

EDUCATION COMMISSION OF THE STATES
Philadelphia, PA
July 27, 1985

Albert Shanker - President, American Federation of Teachers, Washington, D.C.

I don't know which ideas the secretary was referring to, but I'll make a few quick points, first, on the national exam. I've asked for a national, not a federal or a government exam. The exam would be comparable to what's done in other professions, actuary or medical. I'm very gratified that it's had wide-spread acceptance. I fail to understand why anybody would be against it. There is no other highly-skilled occupation or profession in our country that doesn't have something like it. Of course, an examination will not tell you who's a good teacher. It will tell you who is illiterate. That's a very important piece of information. If someone is illiterate, it tells you that you need not consider that person any further. If someone passes the exam, now you can take a close look and see if there are other characteristics and qualities.

I'm not talking about a \$20, one-hour multiple choice examination. I'm talking about an extensive examination taking at least a few days coupled with an internship period later, something in which people would write essays with organized thoughts which persuade, which would show that they understood the principles and how to apply them to practical situations and that they knew their subject matter very well. Such an examination might very well drive the curriculum in many teacher education institutions. If those institutions were teaching to the test, it would be all right, provided the test is a good test.

The second point is a proposal that's been called Merit Pay. I do better with my constituents if I say it isn't. We can call it what we will. Essentially, there is a very deep need on the part of the American people and

within our society to recognize and reward excellence. While we've all had debates about how easy or difficult it is to do, I must say that I have always felt that. I think most people have. The thing is not to engage in an endless debate but to try to find an answer. We try to find an answer.

We think that we can avoid most of the traditional problems of Merit Pay if we were to look at the models that some other professions have. Medical specialty boards are a relatively recent invention. In the 1930's many doctors found that their colleagues were performing in areas that they were really not competent to perform in. They tried to get legislation to prevent certain doctors from doing it; they were unable to because the profession was strong. They decided to voluntarily create a system of certifying specialists and have advertised that to the public and that later on good hospitals and good health plans and good health maintenance organizations would advise, or in some cases, compel people to use board certified specialists.

The board certification is not a mere pencil and paper examination. It's a system of recognizing excellence and competence and expertise and it could involve course training or pencil and paper, but it could involve all sorts of practical research and demonstrated skills. Why not have the Math Teachers Association and the American Mathematical Association? Why not have the American Association for the Advancement of Science and the National Science Teacher group? Why not have groups concerned with their subjects meet at a national level and ask what kind of national standard could we set up in order to certify to the American people that there are certain outstanding "crackerjacks" in our field. Anyone could apply. The local superintendent or principal or school board would have nothing to do with it. There's no theoretical limit as to how many could be so certified.

Outstanding school districts would advertise to the parents that 75 percent of their teachers are board certified and that the others are "board-eligible" and on the way to board certification. Rotten school districts would say, "We don't care." Teachers' unions could negotiate with a local school board saying, just as they now do for a masters or a Ph.D., board-certified people ought to earn much more.

Right now if you get merit pay in Tennessee and move to Florida, you've got to start all over again, but if you're board-certified by a national board, you can move anywhere. I hope to call a meeting this fall of groups in actuarial medical fields, certified public accountants, engineering fields, and ask just how they set up their boards and to meet with the various specialty organizations in education and see if we can move in that direction.

That now moves to the third area, and that's career ladders. There's been a lot of talk about career ladders. The only problem with it is that it's a terrific idea, but nobody knows how to fill it. In higher education it's easy. You recognize people on the basis of their publications and research and a few other ways of being recognized within the academic community. There are no such models in elementary and secondary education.

If you had these outstanding board-certified teachers who not only know their subject and know how to teach, but know how to evaluate textbooks and materials in their area, have conducted research within their area, have done things with their colleagues, it seems to me that each of these fields there would be something that shows that you're a team player in the profession and that you're a leader--you're not just good at pencil and paper work. Why not say that these people not only receive a higher salary but that they are involved in some teacher training programs of novice teachers in an internship and that in terms

of the functions that they play within a school that they're also perhaps adjunct professors or professors at a local college or university because these are experts in the field. The career ladder involves a continuation of teaching, the assumption of some additional role within the school and also the assumption of status within an institution of higher education devoted to the preparation of teachers.

Choice. I am not for vouchers. I am for greater choice. The best way to prevent vouchers and tuition tax credits is to give people greater choice. Schools are too bureaucratic. I'm not looking at this as a voucher system; I'm just taking a little kid who walks into his second grade classroom and the teacher is a fine teacher but she's had a very bad day and she looks at Johnny back there and Johnny's whispering or doing something and she screams at him. She doesn't usually do that, but that particular morning, she screams at him. Johnny is a very sensitive boy and he's frightened and he goes home and cries and his mother takes him to a psychologist and Johnny, who has not wet his bed for many years, starts wetting his bed, and he has to start being taken to school because otherwise he won't get there. Finally mother comes and talks to the principal and says, "Look, I know it's important for kids to know how to get along with adults, and I really did everything that I possibly could to convince Johnny that he should stay and make a go of it. I think the teacher is fine; it was just not a fortunate thing, but I'd like Johnny's class to be changed, because otherwise I think permanent damage is going to be done. What do you think the chances are that Johnny's class will be changed? Almost none. The principal is going to say to himself, "If I do it for you, I'm going to have to do it for everybody else." Miserable, horrible, inhuman, bureaucratic response, and then we wonder why vouchers and tax credits are popular.

Now let's talk about choice for teachers. Now think of this for a moment. Think of a bright young computer fellow who gets a job outside of Boston somewhere in a little high tech firm and he works there for 7, 8, 9 years, and he's terrific and he's brilliant, and then he decides to move on to a bigger high tech firm, and he walks into IBM, and IBM says, "Mr. Jones, you've had a brilliant career for the last seven years; now we wish to inform you that you'll have to take a reduction in salary because we don't give more than three-year salary credit for any work at any other high tech firm.

Well, it's ridiculous. The opposite happens obviously. Companies are constantly stealing from each other and offering high salaries. The only field in which we ask someone who is moving from one place to another to start at the beginning practically is teaching. Where's the competition? The usual career ladder in the outside world is not someone working their way up in one company; it's getting experience and recognition and being stolen by other companies as you move along. Why aren't school districts rating each other? So, choice for teachers, choice for families, choice for students.

Another point is that we cannot do the things that we're talking about doing without a radical restructuring of our delivery system in education. Because of the demographic decline in the group going to high school and college, we are not going to find 2 million people of the calibre that we're talking about in the next period, because other people need them too. There are not enough to go around. So, if we pay more, IBM will pay more, and others will pay more, and we'll end up pretty much with what we're getting. Now, if you take three simple reforms:

- (1) Raise teachers' salaries by 50 percent, so the average is \$33,000 instead of \$22,000. (Teachers are still not wealthy.)
- (2) Listen to Ted Sizer when he says that the only way you're going to

reach your kids is by getting them to write, marking their papers, and spending 3, 4, 5 minutes coaching them so that they can organize their thoughts. If you don't do that you're not going to get anywhere.

Let's say we're going to reduce pupil-teacher ratio by 20 percent, and then let's say that we need a continued colleague relationship, and therefore we're going to give teachers one period a day out of the five that they now teach. Very modest proposals would not make life heaven on earth. That program costs over \$100 billion, so it's not possible. Well, if it's not possible, we either give up on our ideals and say that we're going to a bunch of idiots and we'll tell them what to do and watch them very carefully. If I hired people at the rates we're hiring them at today, I'd watch them closely too.

We've got to have a different structure. I think you need a smaller number of very outstanding people and a larger number of outstanding people who are transient but who have a five-year commitment who want to pay off their college loans. You've got a permanent group and a transient group; it's just that a lot of your better teachers are the transients, and they leave. A lot of the ones who have no place to go are the ones who stay. I'd like to change that. I'd like to give the rewards to the people who stay.

(3) Structure. There's been all the talk about more excellent teachers and all the talk about legislation, but there has been almost no talk about things that we can do within schools that would make a tremendous difference.

One of them obviously is that of the whole peer relationship--Somebody locked in a room for the rest of her life with a bunch of kids, never having an opportunity to react with peers. Doctors don't get supervised by other doctors, but they do have a chance to communicate with each other, and that communication is a much better form of education and accountability and shaping up than having a supervisor come in once a year and sit in back of your room. I won't necessarily argue for or against that right now, but that does not exist.

What about the notion that we're now organized on an annual basis? Does a child who walks into school in September really believe that missing homework or school for a few days in September or October will make a difference the following June? Does a teacher really think that not using every minute. **Different organizations in terms of relationships to teachers, analysis on basic changes in structure, these are the main points.**