole idea of career opportunities for teachers

that will keep them in the classrooms, so they don't have to become administrators, you will look at the possibility of finding ways to increase the time that is available to teachers to plan the school programs.

Some of the things that we ignore in trying to import educational systems from other countries have to do with the relatively light teaching load of high school teachers, for example, in other countries compared to our own country in order to provide time to prepare good lessons.

Side3

Not a break after 180 degrees to do something else. So it will take us a long time to get there, but we can start by identifying those persons who want to be long-term career teachers, who have shown an enthusiasm for wanting to go beyond the nine months that they committed themselves to when they entered the teaching profession and have that choice, and begin the trail now of moving teaching to a full-fledged, round-the-year teaching responsibility and opportunity, with commensurate salaries.

Imagine one-ninth more salary for one-ninth more work. There is a much more significant salary increase than most of the increases that are being proposed. And the payoff?

The payoff in planning, the payoff in attacking some of the chronic issues that are data show is just immesurable.

[Applause.]

GOVERNOR CLINTON: I would just like two more minutes, if I might, to say first of all I agree that it may be that we will spend 85 percent of our time talking about 15 percent of the area for improvement in education. Part of that is a function of the nature of our lives; a fight provokes more attention than accord does.

When I announced my education program back in October of '83 in a 30-minute speech to the people over television, the teacher test occupied less than one minute. So I didn't think it was the only thing we were doing, or the most important thing we were doing; it was the fight, and the fact that I wouldn't give up on it that has provoked all this interest.

Secondly, I think that it is important to remember that a small issue in substantive terms may have enormous symbolic impact and may energize people to promote a whole range of other things which may need to be done more, which may have a more positive impact.

I think this empowerment issue is important. As I



said, we did give teachers in effect a majority input in our career ladder experiment, in the evaluation system for setting up, teachers have heavy but not majority input. I will say this: We still need a lot of research in how in the wide world the State can have minimum standards which can really come alive in the schools, that work in evaluation.

Obviously if classroom evaluation works, it's a better system than anything else you can think of. The Rand study and a lot of other evidence indicates it is going to be very difficult for us to get that done.

Finally, let me say this: In spite of everything Dr. Goodladd said, and I am sure he would say and I would certainly echo, that there are some really terrific schools in this country, with some teachers with enormously high morale with magnificent things going on. Almost without exception, they are schools with great management, and I don't think we've talked anything about that today, we haven't spoken about it, but it still seems to me to be the most undernourished area of education in terms of the study we've given to it and how we pick our managers of our schools and how they interrelate with the teachers, and what can we do to do a better job there.

We are beginning to look at that.

One final thing, I think that public education is spending an enormous amount of money today without any real clear idea about it is being spent or whether it is being spent as well as possible, except we know what the requirements are for percentage of monies in teacher salaries in most states, and we know what the federal government makes us do with special ed. And then maybe we have gifted and talented programs as we do in Arkansas, and all that, categorical aids.

More needs to be done that you could help us with in this association, in comparing, for example, our relative administrative costs in public education with private education, factoring out the fact that they do not have special ed kids and all that. Chicago has got the country's largest Catholic school system, and I think we ought to go back to the beginning and construct our budgets from the ground up and ask ourselves if there is not some way to increase the academic investment we have in education with the dollars which are presently available.

If the State can pass some pretty tough standards on that, to stop money from being spent in ways that perhaps are not as productive.

Finally, let me say, I hope you all are ecstatic to be alive and involved in this profession at a time when the American people have awakened to the importance of it, and it is sad in a way what Mr. Shanker said, but I don't think it's ever sad to look at the truth, however difficult it is, if you look at it with a view toward improving the condition of things, and I think you ought to be absolutely ecstatic that people of the quality of the people that I have shared the podium with today and people like you have the support of the American people in trying to do something that is more important than anything else we can be doing in society. I think you ought to be happy. I hope you are. Thank you.

[Applause.]

MODERATOR: Since John Goodladd gave the Governor some free advice at the end, I will too.

Governor, when you are reorganizing the administration of the schools, keep in mind what best hospitals around us look like -- I am thinking of this apropos John Goodladd's observation of people having to get out of teaching in order to make more money.

I am always struck by the fact that the very best

hospitals have a medical chief of staff as well as a hospital administrator. The medical chief of staff has not stopped working as a physician, but he is in many ways the intellectual and moral leader of that organization, and a hospital administrator has a set of very important roles and managing the life of the hospital, and yet no one thinks it is appalling that in most such cases, the hospital administrator is making less money than the medical chief of staff.

I would like to suggest that maybe one of the experiments you run in Arkansas is to see what would happen if you had a pedagogical student staff in some of those schools, a teacher who is the intellectual leader of that faculty, who continues teaching, serves as role model and mentor to the other teachers as well as pedagogue, and doesn't have the responsibility of the building administrator, important responsibilities though those are, that ought to be maintained by somebody else. It would be a nice experiment.

I want to thank these three gentlemen, who had a real worry before we began. Because for two hours last night in my room, they engaged in what you can well imagine was a vital, exciting and quite stimulating discussion, at the end of

which, past midnight, they looked at each other and said, "We've killed it. How in the world will we get any excitement going tomorrow morning?" You did it. Congratulations.

Thank you very much.

[Applause.]

ANNOUNCER: Thank you. That concludes our program from the American Educational Research Association's 1985 meeting, held at the Palmer House, Chicago, March 31st through April 4th, 1985.

- - -