

1986

May 29-31/86 L. Enfant Ploger

PRESENTATION OF ALBERT SHANKER, LOCAL PRESIDENTS' CONFERENCE

MR. SHANKER: Thank you. And I want to thank all of you who have been serving on the committee for giving your time and ideas and for sharing and helping to shape us up.

I had a little bit more of a role than was suggested, but it was a bad one, which is why it has been forgotten. For quite a few years, I guess, a number of us sat around and say, you know, there are a lot of locals out there that are deficient in many respects. Some of them don't hold regular membership meetings, or they don't know how; some of them don't have dues letters; some of them don't do this, don't do that.

We were going into a lot of teacher's lunch rooms and we heard war stories of what was going on out there and how we were really in danger in many places, that our members would lose faith and confidence in us or that we would be subject to attack from the other organizations because our locals, in some cases, were not doing certain things

they were supposed to be doing.

So I suggested that, and remembered that in the few years that those of us who were in the NEA, I remembered that they had some kind of periodic review, I guess it was kind of an inspection of locals. I think it was every five years; I don't remember exactly what it was. But they would come around and they would have a check list and then they would have private meetings with the leadership; and I think they did it with states; they had meetings, kind of giving you a report card. I had never seen one of the report cards, but I remembered them.

John Ryan came to a meeting in Syracuse and we said, what would happen if we were out of compliance, and he said, well, when your turn comes for evaluation, that is when we will find that these things are wrong and then we will have to act.

But I remembered that they had some sort of systematic evaluation and review, and I had periodic discussions with Bob Boyer, with Mel Cooper, and from time to time with the executive committee, and nobody bought the idea, and somehow it sounded like

the principal coming to the annual evaluation. It didn't sound like that to me, but it did sound like that to everybody else.

So, one day I was presented with an opposing different view and instead of saying we would like the inspectors around telling people what they are not doing, why don't we bring together a representative group of locals and let's find out whether they know what we have to offer them and what we have that they aren't using, let them talk to each other about what they are doing, share ideas, and ultimately we will really end up with the same objective, that is, everybody will get new ideas and people will say, gee, I haven't been doing this; I haven't been doing that. We will end up, but it won't be in the form of a principal's evaluation where people resent somebody coming in from on high to tell them what to do.

So, fortunately my role in this was gotten because it was a bad and traditional sort of idea, but what has happened I think is really terrific,

and I think is very much in line with what we talked about in terms of how teachers ought to be treated.

My initial reaction was to treat locals the way a principal treats teachers, evaluations and check sheets and stuff like that, and then Bob Boyer and Phil and Sandy Wheaton and others came up with the idea that it might very well bring resentment, opposition and people might not recognize themselves and instead of that, just bring a lot of good people together and let them discuss a whole set of issues, and by and large, they will discover for themselves. It is a kind of peer assistance program. And it works, and it is very good, and it is elevating instead of demeaning, and it develops enthusiasm, and develops commitment. It develops all the things we haven't yet when somebody else tells you that list of recommendations and ideas you picked up, if it came from on high, it would be kind of resented. That is what they call telling me what to do.

But when you go around and discover it yourself, it is very different kind of experience.

So I think in our own way we have -- I don't know that we thought about it that way a couple of years ago, but we have really, within the AFT, by doing that, developed the same kind of process of mechanism that we talked about that would be so much for the traditional types of check sheet and evaluation and blame placing and everything that goes with that.

I am not going to make a speech. What I am going to do is ask you to raise issues that you want me to respond to, and I will just do this back and forth. I do it for a couple of reasons. The main one is this: we are not far away from a convention, and I do my convention speeches either just an hour before so I get a lot of sheets of paper and jot a lot of notes down, but I don't know exactly what to say.

I do know that I will be spending a lot of time on the report. I don't think it would be fun for you or for me to do exactly the same thing today and do another group next week and half the people who are sitting in the convention have gone through double and triple jeopardy, and we would

look kind of stale approaching it.

I would like to say just one or two things and then I will open it up, and if you want to pursue the report, fine, and we will do other things, but I do want to touch on one or two things before we open it up to discussion.

I think the one thing I want to underline is that in a very short period of time, as a result of the roads that we have pursued in the last couple of years, I think it is very clear that we have put ourselves in a position which was almost -- it was not possible to dream that this would happen only a short time ago.

Everything that we said a couple of years ago, we needed teachers, we needed schools and we needed children, people would say, well, you know, you are the teachers' union. You can't really be good, except for your members. And we were viewed with a good deal of suspicion and even when we fought very hard against it, that we are not only in our self-interest, but in the interest of students and schools, but we had a terrible uphill

fight.

Within a pretty short period of time across most of this country, and I am sure many of you will have experiences which you have already shared or will share, we have come to a position where we say that something is good or something is bad, people stop questioning our motives, and they said, hey, we have developed a track record of calling shots as they are, of saying something that not all of our members are happy with, of even saying some things that may cause some pain once in a while, and because we have said that and because we have been straightforward, people have said, we are not going to question your motives any more; you really are experts in this field. We are going to listen to you.

Within a very short period of time, we have come from a point where people would automatically question our motives to a time that is pretty much the opposite, where people say, well, if the AFT says that it is no good, then it probably isn't because those people are trying to improve the schools.

Now, that is a very great turn-around.

It is very important for us as an organization. It is very important for teachers and schools. If it has not yet happened in your state or your community, this conference will be a good time for you to talk to those who come from communities where that has happened, because we have in a short period of time, it is very much like if somebody tries to do something in medicine and the doctors will say, well, that is not going to work; we are telling you it isn't going to work. Most people feel that the doctor says it is not going to work, it is probably not going to work.

There may be a few people who may say, well, doctors are just things that make a lot of money, but most people don't believe that, even if doctors do, indeed, make a lot of money. They have trust; there is public confidence in them.

And the interesting thing is, here people in our society are trusting people who make a lot of money and they didn't trust teachers, who aren't making a lot of money. Somehow they suspected

us. But I think we discovered the way to do it, and the way to do it is you have to have the courage and the ability to sometimes take a good deal of heat from our members of short-term issues, and we have to be willing to turn to them and explain that in the long run they are going to be a lot better off if we don't try to cover things up, if we don't try to fudge things, and I think more and more members see that that, indeed, is happening.

Now, I would like to make a kind of general statement about the report, and it is going to be very general. It is almost kind of reminiscing about what this situation reminds me of in my earlier existence, because one of the very important critical talents of being a union leader is that you have to know how to make a deal. You have to know when you have a good deal in front of you, and that takes experience.

A good deal never comes in the way that you want about it. It is never exactly the way you wanted it, and it is never written or determined only by you. And, people who are very'

picky and very, very fussy sometimes never get to see how good a deal it is they have in front of them. They concentrate on a lot of little things, and they miss what is on the plate.

And so I would like to share a few experiences from my history -- well, it might not be things I did. It might be places where I was present, but there were a few of them that remind me of this situation. And I think that what is on the plate right now is just almost unbelievable. That is, who would have thought that governors and state leutenants and the press and most of the power structure in the country would be talking about schools that (inaudible for five seconds) and essentially they would be saying that the way to answer our problems is not more narrow accountability, check sheets and supervision and firing people and getting rid of tenure, but that the answer was that we ought to do with teachers what society has done with doctors and lawyers and for other people, other professionals.

Now, that is what is there. Now there

are some details that we have no problem with and other details that we do have some problems with. But to think about it, when Abraham Flecknew was appointed by the Carnegie Commission to go around in 1910 to try to medicine into something better than it was then, what did he say? He said, the overwhelming majority of medical schools stink. The people who go there didn't learn any science. All the doctors could say is, guess what he's saying about my medical school, and guess what that says about me. And they could have started shooting at him and saying, we don't want the public to get a view that most doctors have poor medical training. And if they had been successful at doing that, they would still be ten thousand medical schools where you could in the evening and the summer, and you know, medical schools would be something not very much respected.

But back in the early days when we were trying to get collective bargaining in New York State, we, as you know, went on strike in 1960, the day before Kennedy was elected President, and

knowing how the Commission was trying to get us collective bargaining and we were all set for collective bargaining that school year, getting all ready for it, going around the schools saying good for us, and what happened?

The following June, June 1961, the Board of Education pulled a surprise on us and instead of offering a collective bargaining election, which we had every right to believe we would have, because of the two commissions that were set up by the City, they both recommended that there should be collective bargaining election; but the Board then said, well, instead of having collective bargaining election, we want to find out if teachers really want collective bargaining and we will have a referendum to ask the teachers, not will you vote for the union or NEA, but do you favor collective bargaining, yes or no.

And so the leadership of the organization sat down and said, they are giving us a royal shaft in this thing. We are all prepared for bargaining and all we are getting is a referendum yes or no. We

should boycott this.

Well, if we had boycotted it, and we are the people who wanted collective bargaining, guess what the referendum would have said. You know, all the other people were against it. They would have voted no and the Board would have said, see that, the teachers don't want collective bargaining.

So, we had to decide whether to play the game. But it was worse than that. They put out a ballot saying, I favor collective bargaining, yes or no, and then there was a little asterisk at collective bargaining so that if you looked down below to see what the definition of collective bargaining was.

And the Board of Education sent a ballot out to teachers asking them do you favor collective bargaining, yes or no, and then it had a definition that said, it is understood that if agreements arrived at, -- agreements arrived at, if any -- was the phrase, if any are terminable at will by the Board of Education.

Now, you go back; this is history.

That's what it said.

Now, what do you do if you are on the executive board of the union that wanted an election and wanted collective bargaining and if the teachers are voting yes, they are voting that the Board has a right to terminate these agreements any time it wants. So we had a lot of smart people in the leadership, and we argued for hours, and a lot of people argued, we want to show that damn Board of Education by urging everyone to vote no. We don't accept the idea of the Board of Education terminating the agreement. What would happen if we voted no.

Well, the NEA told everybody to vote no because collective bargaining was labor and was no good, and all the little rinky dink organizations said vote no, and if we would have said vote no, there would have been a unanimous vote no and the Board of Ed would have said, see that.

So, we had to do something. We had to change the nature of the game, and essentially, we said, vote yes and don't worry about the definition.

WE will make the definition. That won't be the definition. And that was a heavy lift, because we got literally thousands of phone calls saying I'm not going to vote for something that says the Board of Ed gets a chance to decide.

Well, all the labor relations history in this country might have been different. Just think of the shock waves that would have gone across the country if the teachers of New York City in a referendum voted against collective bargaining. Where would all the collective bargaining of public employees and teachers have been? I mean, after all, all those radical teachers in New York were all born as trade unionists. That would have been it.

So we had to be smart enough not to nit-pick. We had to be smart enough to say, well, we're not really voting on what the Board wants us to do. This is part of a process that moves us forward, and if the overwhelming vote on this is yes, the answer is not going to be that we are voting for the Board of Education. It is going to be pretty obvious that we are defeating all the groups that are against collective

bargaining and we move on to the next thing.

16

Well, that is one thing this reminded me of, and then I had a few other experiences. We were in our first negotiations and I was one of three national AFT representatives. I spent most of my time in New York and I was the historian of the first set of negotiations. I kept records. I had about 15 notebooks written in long hand with my own version of shorthand verbatim written on it. And we had 800 demands we went in with. Well, before collective bargaining, there was 106 different organizations, and each organization had their demands and once we got collective bargaining and we felt we had a representative, everybody said, oh, we hate demands on our organization.

And one of the demands we had was, there shall be no after-school faculty conferences. They teachers shall not be required to stay after school, and we had negotiated a lot of things. The school system had agreed to hire school aids, and the aids were going to do hall patrol, and they

were going to do other things, and the superintendent, when we got those teachers out there required to go to after-school conferences, Dr. Thiebold, who was the superintendent, said to the negotiating committee, you know, I think that I go along with that. He said, you know, we could close school once a month, two hours for a week, because we could tell the public that now with all these aids who are doing the clerical work and all these other things, teachers are actually teaching much more because they are not as bogged down in all of these chores that they used to be bogged down in.

But even if we close the schools once a month, two hours, while the kids are still getting more education than they used to get.

So one of the guys on our negotiating committee was a very angry guy. He said, I don't like the superintendent, I don't like the principals and this fellow said to the superintendent you mean you are going to close the schools and

deprive children two hours of education every month, and the superintendent was just shocked, you know. He thought he was giving us something that we wanted very much, and indeed, he was.

So the superintendent says, well, if you don't want these conferences after school, and if you don't want us to close school and let the kids go, how do you expect me to do this? At which time the fellow on the negotiating committee said, that's why you're earning \$60,000 a year. Well, that's the last time we had that offer. The superintendent decided that it could not be done.

So, the next year we went into negotiations and we had class size provisions. And we had demanded that there will be, at that time, class size and a vocational book for shop teachers. Vocational school was quite high; it was up around 34-35, and we went up and demanded 25, and the superintendent came back and he offered 27.

Our negotiating team felt, well, this is pretty early in the game. We should reject 27.

And we said, that is outrageous. Bad safety, and these are people who work around machinery, and we came back to the next meeting and the superintendent said, I just figured out how much my offer would cost and I can't offer it to you.

Now, that was 1963 when that offer was made, and it was never, never again, from that time to this time, it never came back again, never came back.

I could give you a list of about 12 things that at the correct time if we would have said yes, we would have gotten, which we never got after that. I see people going like this. You had that experience too.

Well, every negotiator, obviously, sometimes you do get more. That is the nature of negotiations. I'm not giving you the rule that you always accept the first offer. That's not a good rule either. But I am saying that sometimes you can make a pretty terrible mistake when there is something that is really good there if you don't grab it when you can get it, because it doesn't.

stay there all the time.

I give you on the plate right now or what's on the table, very much that way. It is a really new world and I could pick out a piece here and there that I would have done differently. So could you. But I think the important thing is, see, this is one of these things that they cannot shove down the throats of teachers.

Nobody can force us to take responsibility if we refuse to take it. Nobody can force professionalism down anyone's throat. Nobody can say, hey, we're going to pay some of you people \$75,000 or \$100,000 a year and it won't be any principals, or assistant principals or chairman, because you people are going to say well, you want to do it, and say, I can't do it.

We are in an absolute position of saying we don't want it. Now, right now there are a lot of people we don't want. If we don't want it, then the people who put them together and feel that this is something that needs to be done are just going to say, well, too bad, teachers just

weren't ready. I don't know the next time when anybody in business or industry or finance will stick to their necks out and say we are going to offer something which the people we are trying to help, you know, don't want it.

And, somehow in spite of it, there will be a preheated debate over the issue over the next few years, and I think it's going to be very much like collective bargaining, when we started selling collective bargaining to teachers who did not have a very receptive audience, and most teachers were not -- they had all the arguments, that there is no collective bargaining in government, that the taxpayers make the decisions. We are government employees. We are professionals and we don't want to be guilty; there were just hundreds of these things.

And today, of course, we did sell it. We sold it to the whole country, and we did it by creating a number of models. New York was first and then there were a number of other places, and now we have collective bargaining, and we have got

collective bargaining and we showed people that it worked and if it wasn't illegal or immoral five or ten places, it wasn't going to be illegal or immoral in other places.

And within a short period of time the NEA changed its mind and picked it up, and that is what we are going to have to do here. I don't think we can expect to convince two million teachers; teachers are like everybody else. Nobody feels very comfortable with change. It is going to be a very distinct period, because there are just two things that are going to operate out there.

On the one hand, most teachers are dissatisfied with their salary, their commissions and their status, and they want change, and they want things to be a heck of a lot better. And that's what we have got going for us.

Now, what we have going against us is that the minute people start experiencing the change they get worried. Maybe things aren't going exactly their way and maybe things won't really get better. Maybe it will get a little worse, and

then they start saying, no matter how bad this is, maybe we are better off holding on to exactly what we've got, no matter how bad it is. And depending on who wins in that competition, we are either going to have a very bad situation or a very exciting, very different and very new one.

Well, why don't we open it up. You don't have to stay with this. You can raise questions about the report or about associate membership or about anything that concerns you.

Who is first?

Yes, Marsha.

QUESTION:

MR. SHANKER: Well, they probably won't put it exactly that way. Really, what happens is it will happen slowly. What will happen is that as teachers, and as you and the unions and the members do more and more things that management gives you, they won't have to replace as many people who retire or who leave management, and they will be able to use a lot of that money to finance a lot of the things that you are doing.

And eventually, you may end up with a very lean management, or eventually they may say, hey, you're doing it all anyway, do you think you could do the whole thing. Well, why not? I mean, do we really like the idea that -- well, let me give an example.

Out in California, Marie Shelley at the last council meeting said that -- there is a bill in legislation because they had this report making teaching into a profession out there and there is a state legislator, who is a terrific guy out there, he's a state -- his name is Gary Hart, but he is a different Gary Hart, and Gary Hart, who is the author

of the school reform legislation in California, introduced a bill which would reduce class size drastically in California.

One of the things it did is, it put a pot of money out there and said, any union that negotiates for a peer review system for its school board will get money from the state to do it. That is to relieve the teachers and get them some training and do other things.

It doesn't say you have to do it. If you don't want to do it, you don't do it, but there is a certain sum of money for those who want to do it.

Well, the NEA campaigned to defeat the legislation. It still hasn't passed; we don't know if it will. And they made it an issue in San Francisco, and as I said, the AFT wants peer review and that means that three of your colleagues are going to walk into your room and they are going to look at you and they're going to fire you. No.

So, Marie Shelley said, you know, at first that kind of stunned us, and we didn't know how to handle it, and then we realized that what we were

going to say to the teachers. What happens now; right? And at some point the principal walks in and says, you have been doing a lousy job and he brings you up on charges.

Under this system, three of your colleagues come in and they say, hey, the principal thinks you're doing a lousy job. The teachers at the school have noticed that things aren't right also. We want you to know it is not just the principal. We are here to help you. We want to spend three months, four months, six months, a year, trying to help you.

Now, are you better off having the principal come in at the last minute and try to push you out, or are you better off getting an early warning system and getting some help?

So, you know, we have got to translate all these things, which sounds like we are going to take over. What we are going to do is not the same as what management has been doing up there. We are going to offer assistance.

Now, ultimately, we will have some responsibilities we haven't had up until now. But, if

you want the ability to be able to do that assistance, and you want to get the teachers, you want to move away from the supervision that they complain about, we have to take some of that responsibility ourselves.

And it's happening. It is happening in a number of our locals and well, you answered your own question. You are doing a lot of the things now. You are starting, and when it comes it won't seem like it's very new at all. It will just be like taking the next step.

Yes.

QUESTION: Another problem addressed, we have got in Pittsburgh. We faced those problems before the Yeshiva decision, and that is all around us. And as push on the issue of governance, we are suddenly reminded by our administration of the Yeshiva role.

Secondly, to follow up on the same line, I think the Carnegie report can be of value to us, but we have traditionally resisted peer evaluation. A college boy came up with the master-teacher concept some seven years ago, and as a result, the college

president, administration being toppled, thought it was a bad idea.

But, indeed, I want to argue quality, and maybe not argue how quality is and it is a hell of a thing. Anything you do in that class room is going to result in being fired. And that is our problem.

MR. SHANKER: Well, the Yeshiva decision, I think, this into professionalism gives us a great opportunity to reverse that decision. There is now an assistant secretary of labor, who used to a lawyer. His name is Schlossburg. He was an attorney for the United Auto Workers. His job is to figure out what changes are needed in the labor law to prevent workers and teachers to participate professionally without losing their bargaining rights.

So what we have is very interesting. We have a very conservative administration. And of course, they are interested in improving productivity and we may very well get an initiative that come out of the administration that says it ought to be reversed because the trend is in the opposite direction. You want more

and more employees to be involved, and Yeshiva really prevents them from being involved, because it gives them the choice. It says you either choose collective bargaining or you choose professionalism, and there was a good article in July Fortune Magazine, which is, you know, a great defender of labor rights, but it had an article saying it is probably time to rewrite the labor laws to permit people to have unions and to have a greater voice in the operation of their organization.

So, what we are doing here is to create a rationale. One way of looking at it is that we are really expanding the scope of collective bargaining to what we want it to be. If the law stays the way it is, we will need two mechanisms. They will say, the union is going to sit down and negotiate and then we have this committee of teachers that is going to do this, and we will make believe that the committee of teachers is the union. But of course, they will be.

It is like what we do with trustees. Technically and legally they are not trustees. But in most of our systems where we have collective bargaining and indeed it is the union through its internal .

mechanism that selects the trustees.

So no matter how the law goes, we will find a way. We want to do this. We will find a way of doing it, just as we have in the pension field.

Yes.

QUESTION:

MR. SHANKER: Well, in the first place, it ought to be understood that this is not going to happen on one day next year, or the year after. If it did happen it would be disastrous because the universities aren't ready. We would be involved in all sorts of dislocation of the students who are half way through the pipeline now. There are faculty people who are -- so it can't happen that way.

Look at this whole thing from the same way, look at what happened. Dr. Flexner made his report in 1910, and if you want to say how long did it

take before medicine really started not looking like this. There are letters written by fathers to sons at Harvard saying, if you dare to become a doctor, I will cut you out of my will because it is a horrible field to go into.

Now, how long did it take before those fathers started pushing their kids to be doctors, directing them and urging them not to? Well, it probably took 30 years. We are setting something in motion here which is going to take a while to happen.

Nobody is totally ready for it. There is no way of doing it in a very short period of time. We have got to have some perspective in this.

Now, what will happen is this: within the next year a national board of professional teacher standards will be created. And it will first be a planning group that is created, and then there will be an actual board. And that will be like the American Bar Association, or the American College

of Surgeons or it will be a national group which is there to establish a set of standards, certifying the people are, indeed, professionals and it will establish a code of ethics. They will deal with controversial questions like what is the indoctrination. There will be a whole series. But it will become the Supreme Court of the profession.

And at the same time, two and a half years from now, there will be created an examination for teachers, which is the equivalent of a bar examination.

Meanwhile, a lot of colleges and universities are going to say, hey, something is happening here. Let us now build up our graduate school of education slowly and slowly reduce the undergraduate. Will there still be undergraduate courses in education? Sure, there is nothing wrong with a sociology student taking a course in sociology education. There is nothing wrong with a history student taking a course in history education. There is nothing wrong with people who want to become teachers later who are now English majors deciding

that they are going to find out something about the institution. But those are not their professional courses. It is like pre-law, pre-med, pre-engineering, so you could still take a few courses, but you are not going to major in that. You are going to be a liberal arts major.

So this happens slowly. Now, has it ever happened before in this country, or has it? Sure it has. Business schools. Before World War II business schools, you know, as you go down the heirarchy of schools, there was, you know, you have medicine and law and all that, and then you have got down there and education was pretty low. And one thing that was below education was business administration.

In those days, if you flunked liberal arts, if you flunked education, you were told to go into business administration.

Now, what happened? After World War II, business administration slowly closed up to undergraduate schools that became a graduate program. Try to get into a school of business administration now

and if you take a look at the salaries, I mean, they changed it. They turned it into a professional degree, and nobody got killed in higher ed. Nobody got fired. It went through a transitional program.

I am glad that you raised that question because one of the groups that is going to be hurt by this is going to be many of our members who are in higher education. You say, hey, you represent me too. Why do you want to fire us?

What you better do is instead of taking right now, if you look at it nationally, people who are majoring in education undergraduate are heavily concentrated in the lowest quartile of college students. But of all things, if you are going to be a professor or instructor at the graduate level, you are going to have your pick from all the finest liberal arts graduates.

You are going to say, come on into our graduate program together with an internship, and we are starting you on a career that is going to lead to a fine profession. And because you will have a different group of students, at a different

level, it will be a more prestigious institution. But that is something that has got to be explained.

Now, I should also say that the curriculum of that institution will not be the free-flowing curriculum that it is now. That is, if you are a professor of education, you will not, in the future, just be able to express sort of your point of view, because you will remember, your students are going to end up taking a liberal arts examination, and if you don't take a look at what that examination has in it; it is going to examine the knowledge of teachers and the knowledge base of that profession.

So, if you go off teaching your own personal views, and all your students flunk the national exam, people are going to raise questions about it, and the nature of your institution.

So, what's going to drive the graduate schools is the same thing that drives law schools. The law schools don't spend all their time teaching how to take a bar exam, but every law school makes sure that the curriculum is such that most of its students do pass the bar exam. So, that is the

kind of change we envision in higher education.

Yes.

QUESTION: You have spoken about the fact that teachers earning 5,000 or 100,000.

MR. SHANKER: Yes.

QUESTION: Obviously, we don't see every teacher earning \$100,000.

MR. SHANKER: That's right.

QUESTION: So there are going to be particular teachers who will earn \$100,000, so while a lot of us earn maybe \$50,000 or \$65,000. [inaudible.]

MR. SHANKER: We have had locals in this organization, so did the NEA, for a long time, women teachers got less than men teachers. We rectified that, and society did. And for a long time, high school teachers got a hell of a lot more than elementary teachers did. That lasted up until the early 1950's. And that was part of nature. And that was part of the philosophy of almost every organization. Why was it their philosophy? Because that is the way it was. And that got changed.

And now we say that if you have a

master's degree or 30 credits beyond that or 60 credits beyond it, you get more money. Well, who says that a person that passes a national examination, developed by the profession itself, why is that any worse than a person who has a Ph.D., or 60 credits? It is not your principal that is going to determine if you are going to get \$100,000. It is not your superintendent. It is not your Board of Education. It is not your State Commissioner of Education. Everybody has a right to take the examination. By the way, the examination is no good, nobody is going to pay you that money for passing it.

The reason that the states, the bar exam years ago, we had thousands of lawyers in this country and nobody had passed the bar exam. Why? Because there wasn't any bar at that time. You just took some courses and went out and practiced law. You read books like Abraham Lincoln did. You went out and practiced law. You did a mail order course.

Then, along came some people and they said, hey, a lot of people practicing law out there that are not very good. Let's put an exam

together and the exam was not put together by the government. It was put together by outstanding lawyers.

And some lawyers were out there and said, hey, we want people to know that we're great so we are going to go ahead and take the exam. And before you knew it, one state said, hey, why should we have any lawyers practicing who can't pass the bar exam if we know that passing the exam means that you are a better lawyer.

Now, you have got 50 states where you can't practice law until you pass the bar exam. All that happened voluntarily.

So, if we have a good examination where everybody says, hey, passing that exam means that this person is a really great teacher, then the states are going to adopt that and they are going to do it. Now, if it happens to be a lousy exam, everybody is going to say, hey, it doesn't make any difference if you pass that or not. That is not going to work.

But we have always had some teachers

being paid more than others. We have always said that we do not want to depend on politics, patronage, or the whim of a supervisor. But we didn't say that it cannot depend upon conditions that are objective.

And who says that passing an examination is not as objective as getting a master's degree. So, what is happening, I am not saying that nothing is changing. Obviously, it is changing. We have never had a good national exam before. So things will change.

But it is not in violation of the principles which we have always espoused. We didn't want teachers to be used as pawns by bosses who were going to exercise the threat of lower salary or higher salary to treat them as a bunch of puppets. Well, is that the system we are now espousing? Is the passing of a national examination, which makes you a board certified teacher, or an advanced certified teacher. Matter of fact, it does exactly the opposite. It says that these are board certified teachers, and are as good or maybe better than any existing supervisor and that they ought to run the

schools, so instead of putting people into their clutches of ~~someone~~ else, we are actually saying that they ought to be able to be taken out of the clutches because they are certified, which means, super.

So, I am going to raise the question, because that is exactly one of the questions that will be raised.

Yes.

QUESTION: We are talking about a lot of different kinds of things and when you look at it, you see that that is going to mean a lot of pressure on teachers in performance of their duties, a lot more pressure. You are already aware of how that pressure has been doing to our colleagues.

Why hasn't there been or shouldn't there be something in these reports about the reorganizing of the school system to meet this particular item?

MR. SHANKER: Well, I think it is there. At least, if you read it carefully; it does not underline, but it is there, and that is an excellent point. None of this makes sense. None of this makes

sense unless you have a restructured school system. That is, it doesn't make sense to have a board certified teacher that is locked in a room down there with 30 kids or 25 kids and down there an intern, and over here an instructor, and over here somebody else.

I mean, because the examination and all that, there is merit pay, but it doesn't make sense from an educational point of view.

The report, what the report really does if you read it closely, you see, now teachers are stuck in their classrooms and they are locked in with kids, and teachers feel threatened by kids, they have got to spend a lot of their time controlling the students, and what the report does, the reason it is so revolutionary is that it essentially says, take all teachers and all kids out of the classroom, as we now know it.

The tension is there. The pressure in the classroom is there because it is unnatural for kids to sit still for six hours a day and listen to someone. It is even unnatural for adults. I am not

going to try to do that to you tonight. Don't worry.

So I am reminded of an experience I had at a different institution that was really very much like that. I once worked at a camp in Pennsylvania. It was a day camp. It was a day camp, in a bungalow and a colony of motels. You had the day camp and you had the hotels and you had the bungalows, and generally the parents stayed there with their kids either in a bungalow or a hotel room. In the morning the kids were moved up to the camp and the camp, you know, fed them and took care of them and then they went back to their parents that night.

So, what happens. The first day you are out there and you are looking at the frogs. You are looking at the butterflies and walking along the road and the kids are swimming and they are playing tennis and they are doing all sorts of things. And, of course, one of these kids decides that he is not having too much fun or he misses his mother, and he goes back to see his mother in the hotel.

And his mother looks at the kid and is kind of shocked. And the mother thinks at least

two things. At first, the mother says, I'm paying for this. And the second thing she thinks is, hey, there is no supervision here. Nobody told me my kid was missing from up there. My kid could be at the bottom of the lake. My kid could have been eaten up by a gorilla out there, or whatever it is.

So, the mother then turns to the other mothers who are playing cards and says, do you know where your child is? I'm lucky; my kid came to me; where is yours?

And, so that night there is a meeting of all the counselors and with the camp owner. And the camp owner says, look, under no circumstances do I want any child to ever get back to his mother and father. Here is what happens when they do, and then he enunciates basic underlying philosophy of the camp that there are two kind of children. There are good children and there are wanderers.

And so the next summer he didn't hire teachers to run the camp. He hired a lot of high school kids, 16 years old, because you had to have one counselor for every three kids. And the

instruction that every counselor got was, these are your three kids. You have them for an hour. Make sure they never get out of your sight. And anyone who is a wanderer, when you turn over your three kids to the next counselor, you tell them, Johnny is a wanderer.

So, what happened? What happened is that the kids hated the place. They thought it was like a prison. All the values that usually you have at camp, you know, you can walk down a road and you can throw rocks and you can catch frogs and you can do all the freedom that is associated with camp is now gone because you are now in your little cell with three others and being pushed along. And of course the counselor hate it too because they are jailors now.

So, I think we all recognize aspects of school in this. This really envisions a school in which most of the learning does not go on by forcing kids to sit still and lecture to them. This is a school that has video cassettes, audio cassettes, computer, people who can tutor, yes, sometimes lecture.

It envisions the idea of an education is

that the teacher plans a bunch of experiences for a lot of kids and the kids are actively involved. It is a bunch of experiences for you, the teacher, the kids, and the kids are actively involved and then you figure out how to test the kids or how to find out whether they have mastered something. The outstanding teacher is the one who is figuring out new ways of getting the kids connected if he is not connected.

That so, therefore, the tension is removed, because most of the tension comes from forcing kids to do something they don't feel like doing, forcing them to sit there, very much like the wanderer, you know, preventing the kid from wandering away.

Now, it is revolutionary, and that is why it makes sense to have differentiating staffing, because if you don't have each teacher locked in a room. Now, you have got, because kids are busy doing all sorts of things, and there are interns and residents and instructors, beginning teachers and teachers with different forms of certification.

And, by the way, even some of our peers. But the teacher, the certified teacher is the boss, is the idea person. Now the teacher has time to do coaching, to sit with Johnny and get him to rewrite a paper, to evaluate the materials, to help to train new teachers. It liberates not only kids, but it liberates teachers from what is a very artificial existence of forcing teachers to be jailors.

Now, should we abandon the concept of the system now that we have tomorrow? Of course not. You don't abandon the system that you have and that works for half of the kids, until you develop the new one. So essentially there is a vision that says, look, teachers don't really like what is going on right now. Kids don't like it very much; parents don't like it very much. We are not going to abandon what we have until we have something new. But let's give teachers the same rights as other professionals have to continue to restructure, reshape the institution, until it is the kind of place that they feel that they can do the things that they want to do as teachers.

So, essentially, there is no single

blueprint because that would be the opposite of professionalism. That would be like the new principal say, okay, don't do it the old way. I have got a new way for you to do it.

This one says, hey, we are going to turn over the money, the kids, the materials and everything and you get people in your school to sit down, you'll do it and you will do it a lot of different ways. Naturally, when we find out that some ways are better, then we will ask everybody to do it the way -- we are not asking for diversity for the sake of diversity. We are allowing for some diversity and experimentation because we want to try and find something better than what we have now.

QUESTION: Now, you mentioned that the bar exam concept for teachers. And then a second ago, you said that those creative people are probably the best. How do you develop the kind of test for a creative person and how do you accommodate those two views; one, that a person that can pass an informational test and the other view that the best teacher is the creator?

MR. SHANKER: Did everybody hear that? You did. That is a very fine point, and it has to do with the nature of tests, and I don't blame you for raising it because it means teacher tests. Let's see, the national teacher exams asks a professional question; like a parent comes in and complains about a book that is being used. Which of the following do you do? A, say that it is not your fault, that it's the principal's. B, claim First Amendment rights and refuse to answer; C, say that it is a policy of the state education department; D, ask the parent what she would do.

Now, of course, the answer to most of questions on the entity that they are all defense, because what the test really measures is, the reason it asks, tell the parent what would you do is that essentially the right answer is always the one that creates the least problem. That's the right one.

Now, I look at it as there being no right answer. That is what they are trying to examine is exactly your process of thought. No doctor knows exactly what is going to cure you. If you come in --

first of all, say a patient comes in and looks something like that, and here is what you notice, and here is what the patient complains of. Now they want to know what questions do you ask.

And when you get answers to those questions, what goes through your mind? What is it that the person might have? What is going around the neighborhood? What is the family history? And you know, on a legal or medical exam, you could have ten different answers and they are all correct. And the correctness has to do with, hey, how smart is this guy as to what he is thinking about and what he is evaluating.

There is no such thing as right and wrong. There is smart, average, dumb, and zilch, you know. So you can evaluate it. But that there are examinations that can look at your creativity. And if we don't end up with an examination which is very complex, it really is, what is going through the mind of the teacher in terms of trying to cope with a certain problem, and you might have parents wanting different correct ways, but that is exactly -- are you

looking for knowledge; are you looking for creativity, and how a person combines what is known with reasonable guesses and that is what you are measuring.

Now, we don't have any teachers that do that; there are idiot examinations. They are useless knowledge, and then there are professional things that aren't really professional at all. But, the example of not being any good ends up being an example of correct answers or wrong answers. It will be good if it is a test of how does this person use his or her mind to exercise judgment and creativity?

And that is, by the way, the kind of thing where if you are going to board certify teachers, and right on your door or in your room is that certificate saying like, say, a doctor, or a surgeon or an anesthesiologist has it, and you are the kind of a person who talks to a parent about his or her child and you are sharing the things that you have thought of and trying to deal with the successes and the other things, and by sharing those things, a parent says, hey, now this is not something that any person can do. This person has thought of

all sorts of things, has tried different approaches, succeeded in some ways, didn't succeed in others. But, wow, this is not something that anybody could walk in off the street and do. And until we as teachers create, see, right now, the general public feels that any reasonably intelligent person can walk in off the street and be a teacher. Now, they don't think that about law or medicine or anything else.

So, until we develop the kind of people that they say, hey, wow, nobody is going to walk in off the street and talk about my child that way, this person is really trouble; until we have that, we don't have anything. The examination is supposed to do it.

QUESTION: Part of the report talks about getting incentives for student achievements by the school, and that is something that they have been doing in Dallas, but it represents a problem. The only way you have of measuring student achievement is by administering a test, and I know that [inaudible.]

MR. SHANKER: Yes. All of the sections in this report that deal with accountability, rewards

and performance are very carefully written and if you look at them, it will say we don't know much about this. We should avoid the traditional pitfalls of getting teachers to compete with each other.

In other words, the first thing you will see is here are a bunch of business people who normally would be zillions of teachers and there it is right on top that we don't know how to do this yet. So let's be very, very careful. And then they say, let's experiment and see if we can make it work.

Now, they do specifically say that it is not test course only, that it could be an ability to write essays, it could be all sorts of things, and as a matter of fact, as a statewide school merit plan which works very well in some districts where it has been well thought out and other places where they thought it was well thought out, it wasn't thought out well and hasn't worked.

So all you have here is first place, thank God they said no individual merit pay because that doesn't work and it gets people to fight each other. If you are going to have any rewards for

performance they are going to be awards that are going to make everybody work like a team because we are both going to get it so let's both sit down and help each other instead of fighting each other. And then be very careful because you don't want to narrow it down just to test scores because then everybody will be reaching for the tests and there will be a bunch of idiots who can't write essays and can't think and everything else. So that is all in there. And we are going to end up doing it.

It is not going to be something that someone else opposes. So it is pretty well down there. Now, of course, the NEA will go in there and they will go around saying merit pay. It is ridiculous. Here is a bunch of people who say, we don't know how to do it. Don't do it for individuals, if you do it, do it for groups, experiment with it; open up the different objectives, you decide on a school or on a district level, looking at it objectively, and by the way, you can never get people to turn over complete power to you without saying, hey, once in a while we want to see how well you are doing. And there

will be measurements of different sorts, but they indicate the measurements are not very good right now.

QUESTION: I was concerned about what this gentlemen mentioned regarding the creativity rather than test scores. I don't like to think that because a lawyer passes the bar exam that he is a good lawyer. I have found many, many lawyers who are very poor.

MR. SHANKER: How about the ones who flunked the bar exam?

QUESTION: You don't see them.

MR. SHANKER: Oh, you don't see them, but would you like to have one represent you? That is the issue here.

QUESTION: Well, there are also physicians who pass the medical exam who should not be practicing and we have all heard horror stories there. I do like the idea of having a board certification. I do believe, though, that the creativity does not merely show in a test when you work with a group of students. There is an art in teaching, and since

there is this art, rather than the science or the ability to think out problems and being able to -- a teacher must be able to impart his ability or help children to feel like getting better ability.

How does that the measure? I mean, this is the issue that I find difficult.

MR. SHANKER: Well, two things; first of all, the fact that teaching is an art; it is an art that is based upon a certain amount of science and also on a certain amount of shared wisdom. That is true in medicine too, diagnosing a disease and charting the course is not pure science, and if you go to eight different doctors, you might get eight different approaches. And all those approaches could be sensible. You could also get some approaches that would be malpractice and it would be incompetent.

But there is a range of things that make sense and there is a range of things that don't make sense. There are a lot of fields -- there is also artistry in almost every other field, whether it be architecture, engineering, even have creative accountants. (Laughter.)

So, these teachers are not unique in the sense that it is required that a certain amount of knowledge and a certain amount of just shared wisdom, and a certain amount of art.

Now, remember that we are moving away from classrooms. Right now the great teacher is the teacher who has tremendous control over the children and is a good lecturer, and is a person who essentially is a good actor and a lot of things, because you are dealing with a group setting.

Now, if you change what teaching means, that is, if you are almost never going to give lectures any more, then your ability to read a child's essay and coach that child in terms of how do you redo it and organize your thoughts, or recognizing that Johnny is not very good at working with people because he gets very embarrassed. He thinks the answer is going to be wrong. He would be much better off if you sit him down with a piece of paper and a program, because then he doesn't get embarrassed, or maybe with an older kid because he doesn't mind that.

Then, that is your judgment in terms

of how to get Johnny to do it, how to get him out of his hangups, that is just as creative in teaching as a person who is a terrific lecturer, or knowing that there is a certain particular book or story or videotape or something else, that is likely to get this kid to be able to do something, or developing a game where a bunch of kids, a relay, where they use different skills which they learn and get them to master it and get them to put pressure on each other; all those things are teaching skills.

Now, they don't think they are teaching skills right now because your job is to keep 30 kids or 25 or 35 kids quite and still and doing the same thing as everyone else. So the things that are of value as a teacher now are very different.

For instance, suppose a doctor never saw a patient individually, but 30 patients at a time came into his office, and they had to treat them all simultaneously. The skills that the doctor would have under those conditions would be very different. I mean, what we are doing is just plain crazy, because these kids are just as individual as medical patients

are, and they are not all listening at the same time. And a third of them already know what we are saying to them and another third are so far behind and some of them were absent yesterday. And yet we are trying to teach them.

So in asking that question you have to disassociate teaching from the way we have known it for 200 years and say, suppose that we make the revolution and we redesign the schools so the major problem isn't getting kids to sit still and be quite. And it is a new arrangement now. Now what are the qualities you look for? It is worth thinking about.

Yes.

QUESTION: [Inaudible.]

MR. SHANKER: Well, obviously, well, the statement was, we are taking a very forward stance on professionalism and changes in teaching, and NEA is taking sort of a backward thing keeping things status quo, and yet the other day on, what was it, Face the Nation? one of those things. The other day on television, you say that you favored Burger and having one united organization. Wouldn't that hold us back because if we merged with them, they wouldn't vote the status quo and they would outvote us.

Well, you know, about the only conditions that I would have a merger, I don't have many conditions, but one is that to make sure that teachers were in a labor movement. If they weren't all in the labor movement that they would merge and would be headed in the labor movement eventually. And we haven't talked about that in a long time, and maybe it doesn't need talking about.

And the only other conditions I would have is that it be a democratic organization. Now, in a democratic organization, you don't always win.

But I am willing to bet all this. I think that all of us went into one organization with all of them and we were having the same type of meeting that we are having right now and they were in this room they got the same frustrations as teachers that we do. They are looking for something different. I just have a very strong faith that if we -- and the problem is that someone is talking to them and I am talking here. And I was hoping that Mary Futrell would sign the same report without reservations, and a couple of weeks before, I said, Mary, if that happens, we can both do a joint column. You could be the New York Times column and I could be the Washington Post column and we could maybe even do the same thing. And then we would were talking at our executive committee meeting and we said I would comply and speak to the NEA convention and have Mary Futrell come here and speak to our convention.

I don't have any fear of our people listening to what they have to say and I know they wouldn't have any fear of what we have to say. And so once in a while, a democracy will make mistakes.

That's what it is about.

But, my guess would be that if we have in the next year or two a fair chance of reaching their members that their members, and I don't mean, it doesn't have to be me, it could be somebody inside the NEA, and it shouldn't be me, because that is a rival organization. It should be somebody else, but if these ideas reach them, they have the same chance of accepting these things, I think they are going to arrive at the same conclusions.

[Pause on the tape for approximately 15 seconds.]

MR. SHANKER: I think one of the great dangers is that here is the great possibility of forever transforming the lives of teachers and students in America, and it could be lost because the organization it represents, the largest numbers of teachers in the country, can reject it and everybody else will say, well, there is no point in doing anything for teachers. We tried to give them status, money, power and prestige, and everything else, and what do they do; they just kick you and spit at you and these people are small, they are narrow. Now,

people are not going to push away from something that is in their interest.

But I think we have a much better chance of convincing on their side than we do our side.

Yes.

QUESTION: You see that same kind of idea moving into the community college and higher education?

MR. SHANKER: Sure, and not only that, but this has implications for higher ed in a lot of different ways. For instance, the education professors are the ones who now feel they are under the gun. But they shouldn't feel under the gun, because a lot of the teacher candidates who are failing tests are not failing tests in pedagogy. They are failing tests in arithmetic. They are failing tests in reading comprehension.

So, part of what this means for higher education is that if in the future we are going to ask every teacher to be a liberal arts graduate, how great is liberal arts education? Is a person who is

and English major qualified to be an English teacher? Is a person who is a business major being trained to be a research physicist or are the physics departments in major universities realizing that half of the people they are going to be turning out are going to become teachers and are going to bring future businesses in.

So, now I wanted to mention for excellence in higher education, which is chaired by former Secretary Bell, a number of spinoff commissions now that are going to deal with community colleges, with liberal arts education, because it is connected to everything else. It is very huge, and it will result, I believe, in improvements in all these other fields as well.

One or two more.

Yes.

QUESTION: Last year you made some remarks about the Secretary of Education. Would you like to make some remarks about the Secretary this year?

MR. SHANKER: What did I say? Freud said something about forgetting, didn't he?

Well, I think that the Secretary and the department have, in most ways, been very ineffective, mostly ineffective because they are unsympathetic to the public education. There is one good thing happening and that has been and what used to be in the NIA, and I think there will be an improvement there.

Well, first, they moved into our building, so it must be good. But aside from that, I think in a few years we will have educational information statistics that are equivalent to what the Bureau of Labor statistics has. Right now we talk about things. We don't know how many people are leaving, how many are coming in, how many are teaching, are licensed. We know almost nothing.

You know, if you try to negotiate and you try to get information on this thing, and you know if management doesn't have it, so they are developing a national system of information gathering which over a period of time will be good, but otherwise I think that Bennett is a terrible disappointment, and instead of him saying, look, I was put there to help further the interest of education in this country,

I am within the parameters of the Administration, and I will try to do it. You have a feeling that he just enjoys taking potshots because he feels that top people in the Administration have no interest in public education and he is trying to get brownie points by taking shots once in a while saying that the teachers aren't very good; the schools aren't very good, except the private schools, and of course, they are great in his view.

So, he is a great disappointment, but he is no worse than the alternatives who are under consideration. That is what happens when you lose an election.

QUESTION: The Governor has come out and called for the retesting of doctors.

MR. SHANKER: Oh, you noticed that.

QUESTION: Yes. What is your comment?

MR. SHANKER: Well, I agree with him. People are always asking me about retesting of teachers, and I say, well, while you retest teachers, why don't you retest all the other professions. I don't single us out, but on the other hand, I have always felt that

it makes sense. You have somebody who graduated school 20 years ago, you know, a very busy person, runs a hospital. The hospital takes the patient, they have all sorts of visiting hours. Some years ago during a scandal we found out what happened there, that doctors don't have any time to brush up on what is happening so the pills the salesman sells comes in and says, here is 50 packs of these. Try them out on your patients. They are really great. By the way, we will send you a case of scotch, and these doctors are given a lot of different things from all these different pill salesmen, and many of them are not practicing according to what is known in recent years. Now, that is very frightening.

I don't think that there is anything wrong with that. We pay a lot of money for medical care in this country, and doctors ought to take a little time to refresh their education. I am sure we will all pay for it. They are not going to starve. They will add a little bit of fees so we will all pay for it. But I know when I am going to a doctor that I am not getting a 1921 treatment, or that I am not just getting

the latest thing in some pill.

Now, it is very interesting, if you read that article carefully, there are a number of different ways in which doctors can do that. They can take courses or they can take examinations or the medical profession can develop its own peer review system where a number of other doctors will certify that one of their colleagues is up to date, which is a very interesting thing.

I think that what Cuomo has done is going to start something in New York and I think in ten years every state in the country will have some form of recertification of all its professions.

Yes.

QUESTION:

MR. SHANKER: Well, we can begin to have some models across the country where we do it. It leaves open the possibility that there will be schools without principals. By the way, there are law firms that operate without a single being the boss or senior partners all share in certain decisions, and when it comes to criminal justice, one or two of them make a decision; When it comes to tax law, a few others.

Colleges and universities, the president of a college or university, can't tell -- he is not the boss of the professors. The department chair isn't the boss of the professors. I mean, there are colleague relationships and tenured people have rights and non-tenured people don't, but there are institutions where other kinds of relationships -- Secretary Bennett has taken this as a major criticism of the report, saying that the effective schools research that effective schools have principals who are the instructional leaders of the school. Now, the effective school research doesn't really show that. What it shows is that if you have an institution that

if you have an institution that is a dictatorship, then if you have a good dictator, then you will have a better country than you will have if you have a bad dictator. Because dictators don't allow other people to take over the leadership.

But if you didn't have somebody who was dictatorial and who did allow people to exercise leadership, then the principal wouldn't have to be the instructional leader in the school.

I could get into a camping experience of mine; this time a sleep-away camp. I was at one time one of the managers of a camp. And therefore, I was in charge of doing a certain amount of hiring. And I spent a good part of the year hiring people. And one of the people I had to hire was a music counselor. And I ended up higher a women who was a teacher and who had a master's degree and played the piano and organized musical productions, and quite a record and a lot of good recommendations.

And the opening day at camp came and there were 300 kids at camp and there we were inside the recreation hall, and there was this music counselor

whom I had hired and she was sitting by the piano playing and there were three kids sitting next to her singing songs.

At the other end of the recreation hall, there was a 17 year old kid who was hired as a junior counselor. He had a banjo and he had 300 kids sitting around him singing songs. Now, I went over to the kid that had the banjo and I said, now you don't seem to realize that the music counselor is the musical leader of the camp, so stop playing the damn banjo. It is very embarrassing and I sent all the kids over to the piano. And if this were a school, that is what I would have done.

I would have said to the principal or to the instructional leader of the school. It would have been ridiculous, of course, because the kids wanted to, obviously, he had something in terms of focusing. Now she was very good. She did a lot of musicals and did all those things. She was definitely worth the money, but she wasn't in any real sense the musical leader of the camp.

So, what we are talking about is a

development of different styl-s of leadership.

The next step in this is to get the school districts to say, hey, we are willing to try this in one school, or in half the building, and then get those teachers -- don't force any teacher who doesn't want this -- plenty of room in the world. A lot of teachers aren't ready for it yet. Say, anybody who wants to have an exciting time and is willing to work a lot harder, because none of this is put together yet; those who want to do this, come on over here and then what we have got to do is offer some resources, bring people together, share the same kind of ideas that we are sharing about unions now, and share about how these schools work and develop a national interest. And then a couple of years from now, say, hey, here is how it works.

And we will have a number of different models, but that is how I am certainly convinced that there are many effective institutions in our society that work very well without the idea that the guy who is the chief executive must be sort of an all authority. But you have it sometimes. Sometimes you have people like that who are the boss, and it works. But basically

it doesn't work because there aren't enough good people who will always happen to be at the top at every system.

You have to have the ability of leadership to emerge in lots of places. I agree that that is one of the most radical notions there, and I think it is going to be fascinating. We have got to be very careful when we put this together that we have really got to try and make it work.

We can do it bad, and sloppy and then to have a whole bunch of reports years from now that now there are 20 schools where the teachers took it over and there wasn't a principal, and the whole thing was a disaster. It could happen. But it is not easy to do.

Groups like law firms and universities have managed to work on a colleague relationship have been there for dozens of years and in some cases hundreds of years and these traditions and roles and everything develop very, very slowly. You cannot create something like this instantly.

Last one.

QUESTION: You commented that it may

take 30 years as it did in the medical profession to see something. You commented a few questions ago on that we should be looking to the future and education, as we see it, or the people as we see it, is going to be a totally different kind of thing involving coaching, more individual -- we won't have 25 kids in five classes a day, or whatever it is.

Have you or has the report, the people who were involved in preparing the report, made some recommendations or discussed how we are going to get the people across this country to pick up the costs for all of this. Because usually everything comes down to a dollar thought, and if we are having one teacher teach 125 kids a day, and now we are going to be talking about maybe one teacher dealing with about 25 kids, and we are facing a shortage in teachers, how are we going to bring all this and still earn the \$60,000 or \$70,000?

MR. SHANKER: Well, the reports that I have got, the section on finance, it sort of shows that there is an annual growth toward real money and what is spent for education, and the entire economy grows at a fairly slow rate that the money that will

be coming in would be almost sufficient to pay for this sort of thing.

Now, the reason that everybody says more money will be needed is because everybody is kind of hoping that there will be a new administration, and there will be monies forthcoming and that we ought to push for more money.

However, I want to say to you that it may be possible to do this without any more money. Because if you had a school system, you see, right now what percent of the money that is used in the operating budgets of schools is spent on teacher's salaries? Does anybody know?

QUESTION: 85 percent.

MR. SHANKER: No, 37 percent nationally of operating budget is spent on teacher's salary; 37, down from 48 percent 14 years ago; down from over 80 percent some decades ago. Now why is this? Well, school districts hire teachers that they feel are not competent. And when you hire people that you think are not competent, then you have to hire other people to watch them, and help the. So we have lots of helpers.

I don't know if you have noticed it lately. But the schools spend at least as much on helpers as they do on teachers because they think they need help.

Now, if you hire enough good people that you had confidence in up front, you wouldn't need all those helpers. In other words, you would have a system that has all overhead. Right now you have higher overhead.

Let me give you a set of alarming figures and I suggest that you do this experiment in your own district, because you might find that while the numbers are not exactly the same, you might come up with the same set of shocking figures.

New York City has a total budget for the school system, operating budget, no construction here, all operating budget, of over \$5 billion. And has about 950,000 students, which means that it spends more than \$5,000 per child on operating budget. New York City class size, it is not unusual to have over 30 children in a class. So if you are a teacher in a class and you have 30 kids in a class and each kid is carrying \$5,000, is \$150,000 being spent in your classroom. Now, about your salary and your pension and

— your fringe benefits. Well, let's be pretty generous and say it's \$50,000. It isn't \$50,000, but let's say it is \$50,000; where is the other \$100,000? Are the schools painted every month? No.

Do the kids have a brand new set of textbooks every year? No. Is there a computer on every desktop or one in each classroom? No. Where is it? It is all in helpers and supervisors, and administrators, and also, it is a lot of things like that.

Now, what we can do here is to take that huge amount of money that is all there and move it up front and give it to teachers and to para-professionals and to school related personnel and buy computers with it and buy video discs and video tape and equipment. You could practically, with all the money that tyou have got in the overhead, almost create a kind of paradise by moving it up front.

By the way, any factory that is not doing such a good job and when management found out that they were only spending 35-37 percent in the production process and the rest of it was overhead, they would try to figure it out how to do it all over again.

—

Now, one of the things if you find another slightly radical proposal, is that the school should get the \$150,000 for each classroom. They could get their whole budget and a faculty to sit down and should figure out who they want to hire as helpers and as coordinators, and you might need some help. You might need a business manager.

There was an article in the New York Times a couple of weeks ago which in certain districts they decentralized school purchases, and so in those districts, they gave the principals the right to purchase all the materials in the school. Guess what they found? They found that 87 percent of the supplies that the principals were purchasing were forms for the teachers to fill out, to help the principal to get information. You see how backwards this whole thing is.

So I am talking about, you figure out what your operating budget is in your district, divide it, see how much money stands behind each children, take the average class size in your district and see how much money is in each classroom, and then see how much of that the teacher really sees,

and I think you are going to see numbers that are very close. The numbers won't be the same, but the percentages are going to be pretty much the same and it is going to get you thinking. Sure, we want more money and we ought to have more money, but also, there ought to be a reasoning of how the money is now spent. It is not being spent on kids. It is not being spent on teachers, and that is one of the things about this. It moves it up to teachers and to children, and away from administration.

Well, I think this has been a very unusual hour or so. Whoever thought that the leaders of a top nasty bunch of teachers in a teacher's union are going to be spending all this time talking about professional issues. Absolutely amazing.

(Applause.)

End of tape.