

# ISSUES

## TEACHERS IN TRANSITION A KEY: EVERYBODY LEARNING

Clarke M. Thomas



University  
of Pittsburgh  
Institute  
of Politics

# Table of Contents

Chapter 1	
Pennsylvania Patterns .....	2
Chapter 2	
The Strauss Spur .....	5
Chapter 3	
The Ridge Regulations .....	9
Chapter 4	
Ragged Recruiting .....	14
Chapter 5	
Teacher-Training Turmoil .....	20
Chapter 6	
Hiring Headaches .....	31
Chapter 7	
Resisting Rustiness .....	37
Chapter 8	
Voucher Ventures .....	50
Chapter 9	
Mainstreaming Mel ee .....	53
Chapter 10	
School Boards Battered .....	57
Chapter 11	
Observations .....	61



## Chapter 1 Pennsylvania Patterns

Not so long ago a school board in the Pittsburgh region found a quick solution to a “problem” of selecting teachers to fill nine vacancies.

There was no shortage of candidates, since there is an overabundance of certified teachers in Pennsylvania. So, one board member suggested: Why not just let each of the nine board members pick one teacher apiece? Presto! No sooner said than done.

Typical? Of course not. But this true story demonstrates the lax legal and regulatory atmosphere in Pennsylvania concerning teacher certification and hiring in which such a decision could be made. It is an example of the numerous problems that Pennsylvania faces in finding the key to any meaningful effort to improve its public schools, which is:

### **Getting the best teachers into the classrooms.**

As of the end of 1998, Pennsylvania was in the midst of a major effort by the administration of Governor Tom Ridge to address the issue. That’s something his backers hoped would make him an “education governor” to match or surpass other Republican vice-presidential hopefuls yearning to team up with the leading GOP presidential aspirant. That’s a reference to Texas Governor George W. Bush, who already was receiving that accolade nationally.

But it is a sign of the complexity of the issue and of proposed solutions that the governor is being resisted on some items by many segments of the education establishment, and not just the stick-in-the-muds. The opposition has arisen because Ridge has insisted on including in his education efforts a move for vouchers for non-public schools, something his critics insist would undercut the very system of public education he purports to be saving. (More on that subject in Chapter 8).

Here are some of the conditions in Pennsylvania that have brought us to this pass:

- Given a lack of state-set standards, a school board can override its superintendent and staff and choose whatever teachers it wants—including cousins, sons and daughters of friends, and so on.

- With minimal standards, schools of education have been able to accept students with no specific grade or SAT qualifications. And they then can turn out prospective teachers with no specific academic record in the subjects they will be teaching—whether math, science, or English.

- This means—and the record unfortunately shows—that, along with many top-notch persons, far too many substandard students have been attracted into teaching—and been able to obtain jobs, despite the oversupply. While it may be understandable politically that many communities demand that a member of the community at least be interviewed, this factor has

only underlined the need for standards that would enable conscientious district officials to withstand poor candidates.

- Oversupply clearly compounds the difficulty. A large number of individuals hold Pennsylvania certificates but are not currently teaching in schools. To be sure, the magnitude, demographics, and quality of this pool are factors not clearly understood. Yet teacher candidates continue to enroll and graduate in large numbers from the state's 91 colleges and universities offering teacher-preparation programs. In the past five years, the number of newly certified teachers in the state was 50 percent higher than in the previous five years.

And, in Western Pennsylvania alone, an estimated 10,000 students are currently being trained to teach. Of these 10,000, fewer than 20 percent will go on to find jobs as teachers in Pennsylvania. The point is that the supply of new teachers is not the problem. It is the quality of those who are recruited into the profession, ultimately hired, and who remain in the system that is important.

- All these factors have constituted a deterrent to attracting the best scholars into teaching, despite good salaries and such amenities as long summer vacations. They also constitute a barrier to evoking interest among talented young African-Americans, a highly necessary teaching component not only in urban schools but elsewhere where diversity is desirable.

- For all these reasons, not only is Pennsylvania having difficulty attracting the best into its classroom teaching profession, but it often loses to California and other states some of its top college-of-education graduates. And it is not able to attract from other states their best graduates.

- In turn, that diminishes public confidence in and support of the public schools. It makes taxpayers cynical about the claims of teachers' unions that the higher salary scales they seek are necessary for the "professionalization" of teaching and education in general.

At the same time, demographic trends in Western Pennsylvania in the coming decade offer its 94 school districts the best opportunity in years to institute changes. Robert P. Strauss, of Carnegie Mellon University, offers two reasons why in a paper written for the State Board of Education, a project financed by the Vira I. Heinz Endowment, the Grable Foundation, and the Frick Fund of the Buhl Foundation, all of Pittsburgh.

A. During the next 10 years in most districts, "most students will increasingly be in the secondary grades." At the same time, "elementary enrollments will drop in all but a handful of these 94 districts." For businesses and other taxpayers, this has economic consequences: secondary education is generally more space-intensive and more diverse in curricula, both elements that are more expensive to provide.





B. However, the retirement of vast numbers of teachers for reasons of age will create “budgetary leeway, as experienced, highly compensated teachers are replaced by inexperienced, less expensive teachers.” Strauss estimates that as much as 65 percent of the current available teaching workforce in the region will be needed to replace retiring teachers in the coming decade. At the same time, this turnover will offer school districts the opportunity “to strengthen the academic background of the teaching staff.”

The caliber of Western Pennsylvania’s future teachers will be vital both for quality of life here and, highly important, for its economic development. Joseph Dominic of the Heinz philanthropies puts it succinctly: “Hiring good teachers is crucial in the region’s economic development process.”

Let it be emphasized that there are many excellent teachers in our schools, all too often under-recognized. But clearly there are not enough of them.

The time for action is propitious, for these reasons:

1. Throughout the region, districts are undertaking reform efforts to bring higher standards, higher achievement, and more accountability into their schools. These efforts are already changing the instructional practices of several thousand teachers. Considering also that of the dozen higher educational institutions in the region currently training students, several are seeking to change the way they do busi-

ness; the opportunity to inform and strengthen these change efforts definitely exists.

2. As outlined above, there is an opportunity to hire a large number of new teachers to replace the significant percentage of our current teacher workforce soon to retire.

3. Because of the oversupply of teachers—including those with teaching certificates but not currently teaching in a school—quantity is not a problem. Therefore, the emphasis can be on quality.

Given this opportunity, here are imperatives for achieving teacher effectiveness. Let us address it along these lines:

1. Attract the best students, black as well as white, into teaching, and deter those of lesser ability.

2. Give these students the best possible training, including specific emphasis in the subject matter they will be teaching. (In Chapter 5, we will be discussing the fifth-year Master of Arts in Teaching (MATs) approach now gaining attention in the American teacher-training system.)

3. Set hiring standards so that the better students have the best chance, rather than “somebody’s” less qualified nephew or cousin.

4. Establish environments in school systems so that teachers can operate as true professionals. In many districts this will necessitate changes in seniority arrangements and “time” allocations. The latter would allow in-service training and other profes-

sionalization activities, but not at the undue expense of students' classroom time. We shall also be discussing the new concept of 12-month teacher contracts replacing the present 9-month system.

In addition, we will depart from our concentration upon the proposals for teacher effectiveness to discuss three elements impacting upon any plans for the improvement of Pennsylvania's public schools, that is, the environment in which teachers operate:

A. Proposals for vouchers to allow parents to use tax money to send their children to non-public schools. This provision in Governor Tom Ridge's educational-reform package has cost him support among public-school advocates, jeopardizing other needed elements.

B. Special education, that is, the education of "special needs" students, a topic encompassing a range of subjects from the diminution of state funding to questions of discipline in the classroom. While this topic wasn't originally envisioned for this *Issues* brief on teacher quality, it arose repeatedly in interviews with school administrators at all levels because of budgetary factors, and especially with classroom teachers, in terms of classroom order and instructional effectiveness. Clearly, it cannot be ignored.

C. The pluses and minuses of elected school boards, a fundamental of American democracy as it has developed, but sometimes part of the

problem of improving public education—for example, their role in teacher-hiring practices.

In the final chapter, we shall make recommendations for addressing the needs and goals outlined in this *Issues* brief.

But, first, we'll discuss further the Strauss Report, an important prod for the current wave of school reform.

## Chapter 2 The Strauss Spur

"As you can imagine, much of the discussion at the meeting was pointed and, at times, more than energetic."

That sentence from a 1997 memorandum from the Pennsylvania Federation of Teachers to local presidents and other PFT leaders provides a sample of the strong impact the so-called Strauss Report has had in educational circles. The memorandum describes a November 15, 1997 meeting of an advisory committee convened by members of the State Board of Education to hear Carnegie Mellon University's Robert Strauss outline his report, released eight months later. (See Chapter 1 for the major points of his "Teacher Preparation and Selection in Pennsylvania.") The letter continues:

"Representatives from the teachers' and administrators' organizations attended the meeting, as well as representatives of teacher prepara-





tion institutions and the School Boards Association. Dr. Strauss concludes from his research that teacher preparation and certification need dramatic revision and improvement, and he raises strong questions about the propriety of hiring practices engaged in by school districts.” Then came the sentence in the memorandum about “pointed” and “more than energetic” discussion.

Sometimes hard-nosed statistics from an outside economist such as Strauss can spur more action than reams of studies and reports from within a given system. That may be the case with the present wave of reforms taking place within the educational systems of Pennsylvania.

However, to over-credit the Strauss Report would be like congratulating a rooster’s crowing for causing the sunrise. Certainly, the many public criticisms, studies, reports, and new accrediting systems at the national level have been motivating factors in Pennsylvania as elsewhere across the country. As Ron Cowell, a former chair of the Pennsylvania House of Representatives Education Committee, says, “The train was already on the track.”

But maybe a series of studies by Strauss, an economist and public policy analyst at CMU’s H. John Heinz III School of Public Policy and Management, was the rooster’s wakeup call to Pennsylvania leaders to recognize the “sunrise” taking place.

The most recent Strauss Report, the fifth in a series he has completed

at CMU, clearly was a major basis for the controversial regulations on teacher preparation and certification pushed by the Ridge administration and passed by the State Board of Education on November 18, 1998. Incidentally, Ridge officials prefer to call it “The Heinz Report,” presumably because the name of a major funder for this particular study, as well as of the Heinz School, lends more cachet than an academic’s name.

By whatever name, the Strauss reports have become both a catalyst for action and a lightning rod for dissent throughout the educational establishment. A major complaint is that, in his stress on the mastery of content courses in teacher training, “Strauss just doesn’t get it”—the “it” being the need for pedagogical training as well as content. Here is a genuine cause for rational discussion, which will be covered in later chapters on teacher preparation and hiring.

The other reaction is that “Strauss goes too far,” that is, his statistics lead to unwarranted negative assumptions about the quality in general of schools of education throughout the Commonwealth, as well as of hiring practices in many school districts. This feeling apparently was behind a private complaint from one State Board member to the CMU provost about the tack Strauss was taking, a move which, fortunately for Strauss, got nowhere. Some of his critics contend he is oversensitive to questions honestly raised about his findings.

These viewpoints about conclusions are interesting because the 1998 Strauss Report makes no recommendations as such—they will come later, he says. The closest he comes in that direction is his Chapter 9, where, in a section on “Practices and Trends in Other States,” Strauss points to significant initiatives across the country. Example: Connecticut has a state-imposed admission standard for students entering a teacher training program—1000 or more of combined SAT scores. Example: California requires that educational preparation institutions publicly state in their published catalogue their success rate of placing their graduates, so that applicants and students are informed of their employment prospects. (The Ridge-propelled initiative embodied in the State Board of Education regulations approved November 18, 1998 calls for that “transparency” rule.)

Still, one doesn’t have to be a close student of organizations to see where the findings themselves in this and earlier Strauss reports would send tremors through the system. Strauss admits that he sometimes has had to leak reports to the media because education officials and even, at times, some funders seemed reluctant to have the results made public. Interestingly, too, is the fact that the media—except for an occasional reporter—hasn’t seemed interested, perhaps because combing through such a woodpile of statistics is not their forte.

The first two studies, in 1989 and

1990, measured the differences in access to science and math courses among secondary schools in Western Pennsylvania. The third study, published in 1993, dealt with the adequacy of Pennsylvania’s teachers across all grade levels, as well as the ability of the state’s various teacher certification programs to meet evolving teacher needs. The fourth report, in 1994, dealt with hiring practices of Western Pennsylvania school districts in relation to the content knowledge of new hires.

Even absent specific recommendations, it’s easy to see why the Strauss reports have heated the atmosphere. For they raise fundamental questions about what should be taught in a school of education; content courses vis-à-vis pedagogical courses; what standards should be required both for admission and graduation; whether those requirements will lock out “late bloomers” and even minorities who will be better able to relate in a diversified classroom than those whose SATs and content ability may be higher; as well as about hiring practices in those districts which have tended to favor local residents over more highly qualified “outsiders.”

And most disturbing of all in some quarters, given the superabundance of teachers trained in Pennsylvania—with 91 schools offering certificates—do we have too many teacher-preparation institutions? That’s a question that eventually could touch some of the 14 former teachers’ colleges, now full-fledged universities in the state







system of higher education.

Again, it is interesting that the furor has come from dry-as-dust statistical reports from an economist outside the education profession. For that reason, it is worth offering a quick profile of Strauss to respond to the obvious question: “Who is this guy Strauss anyway?” He attended a public school in the Cleveland suburb of Cleveland Heights, went to the University of Michigan (including a junior year at the London School of Economics), and obtained his PhD from the University of Wisconsin. He then spent 10 years on the faculty of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill where he did a 1986 study on the correlation of teachers and student achievement. It showed that the high schools with high-standard teachers send the most graduates on to college. While that finding might seem obvious, it was the first such study in the nation.

That led to his coming to CMU, where an early assignment was working with a Robert Casey administration task force on a proposal to revamp Pennsylvania’s local tax system. While that effort went down in flames in a May 1989 statewide referendum, Strauss says that experience got him interested in the question of the public schools, a major component in the tax bill of most Pennsylvanians. His first funding support came from the Pew Foundation in Philadelphia and only later from Pittsburgh philanthropies. The result has been the sets of reports which have made him a hero

to some in the field of education and a devil to others.

By themselves, the reports don’t provide the “silver bullets” that many would like to have for addressing the problems of public education. Certainly the conclusions being drawn from the Strauss reports aren’t the gospel. We will outline in succeeding chapters the cons as well as the pros they have raised. But the point is that, regardless of interpretations, their outline of hard facts makes them the 800 pound gorilla in the road of reformers both of the “gung-ho” and the “not-so-fast” varieties.

This Strauss version of the obstacles and slights he faced may seem overdrawn. But it would be paralleled by the tales of other educational reformers. Yet this is not merely a case of resistance for the sake of the *status quo* but because there are genuine, heartfelt differences on what should be done. The intra-education battles that make decisions for change so difficult are succinctly described in the fall 1998 issue of *Daedalus* magazine. Carrying the theme of “Education yesterday, education tomorrow,” it explains: [There] is the competition within the educational world among different approaches to improve schools. The choice between phonics and whole language, heterogeneous or homogenous ability grouping, back to basics versus teaching for understanding—these are a few of the many divisions that frame the discussions

about improving teaching and learning. The advocates of a particular approach aim their fire at colleagues within the profession rather than fight outsiders.

With that honest struggle in mind, let us now turn to the new rules for Pennsylvania promulgated in 1998, regulations that will be tested in the court of public opinion, in the State Legislature, and ultimately in a review by the state's Independent Regulatory Review Commission (IRRC).

### Chapter 3 The Ridge Regulations

The Great Debate over the future of the Pennsylvania educational system at all levels—kindergarten through the post-graduate sections of the schools of education—is now centering on new regulations being promulgated by the State Board of Education.

They embody recommendations from reams of studies, both national and local; from recommendations of such research institutions as the Learning Research and Development Center at the University of Pittsburgh; from testimony at legislative hearings; from innovations in other states; and from complaints from the public, including the business sector. They are part of Governor Tom Ridge's initiatives to improve education.

The new "regs" come in two

packages. One lays down standards for student achievement in English, math, and science (including ecology).

The other, with which this *Issues* brief is more concerned, sets higher standards for teacher certification and for the schools of education that prepare people to be certified teachers. It revamps Chapter 354 of the Department of Education's regulations. The regs would take effect in the fall of 1999 and would be phased in over three years.

Both packages are bound to become lightning rods for controversy in the coming months as they go through the public-hearing and review processes. The debate will line up in two ways. Some want a "whole system" approach to reforming education, as against those who believe piecemeal is better. And, slicing it in another way, there will be those who believe the present system will work with just a bit of fine tuning and, therefore, will oppose the regulations as going too far. That point of view will clash with variations in attitudes all the way across the board to those who contend the "regs" fall short of the drastic remedies needed.

We will consider many of those viewpoints in the chapters to come.

Now then, here's a rundown of the teacher-certification regs as approved by the State Board of Education on November 18, 1998. The basic elements:

A. Students wishing to become teachers must have a 3.0 (or B) aver-





age after three semesters of college. This requirement will be phased in over a three-year period, starting with 2.6 in the fall of 1999, 2.8 in 2000, and 3.0 in the third year and thereafter. Exceptions can be made for up to 10 percent of the students seeking entry, if their lower grade averages are counterbalanced by high scores on the teachers college entrance exam.

As we shall see in the next chapter, this seemingly sensible idea already has provoked considerable controversy. Some don't like the idea of such a heavy emphasis upon grades only. Some of the opposition comes on the grounds that it doesn't account for "late bloomers," students who mess around in their early years in college, but who can become splendid teachers once they find a goal-oriented footing. This is said to be particularly true of many African-American students who may not fare well in the early years of a college environment which may be different from what they are used to.

Others say the regulations should place weight on factors other than grades, such as specifics related to teaching potential as indicated by entrance exams and other criteria.

Some cynics would contend that some of the opposition comes from departments of education in universities and colleges, both public and private, who fear this would diminish the flow of students entering their programs. The results could vary from the need to cut a few faculty positions to the pos-

sibility that some of the weaker departments might be forced to close altogether—and therefore possibly endanger the entire institution. (This consideration gets us into the "cash cow" question which we will discuss further in Chapter 5.)

B. Students in teacher-training departments would be required to maintain that B average throughout their college years.

Some wonder if this will result in the "Lake Wobegone syndrome" of the Garrison Keillor radio show, where all the students in that mythical Minnesota town are "above average." Will there be grade inflation to keep the classrooms full and the current faculty employed?

C. In an emphasis upon content, the new regulations mandate that prospective secondary school teachers must fulfill the same core requirements as students majoring in a specific discipline, such as math or science. And they must maintain the same B average-or-above as in education courses. The purpose here is make sure a student can't slide through with A's in education subjects to counter-balance C's in the courses designed for English, math, and science majors.

Here, one can expect a major battle between those who say teachers must be well-grounded in the subjects they are to teach and those, on the other hand, who contend that it's not enough to know a subject; one must be taught how to teach it so that students actually learn.

An interesting added objection is that some majors don't require the very courses that a prospective teacher will need to know. Example: Some college math departments don't require a major to take geometry, on the assumption a math major took that in high school. Yet a student coming into goal-setting late in his or her educational career may have missed that along the way. Presumably that young person would need counseling; but the point made by critics is that just saying "fulfill the major" may be off the mark.

D. The new regulations spell out in detail a mandate that teacher colleges must monitor their students' programs to insure they gain classroom experience as well as skills considered essential for all teachers, including classroom management, sensitivity to students' needs, tolerance for stress, and innovativeness.

This emphasis points the way to more collaborative arrangements between the training colleges and the elementary and secondary schools to which they send trainees. This trend already is happening with some of the better teacher-training departments (see Chapter 5).

The mandate points to more "content" class experience for trainees, something some schools of education already have inaugurated. This element becomes a crucial part of the debate over 5-year vs. 4-year programs.

But the new regs also recognize the fresh approaches to education

necessary in diversified public school classrooms, where the straight lecture methods of the past often are inadequate.

Yet it's not just *status quo* people who point out that this will require more time for college faculty consultation and hours in the classrooms where trainees are sent, as well as the same demands upon the time of the master teachers in elementary and high schools chosen for collaboration. This aspect may require more personnel at both ends. A national leader in education, Linda Darling-Hammond of Stanford University, estimates that in Connecticut, a reform leader, 40 percent of the teachers now are involved as assessors, mentors, or cooperating teachers.

Will the Ridge administration acknowledge the need for specific state aid to carry out this needed reform, or will that be another mandated cost dumped on institutions below?

Another pitfall in all this is what could be called "battle-weariness." School teachers and administrators have gone through so many "school-reform" changes—desegregation, mainstreaming, magnets, charter schools, site-based management, parent councils—that their attitude toward even sound new approaches may be, "This too, shall pass." All the more need for enlisting their ideas and support.

A summation of what now is to be expected of teacher-preparation institutions in terms of "courses and ex-





periences offered” is outlined in this new language in the teacher-certification regulations:

—Assessment of basic skills: A measurement of a candidate’s ability to communicate orally and in writing and to demonstrate proficiency in fundamental computation skills.

—Assessment of general knowledge: A measure of a candidate’s knowledge in the fields of literature, fine arts, mathematics, the sciences, and social studies.

—Assessment of professional knowledge and practice: A measure of a candidate’s knowledge of educational theory, principles of human growth and development, educational psychology, and other subjects directly related to educational practice and their application/demonstration in school settings.

—Assessment of subject matter: A measure of a candidate’s knowledge of an academic field or discipline to be taught in the public schools of this Commonwealth.

Three significant items that might have been expected but which didn’t appear in the new regulations are worth noting. The first “omission” is “alternative certification,” or allowing persons with expertise, say in the field of physics, to be certified without going through the education courses prescribed for future teachers. While this was an important plank in the Ridge education program, it apparently didn’t pass muster. The pros and cons of that issue will be discussed

in Chapter 5.

The second “omission,” some groups contend, is that there is no provision for certifying teachers for gifted students, as separate from the normal special education certification. Thirty states, including neighboring West Virginia and Ohio, require special gifted certification. William Penn, director of special education at the Pennsylvania Board of Education, told the *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette* (December 28, 1998) that the idea had been periodically considered but then rejected because of the bureaucracy it might create.

The third “omission” is that of requiring teachers to be relicensed periodically. That concept is coming down the pike in legislation likely to be reintroduced in the 1999 session of the Legislature, based upon HB 2100 in the previous session (originally HB 8). The proposal would sidestep the idea of any relicensure examination *per se*, but would mandate that a teacher during a five-year period must take a prescribed number of in-service training hours (probably 180), or college courses (probably six credit hours) or else lose the license.

Under present law, such a regulation would apply only to teachers certified after 1987. That’s because under Act 178, passed that year by the Legislature, those already holding certificates were “grandfathered” with 99-year (lifetime) certificates. Extending any new recertification regulation to teachers certified before 1987 would

require legislative action. Teachers organizations don't want that.

The Ridge administration may have missed a bet on this issue by shunning a new teachers' examination setup that is sweeping many of the states of the country. That is a procedure perfected by the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) of Troy, Michigan.

As described by Mary Ryan Taras, an NBPTS official, the examination is a complex performance assessment, "not just filling in the blanks of a multiple-answer test." To qualify, a teacher first pays a \$2,000 fee and then goes over a number of hurdles, including submitting a portfolio of work, video tapes of teaching a class, and examples of the work of his/her students, along with "reflective critiques" concerning that student work. Then there are four different examinations to test the teacher's depth of knowledge. For example, a person teaching first grade would have to demonstrate knowledge about 3-to-8-year-olds, not just 6-year-olds. A high school algebra teacher would need to show competence in geometry and trigonometry as well, even though not teaching those subjects.

Taras emphasizes there is no battle between content and knowing how to teach it; demonstrating competence on both scores is required.

For those passing all the tests, there is the satisfaction of being designated a National Board Examination Teacher with a 10-year certificate. But,

significantly, governors and legislatures in many states are so enthusiastic about the program that they offer salary increases or bonuses for those achieving the goal.

For example, neighboring Ohio pays the full \$2,000 fee and then gives an annual award of \$2,500 for the 10-year life of the certificate. Cincinnati adds \$1,000 to the base pay of these master teachers. Ohio now has 337 of these certified teachers.

North Carolina has surged ahead with 536 teachers having achieved the honor. The state pays 50 percent of the fees. Several counties offer \$500 bonuses to the successful applicants.

Mississippi, not often considered an educational leader, has 62 National Board-certificated teachers. It reimburses fees when the applicant succeeds and pays an annual \$6,000 bonus for the life of the certificate.

The Florida Legislature, to expand beyond the 22 already certified, recently made a \$12 million appropriation to 1) cover 90 percent of application fees, 2) grant a 10 percent salary increase for the life of the certificate and 3) provide an added 10 percent bonus for any certificated teacher who mentors newly hired teachers to ready them for the tests. In addition, Dade County (Miami) pays a \$5,000 bonus and Broward County (Fort Lauderdale) gives a \$2,000 annual salary supplement.

Meanwhile, Pennsylvania has only four such nationally certified teachers. The Ridge administration is





said to have turned down the NBPTS idea on the grounds it is working out its own system of improving teacher competence.

Finally, it is worth noting that the November 18, 1998 regulations, minus the “omissions” listed above, appear to suit the teachers unions. On the one hand, they strongly oppose alternative certification and want no change in the certification laws that would require a periodic reexamination. On the other, they seem comfortable with the tighter standards for the future embodied in the new regs.

This suggests “protectionism” for the current membership but also a keen desire to attract high caliber newcomers. (In Chapter 4, we will discuss some of the programs of the two statewide teachers groups to that end.)

We now turn to the first leg of the process of obtaining the best teachers for the 21st Century—that is, recruiting the most able young people.

## Chapter 4 Ragged Recruiting

The traditional brush-off has been that if you can’t do anything else, try teaching.

That assumption in the past, however unwarranted, probably has been a deterrent to attracting education’s share of the best students entering college. And it has seemed particularly true for young African-Americans, for

whom teaching in the now-distant, segregated past was one of the best routes into the professional class. Now, given the wider opportunities for educated blacks, the education system has had to work all the harder to attract this group.

The same is true for talented women, now that opportunities in business, law, and other occupations mean that teaching is no longer the likeliest professional option.

A recent national report, “What Matters Most: Teaching for America’s Future,” stressed that the nation suffers from the myth that “anyone can teach,” with a resulting diminished status of the teacher. The report was issued in 1996 by the National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future.

But the picture now is changing, including in Pennsylvania. The reasons, not necessarily in this order, include (1) pay and security, (2) the fact that for teachers willing to move, opportunities abound elsewhere, such as in the West and Southwest, and (3) the challenge of being a part of major changes in public education and helping to shape them. In the long run, the last item may be the best recruiting incentive, although the first is not insignificant. As one educator put it, with entry salaries often at the \$30,000 a year mark, “You no longer have to take a vow of poverty to go into teaching.”

James Henderson, dean of the Duquesne University School of Edu-

cation, says that “kids willing to travel can go any place—Los Angeles, Las Vegas, Baltimore, the Deep South.”

Former State Representative Ron Cowell laments that Pennsylvania loses out to states and school districts that offer bonuses for teachers with certification by the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards (see Chapter 3).

Joseph Werlinich of the School of Education at the University of Pittsburgh argues that in this day and age of corporate downsizing, teaching is a “safer” profession than most in the business world. Given future demand, once you are in teaching and do a good job, your chances of continuing in the profession are much better than in many other occupations.

And this demand is particularly true for African-Americans as even suburban districts increasingly seek faculty diversity because of burgeoning percentages of middle-class black students, as well as of Asians and other non-whites.

Stephen Tamaino, superintendent of the McKeesport schools, says, “People are seeing that with today’s salaries, these are jobs people fight for. It used to be that people came and went, but now you don’t give up a teaching job.”

But Tamaino emphasizes another important aspect. “We are now seeing a lot of youngsters [new teachers] coming with high grade point averages, full of fire and brimstone. Many of them consider society to be out of whack and

teaching as a place where something can be done about it.”

Stinson Stroup, executive director of the Pennsylvania Association of School Administrators, backs up this assessment. “The quality of young folks coming into the field these days is very high. They are better skilled, better trained.”

Still, Pennsylvania is plagued with the same problem as everywhere else, as outlined by Stanford’s Linda Darling-Hammond in her landmark treatise, “Standard Setting in Teaching,” (in *The Handbook on Research on Teaching*, 4th edition):

This era is developing an even more sharply bi-modal teaching force than ever before. While some children are gaining access to teachers who are more qualified and well-prepared than in years past, a growing number of poor and minority children are being taught by teachers who are sorely unprepared for the task they face. This poses the risk that the nation may undergo heightened inequality in opportunities to learn and in outcomes of schooling—with all the social dangers that implies—at the very time it is crucial to prepare all students more effectively for the greater challenges they face.

A paradox remains in the teacher recruitment picture:

(1) An oversupply from the state’s 91 colleges and universities offering teacher-training programs;

(2) Still, an inability to attract







the profession's proper share of the brightest and best in the colleges and universities.

### Oversupply

Gerard Longo, Quaker Valley superintendent, says bluntly that "the pool is too large, especially at the elementary level." While, theoretically, that should make it possible for school districts to choose the best, in practice the opposite often seems to happen.

As mentioned already in Chapter 1, the Strauss Report for the Vira I. Heinz Foundation states that in the previous five years the number of newly certified teachers in the state was 50 percent higher than in the five years before that. That comes atop the fact that 500,000 persons (including 52,000 in Western Pennsylvania) have been trained since the 1960s. The result is a pool of 100,000 classroom teachers statewide, obviously backing up the superintendent's "oversupply" assertion.

Another superintendent, Bruce Bovard, of Canon-McMillan in Washington County, describes how his district has 1,200 applicants for every elementary teacher opening.

And, in western Pennsylvania alone, an estimated 10,000 students are currently being trained to teach. Yet "of these 10,000, less than 20 percent will go on to find jobs as teachers in Pennsylvania." Strauss concludes, "It is therefore not the number of new teachers that is in question; it is the

quality of those that are ultimately hired and remain in the system that is important."

Nor should beginning salary levels be a deterring factor. The National Center for Education Statistics reports that the minimum salary for Pennsylvania teachers ranks the third highest in the nation. In 1993-94, the latest figures compiled by the Center, that minimum average beginning salary was \$28,231.

Finally, in many districts there will be a major turnover in the next few years. Example: The Penn Hills School District expects to lose 70 percent of its teachers in the next five years, abetted by a buyout proposal for retirees with 30 years service which includes both continued medical benefits and a bonus of \$5,000 a year for three years.

William Cooley and Carole George of the Learning Research and Development Center (LRDC) at the University of Pittsburgh, in a 1995 statistics-based survey, predicted that in Pennsylvania "over one-fourth of our teachers (about 25,000) will have to be replaced during the next five years."

But, at present, the oversupply poses problems for placement officers in teacher-training institutions. Cooley and George explain, "Given the large pool of unemployed teachers, placement officials have had a difficult job placing their teacher graduates during the past decade." A major problem remains of districts where either nepotism or the favoring of "neighborhood boys and girls" over

better candidates from the outside continues. (We will discuss that further in Chapter 6).

All of this is compounded by the second large problem, to be discussed next.

### Low Standards of Entry

Questions about “open admissions” policies at teacher-training institutions have contributed to the State Board of Education’s November 18, 1998 tightening of standards for admission (Chapter 3).

Standards of entry into teacher preparation programs have varied in rigor from institution to institution. In general, schools of education are not highly selective in their admission policies. For instance, a survey recently conducted by the Massachusetts Board of Education shows that some private Massachusetts colleges have average combined SAT scores as low as 642 on the 1600-point exam, and students enter some of the state’s larger teacher-training institutions with test scores in the 800s.

In Chapter 3, we discussed some of the pros and cons on the new regulations governing this subject. A primary fear is that higher standards may discourage some of the very people who would make the best teachers.

Let me contribute an anecdote from my journalism career that may respond to that concern. When I came to the *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette* editorial page in 1971, we often had problems

securing enough letters to the editor to fill the allotted space. At times, we even had to resort to asking people in the newsroom to write a letter!

But when John Craig became editor in 1977, he announced a new rule that we would allow a letter writer the publication of only four letters a year. I personally thought this was absurd, that is, shutting off letters when we had few enough as it was.

Well, it turned out that John Craig was right and I was wrong. Instead of inhibiting the flow of letters, the new policy produced an increasing flood, and good letters to boot. Apparently when people realized that the same old names weren’t going to appear repeatedly on the letters page, they responded accordingly. Not only did the quality improve, but, eventually, we had three times as many letters arriving as we could accommodate.

More to the point, Lauren Resnick, director of the Learning Research and Development Center at Pitt, says that in Finland it is harder to get into a school of education than into a school of medicine! Does anyone suggest that this situation would discourage top-notch candidates?

Yes, restrictions can result in quality. That leads us to the next topic.

### Attracting the Best and Brightest

Here is another paradox. As careers traditionally closed to women have opened their doors, schools of





education have witnessed a reduction of promising females in their programs. And for too many, teaching is a career of last resort—one that students fall back on because first choices are not open. Yet, a complaint lodged about the Pennsylvania situation is that the majority of persons enrolled in teacher preparation programs are female and white, indicating a lack of diversity.

Kenneth Metz, dean of the School of Education at the University of Pittsburgh, makes the pertinent point that all the professions (law, medicine, etc.) and their preparatory schools (pre-med, pre-law) in colleges and universities are seeking students from “the same pool” of the brightest students, including the best African-Americans. That makes all the more important the effort for education to obtain its share.

One foundation official believes a problem is that many parents didn’t have a good experience in public school, sometimes think of schools as the enemy, and pass that bias on to their offspring. Their history is unlike that of parents of private school children where parents and teachers “are on the same page.”

Quaker Valley Superintendent Longo proposes that a campaign using television spots and enlisting the support of churches be used to recruit the best young people into teaching.

An African-American educator, Nancy Washington of Pittsburgh, strongly urges that “the responsibility cannot rest solely on the minority community. Schools of Education,

major media sources, foundations, and other mainstream agencies should be enlisted to support the goal.”

Note: The Pennsylvania State Education Association furnishes two scholarships yearly for minority students in Southwestern Pennsylvania entering teacher training.

And the Pittsburgh Federation of Teachers, in 1986, changed its annual program of awarding PFT QuEST Scholarships to focus them on those qualifying graduates who intend to go into the teaching profession and who indicate an interest in teaching in Pittsburgh. In 1998, the PFT was in the 26th year of awarding these scholarships to Pittsburgh Public School students who graduate with excellent academic records or with high teacher recommendations, or both.

The PFT awards \$1,500 to each winner in his/her senior year of college. To win a QuEST Scholarship, a candidate must make the dean’s list four of the first six semesters in college. An added incentive is that the Pittsburgh School District has agreed to attempt to hire each winner to be a Pittsburgh teacher—either immediately upon being eligible or as soon as possible thereafter.

An additional PFT-sponsored award, from the PFT’s Anne Lifer Fund, also provides a \$1,000 scholarship for any product of the Pittsburgh public schools at the point that he or she is a graduating college senior intending to enter teaching.

One recruiting effort that should

be noted is that of the Pittsburgh Federation of Teachers and the Pittsburgh School District. Their joint program seeks to recruit future Pittsburgh teachers from among Pittsburgh's own students. The focus of the recruitment is particularly on (1) honor roll students, (2) minority students, and (3) certain other students specially recommended by their teachers. Special adviser/support teachers at each high school monitor and counsel the participating students.

Another recruiting approach being used in the Pittsburgh schools is called the Urban Teacher Recruitment, Retention and Re-education Pathways to Teaching Project (UTRRR). UTRRR is designed to help classroom aides earn teaching certification. Funded by The DeWitt Wallace-Reader's Digest Fund and administered through the Bank Street College of Education in New York City, UTRRR is designed to increase the number of teachers, particularly minority teachers, who are committed to working in urban public schools.

In Pittsburgh, UTRRR has been used to help classroom aides earn teaching certification through Indiana University of Pennsylvania. In May, 1997, the first group of 11 aides received bachelor's degrees in elementary education from IUP; another 23 aides are in the UTRRR pipeline.

Another problem: Unfortunately, schools of education are not taken seriously by many college and university boards. The irony is that the citizens

who sit on these boards—the very people who understand how difficult it is to find quality workforce members and complain about it—do not make the connection between quality schools of education and the preparation of tomorrow's workforce. As a dean of one education institution commented, there exists an attitude toward teacher preparation programs of “you're just preparing teachers.”

Few tips come even from national organizations, except the mantras of “more research.” Even while making that pitch, the Pathways to Teaching Careers Program in a glossy booklet, *Teaching's Next Generation*, carries this lament:

There are few national champions (either persons or institutions) for precollegiate teacher recruitment initiatives; there is only a fugitive body of research supporting it, and as in many grassroots movements, there may be only meager consensus among the number of practitioners of the art on the best ways to accomplish its goals. As Gertrude Stein might have observed, “There is no there *there*.”

More to the point for a teenager thinking of a teaching career is the *Careers in Teaching Handbook*, issued by Recruiting New Teachers, Inc., 385 Belmont Ave., Suite 100, Belmont MA 02178. It not only contains advice about opportunities in teaching, the path to certification, and finding a job but also carries vignettes from teachers telling why they love what





they are doing.

From interviews for this *Issues* brief, I would suggest also:

1. Students should give serious thought as to whether they want to enter a 4-year or a 5-year program. A discussion of this issue will be carried in Chapter 5.

2. This look-ahead may be made easier with the requirement in the new state regulations that the placement records of teacher-training institutions be made public. That will give prospective students and their parents a solid basis for deciding where to go for the best chances for eventual employment, rather than automatically choosing the institution closest to home.

3. Given the climate of diversity in the classrooms today, especially with “special needs” pupils (see Chapter 9), a would-be teacher might be wise to have a second major, that of special education.

4. Even while still in high school, it might be wise to start a portfolio of achievements in writing, math, foreign languages, as well as extra-curricular activities. Portfolios (and, later, videos) will be important assets in furthering one’s career—whether in teaching or otherwise.

In closing this chapter, I would harken back to Superintendent Tamaino’s comment and suggest that any teacher recruitment program should concentrate on what can be called the “hero concept” of teaching. As *Recruiting New Teachers, Inc.* has put it in its public service advertise-

ments featuring the faces of teachers:

“These are teachers. But to the kids they’ve reached, they’re heroes. They’ve given them hope. They’ve given them choices. They’ve given them lives.”

We now turn to what has become both target and beacon in the discussions of getting the best teachers—namely, the teacher-preparation institutions.

## CHAPTER 5 Teacher-Training Turmoil

During the spring of 1998, the nation was shocked to learn that when Massachusetts introduced its first-ever teacher certification examination, nearly 60 percent taking the test flunked.

That distressing result for teacher-college graduates has redoubled the finger-pointing in a particular direction—to teacher-preparation institutions. States such as New York, Texas, and Pennsylvania have begun tightening their standards, creating turmoil at teachers colleges where budgets and faculty numbers often have depended upon enrolling as many students as possible.

*The New York Times* in a special “Education Life” supplement on November 1, 1998, focused on three college programs in New York facing a loss of accreditation and commented:

The anxiety at New York's teacher colleges is not unique, nor is the soul-searching about the teachers they are sending out and the students they are letting in. Schools across the nation are taking a hard look at their curriculums, with many shifting emphasis from a theoretical approach to practical experience, and state after state is introducing or toughening licensing examinations and mandating higher standards in what amounts to an all-out assault on education programs and budding teachers.

While Pennsylvania has 91 teacher-preparation institutions, public and private, attention focuses on the universities in the State System of Higher Education because they train such a large share. The 14, with a total enrollment of 82,636, are Bloomsburg, California, Cheyney, Clarion, East Stroudsburg, Edinboro, Indiana, Kutztown, Lock Haven, Mansfield, Millersville, Shippensburg, Slippery Rock, and West Chester.

Some Pennsylvania institutions are conducting counter-offensives, including both cogent defenses of how they operate and also important changes in their methods (see below). But to see why they are facing serious questions, consider this scenario:

Suppose you learned that in your child's school, 87 percent of the students received an A grade.

Even if your child was one of the "lucky" ones, you might have serious enough doubts that you would want

to raise a rumpus about such a "feel good, no knowledge" situation.

Yet, in a real sense, figures in the Strauss Report (Chapters 1 and 2) suggest that is the way teachers are "graded" in Pennsylvania. Teacher candidates need only score at or above the mark earned by the bottom one-eighth of those taking the National Teachers Examination (NTE) to pass the exam's test of general skills. That is, everybody except the bottom 12.5 percent gets an "A" on the way to the accreditation that makes them available for a teaching job. (The NTE comes from Educational Testing Service, the same Princeton, New Jersey, organization that fashions the SAT exams for students.)

For the equally important test of professional knowledge, in Pennsylvania anyone above the bottom sixth percentile (16.33 percent) of those taking the NTE test gets the "A" needed on the way to accreditation.

For a comparison, the Strauss Report notes that in the case of lawyers and accountants, only 50 to 60 percent pass the accreditation exams. In teaching, as we have seen, 80 to 90 percent pass.

No wonder the Strauss Report says flatly that Pennsylvania requirements for passing scores on the NTE are "dismally low."

More disturbing still are the low standards for minimum scores in specialty test areas. For example, in Pennsylvania, math and biology scores are at the 19th percentile of the national





distribution. That means that a five percent mastery is good enough for the “A” that counts.

Talk about grade inflation! Kids might love it, just as Pennsylvania students seeking teacher accreditation do. But just imagine your unhappiness if you learned such a score was good enough for an “A” in your child’s classroom, let alone your ire at a teacher that would grade that way!

Why has this happened? And especially at a time when there is an oversupply of certificated teachers?

Some persons knowledgeable in the field say the situation exists because too many teacher-training institutions want it that way—to fill their enrollments and their treasuries. For instance, moving to one of the alternatives—a fifth-year-only graduate program—would pose difficult problems of what to do with much of the undergraduate faculty.

A January 1998 summary report for the State Board of Education by its Study Liaison Committee, headed by Helen S. Caffrey of Penn State, gives this picture for Pennsylvania:

The size and range of offerings varies greatly from over 2,000 students in a comprehensive set of programs at the larger institutions to less than 20 students in one or two programs at the smallest. The [14] member institutions of the State System of Higher Education graduate almost half of the teachers prepared in the state in a given year. While all programs must

comply with standards established by the Pennsylvania Department of Education, there is a great variety in the ways in which colleges and universities structure their programs. Currently, the standards which programs must meet for continuing approval focus on inputs, process and procedures rather than demonstrated success. Results of NTE tests across the institutions suggests that where some are very successful in preparing students to success on these measures of basis competence for teaching, others continue to be less successful. Available output measures such as these have not yet been incorporated in the approval process.

And, apparently, no one is willing to bell the cat in deciding whether some colleges of education, public or private, should be closed.

Stanford’s Linda Darling-Hammond points out that only three states require that **all** schools of education be accredited. They are Arkansas, North Carolina, and West Virginia.

Adding to the confusion is that two systems of accrediting teacher-preparation institutions have evolved. The older one is the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE, usually pronounced “En-kate”). Only 15 institutions in Pennsylvania are accredited by that agency, including 10 universities in the State System and Penn State and

Temple, but not Penn and Pitt. Its catalogue gives this description: “Institutions that have received NCATE approval have demonstrated excellence by meeting national standards in areas such as the design and delivery of curriculum, faculty qualifications, supervision of clinical experiences, advisory and counseling services, student admissions, and adequate and up-to-date resources.”

However, in 1998, a rival accreditation agency was formed by educators dissatisfied with NCATE as being too lenient in letting institutions grade themselves and in not reflecting changes in teaching-for-learning procedures. Called the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC, pronounced “Tee-ack”), it now is headed by Frank B. Murray of the University of Delaware, a national leader in school reform efforts.

In an interview in the biweekly *Teacher Education Report*, Murray said the new agency has launched pilot programs with a number of the 35 schools that already have joined. “Once we feel we have bugs out and understand the system, then we’ll open it up” to others.

Pitt Dean Metz said both NCATE and TEAC officials will be invited to a seminar in the spring of 1999 to explain their separate rationales. Pitt dropped out of NCATE in 1990 on grounds that its “one model fits all,” based on the traditional 4-year model, didn’t work well with research institutions. Metz said NCATE officials

report they have since modified their procedures, a reason they’ve been invited along with TEAC to the seminar in Pittsburgh.

In any event, the competition between the two accrediting groups makes it difficult to advocate action, or standardization, when the situation is still clouded.

Some further observations at this juncture come from a report by a workforce advisory committee of the Working Together Consortium of top Pittsburgh business leaders.

- High standards of **student achievement** are critical if schools of education are to graduate quality teacher candidates. Of the 112 certification programs [in 91 institutions] that exist in Pennsylvania, very few have been accredited. Not only that, but several different systems of accreditation are in place. From any common sense point of view, a single set of commonly agreed upon standards is imperative.

- Further, if all teacher trainees are to meet a single accreditation system, current **teacher-preparation curricula** will need to be strengthened in many institutions. Many teacher candidates are not adequately exposed to subject areas, so they do not have a strong command of the areas they will later teach. And in many teacher preparation programs—those for elementary education in particular—teachers are exposed to many subject areas, but often only superficially.

A foundation official steeped in







education matters suggests also that because many teachers come to teaching without a middle-class background that teacher-preparation institutions should “break open the box for students—take them to the theater, send them abroad, broaden their experiences beyond just classroom learning itself.” This proposal would help would-be teachers meet the new State Board of Education standards, promulgated November 18, 1998, which include as a certification requirement an “Assessment of general knowledge: A measure of a candidate’s knowledge in the fields of literature, fine arts, mathematics, the sciences, and social studies.”

The idea of setting standards brings us to the hottest current debate of all—content vis-à-vis pedagogy. That is, “what to teach” as against “how to teach.” Obviously, both are important, but given the limited amount of time in a 4-year or even a 5-year course, what should the mix be?

Critics of the teachers colleges say too much time is spent on pedagogy, that is, educational theory courses, and not enough of mastering the subjects—whether writing, math, or science—that graduates will be teaching. They contend that too many pedagogy courses consist of boring lectures, having little to do with the emphasis on “learning by doing” that is the goal in education nowadays. (For innovations in the latter direction in some teachers colleges, see below).

And critics point not only to the

Massachusetts certification-examination debacle but also to the sometimes discouraging results of American students on examinations on these basic subjects in comparison to students in other nations. The question is asked: If a teacher doesn’t have a good grasp of a subject, how can he or she teach it to someone else?

These considerations explain the drive behind the 1998 reforms adopted by the State Board of Education, nailing down competence in core subjects as well as in pedagogy courses by setting a B-grade minimum in both areas (see Chapter 3).

The discussion also brings us to a major debate in teacher-education circles—5-year versus 4-year programs.

In an attempt to increase the depth of teacher candidates’ mastery of knowledge content, more schools across the country are turning to fifth-year teaching programs—Master of Arts Teaching (nicknamed MATs). In this system, a student in the undergraduate years concentrates upon gaining proficiency in a particular subject—whether English, mathematics, science or social science. Only after attaining a baccalaureate degree, does he or she enter teacher training through a 12-month course leading to a master of arts degree.

Kenneth Metz, dean of the School of Education at the University of Pittsburgh, explains that “back in ’88-’89, we decided to move to a 5th-year graduate level program on the basis that the depth of knowledge of sub-

ject matter is a central prerequisite to good teaching. And we get a more mature student. I'd say 20 percent of our students are mid-career people, such as a mathematician from Westinghouse who decided to take up teaching.

"In our model, people do practice teaching during the day and take professional course work in the evening," Metz outlines. "We sometimes teach the evening courses at the school site—Pittsburgh, Penn-Trafford, and Franklin Regional are examples."

However, among the 91 institutions in Pennsylvania with teacher-training programs, only two have the MATs framework. They are the University of Pittsburgh and the University of Pennsylvania, with its Graduate School of Education.

One leading superintendent in Allegheny County, Quaker Valley's Longo, expresses great satisfaction with graduates of MATs programs. He makes the point that these teachers don't have to do double duty while starting out on the job—teaching and also going to school to meet state tenure standards. "They already have their master's degree."

And a Pittsburgh's Working Together Consortium committee, in a 1997 report, said: "There is a growing belief that graduates from Bachelor of Arts programs who extend their education to receive teacher certification in a fifth year of college are better prepared to teach math, science, English,

etc." The Consortium, first noted above, is a volunteer collaboration of civic leaders who have agreed to monitor the implementation of action recommendations made by the Regional Economic Revitalization Initiative in 1994. Doreen Boyce, president of the Buhl Foundation, headed the Workforce Advisory Committee making the report.

Lauren Resnick says persons in 5-year programs are more mature in terms of judgment; many may have had other work experiences. She is director of the Learning Research and Development Center at the University of Pittsburgh.

But not everyone is enamored of the 5-year programs. Many school administrators prefer the 4-year programs because students are immersed in actual classroom experience much earlier than the fifth year.

One principal at a Principals Academy meeting said that 4-year BA graduates have had many semesters of experience in the classroom with model teachers and practice teaching, gaining a lengthy period of knowledge not possible in one year of graduate work under the MATs setup.

Steven Pavlak said that the College of Education at California University of Pennsylvania, of which he is dean, did take a look at the 5-year concept but decided to stay with a 4-year program. The reason: "You start out right away in field experience as a freshman. During your college career you learn about school board meetings,





PTA meetings, as well as have extensive classroom-teaching experience.”

Again, on the pro-5-year side, Stanford’s Darling-Hammond makes the point that the 5-year programs do produce more people who go into teaching—90 percent versus 60 percent for the 4-year schools—and who stay in teaching—80 percent three years later as against 40 percent from the 4-year schools.

In that light, Darling-Hammond notes, in the long run, the 5-year route is less expensive per candidate.

But 4-year advocates say that while the longer course may be cheaper for society, it isn’t so for the individual candidate. Stinson Stroup, executive director of the Pennsylvania Association of School Administrators, says that while his bias is toward the 5-year program, “I’m also cognizant that a lot of folks who go into teaching would not fit the 5-year program—too much time and too much money.” (Darling-Hammond notes that many other countries, unlike the United States, subsidize the education of higher quality teacher candidates.)

Some deans of the colleges of education say new programs they have initiated make many of the criticisms out of date.

“Collaboration is the key,” explains Catherine Morsink, recently retired dean at Slippery Rock University. The concept is to create a tie between the college of education and a particular school in a public school system. That goes beyond the programs

of the past where student teachers were assigned “cold” to a given school for practice teaching. Under the new approach, university faculty members actually go into the classroom to hone their skills, and teachers from the designated school go to the university campus to connect with faculty and students.

Moreover, Morsink adds, faculty and teachers work together as a team to develop common goals, assess strengths and weaknesses in the school, and work out a plan. “We try to create an environment in which adults and kids can learn at the same time.” And under the arrangement, Slippery Rock students are in the classrooms on a sustained basis much earlier than the final semester of their senior year. With model teachers monitoring, the student teacher can be helped with such questions as, “Why did you teach that way? Explain why it worked or didn’t. What will you do next time?”

Slippery Rock has established a collaborative arrangement with the Pittsburgh Public Schools that also involves the School of Education at the University of Pittsburgh. The initial effort has been at McCleary Elementary School in the Lawrenceville neighborhood. Another Lawrenceville school, Woolslayer, is next.

“In the old days, we didn’t want to be in an urban school,” Morsink says. But with the new emphasis on diversity, students from a rural university need experience in an urban set-

ting, she says.

Indiana University of Pennsylvania also has a collaborative arrangement with the Pittsburgh District. California University of Pennsylvania has a collaborative setup with the Charleroi School District.

Funding for these particular collaborative programs is coming from the Heinz Endowments. Joseph Dominic, Heinz program officer, notes that the philanthropy without a lot of fanfare in 1997 made these collaboration grants available. As it turned out, only CUP, IUP, and Slippery Rock applied.

Enterprising Slippery Rock also has a collaborative contract with the Clark County, Nevada, School District, the fastest growing school district in the nation. That particular district annually offers 12 to 15 seniors a variety of intern experiences—from rural to small town to Las Vegas itself, as well as multi-cultural and bilingual opportunities. The connection was made through Slippery Rock graduate Frank Lamping, a national award-winning principal in Clark County. All the interns, shepherded by a Slippery Rock faculty member, usually are offered jobs there but, says Morsink, the largest number want to return home.

In the private-college sector, Duquesne University's College of Education is using what Dean James Henderson calls the "Junior Achievement pattern." He explains that the national organization which once concentrated on helping teenagers form "businesses" is no longer "making trin-

kets to sell." Instead, it has developed a classroom module of economics education "to help kids from kindergarten on up to learn about society and community from an economic perspective." Henderson says the 5-week module with one lesson per week is popular both with student teachers and students alike.

In this collaborative with the Pittsburgh public schools, Duquesne students also learn how, in an urban environment, to travel to their assigned schools by public transit and how to make contact with the teachers who will be mentoring them.

In Chapter 7, we will discuss some of the other programs that the state universities are using for teacher development, such as in the northern tier of Pennsylvania where distances make it difficult for teachers to travel to earn college credits. This avenue will become more important as the new laws about renewable certification come into reality.

Frederica Haas of the Pennsylvania State Education Association welcomes such initiatives. Before she joined the organized-labor side of education, she worked in the State Department of Education. "There definitely is a need to bring faculty into the schools. Some of the worst teaching is in these colleges."

Even the vaunted idea of providing for college students the opportunity to practice-teach in a regular classroom has to be carefully managed. Otherwise, Haas says, "Student teach-





ing can be like learning to cook in your mother-in-law's kitchen."

A particular challenge for teacher-training institutions these days is that of computers. CUP Dean Pavlak says, "Superintendents want people who can come to them already having this capacity. Colleges are struggling with this. For example, how do you integrate the Internet into your curriculum?"

In any event, such innovative efforts on the part of a few teacher-preparation institutions seem to be addressing many of the points made by the Working Together Consortium's Boyce Committee in its 1996 report. That survey leveled these **criticisms** at teacher-preparation curricula:

- Insufficient clinical experience for students.
- Content and approaches that lag behind current educational reform and innovations.
- Little exposure to state-of-the-art technologies.
- Often a lack of diversity training and internship experiences in a variety of classroom experiences—urban, rural and suburban settings.

The Boyce Committee report urged that teacher-training institutions focus on **strong model educators** through some of the following ways:

- Teacher candidates should be exposed to great teaching, both in their own college classroom experiences and during their internships in the field. That means teacher-preparation faculty who

are enthusiastic, dedicated to the discipline of teaching, are up-to-date and connected with classroom practice.

- Care along these same lines should be exercised in selecting for internship sites the best model teachers available in a district.

- Faculty reward systems should be developed to insure that educational departments maintain high quality faculty—model educators, that is. The reward systems currently operating in many universities and colleges often work against these goals, as research and scholarly publication are often valued over good teaching.

- These reward systems should provide incentives for faculty to engage in partnerships with schools and teachers.

- The use of intern scholarships should be increased.

- Education faculty should spend time in the classroom, and classroom teachers should be utilized as "show-how" experts in teacher-training institutions.

Into this tinder-box of controversy, the Ridge administration has tossed the incendiary match of "alternative certification." The idea is to make it possible for a gifted person to begin teaching without going through a round of pedagogy courses. Among other arguments, Ridge officials say this would help alleviate the shortage of teachers in such fields as physics, chemistry, and biology because quali-

fied people could come directly from business and industry.

The teacher would be mentored and required repeatedly to take tests for a least the first 15 months. “We want to be sure the new teachers do no harm,” says Michael Poliakoff, who has been a prime mover—and lightning rod—for the Ridge program for improving education. He is deputy secretary for post secondary and higher education in the State Department of Education.

To critics of the Ridge education package, Poliakoff says, “They are worried about success, not failure.” A native of Philadelphia, Poliakoff’s background includes Wellesley College, Hillsdale College, Georgetown University, George Washington University, a stint with the National Endowment of the Humanities, and a time as associate dean of arts and science at Bloomsburg State University before being recruited by Governor Ridge in 1996 to spearhead his educational reforms.

For instance, Poliakoff contends that Texas has found that teachers with alternative certificates are “every bit as good.” He adds, “In Colorado they are attracting PhD’s into teaching by this method.”

Poliakoff says this approach also “would provide relief to the emergency certificate process.” The state issues about 9,500 emergency certificates a year to fill vacant slots, particularly in the Philadelphia system. The largest number are for day-to-day substitutes

for teachers absent for one reason or another. The alternative certificate route “would allow people who want to get into teaching to move permanently into the work force.”

But teachers college deans and union officials can cite case after case of persons brilliant in their fields who have flopped in a classroom situation because they couldn’t cope with such matters as discipline and diversity in ability, let alone the capability of transmitting knowledge so that students really learn.

John Tarka, executive director of the Pennsylvania Federation of Teachers, contends: “There are people knowledgeable in content that couldn’t last 10 minutes in a middle school classroom. It’s a contradiction to be tightening standards for regular teachers and then talking about loosening them for people with no teaching experience. Why not 25 percent unlicensed physicians or lawyers?”

Dean John Butzow of Indiana University of Pennsylvania says that “the real job is not to parrot knowledge but to get children to learn. We sometimes have had A students who blew the top off tests. But they didn’t have a clue as to how to teach. It’s not enough to say, ‘I love children.’”

From Dean Morsink comes this comment, “Yes, there is so much to learn on the academic side. But the need is for someone who can take that information into the classroom and make hard subjects easy to learn. Would observers in the classroom see





that children really were learning? You can have a general body of knowledge, but the applications come case by case. It's like testing of drugs. Some look promising but don't work."

The PSEA's Haas asserts, "You can talk about turning a liberal arts major into a teacher through an alternative certificate. But that doesn't get you to quality teaching."

But the feeling about certification requirements is not universal. Superintendent Stephen Tamaino of the McKeesport district, for one, believes some requirements need to be less stringent. He points out a difficulty of a different type, that is, that some positions are hard to fill—industrial arts, physics, languages, home economics. "The regulations require us to look for people that basically are not there. Some certifications need to be loosened up. For example, school nurses. Why can't a trained nurse do the job—pills, cuts and bruises—without going through the certification process?"

Suppose the various proposed reforms took hold. For example, if the 4-year institutions were to be pushed into a 5-year MATs system, there would be the practical question of what to do with all the present faculty members who are teaching Education undergraduates. Obviously, state action to balance the debits and assets for such institutions embarking upon change would be needed, unless the approach is to let the feebler programs and institutions sink into oblivion.

That brings up the point made by

both critics and defenders of the present system: the charge that the departments of education are "cash cows" for their colleges and universities as a whole. That is, the costs of teacher training are much less than, for example, those for disciplines that require costly laboratories. So, it is said, some institutions of higher learning leech off education tuition income to fund other departments.

The parallel but different responses of three deans are instructive at this point. Dean Morsink says there isn't a "cash cow" situation at Slippery Rock because, if anything, the College of Education is requiring more money than ever, what with its collaborative innovations that require travel and faculty-time costs.

Dean Butzow says IUP doesn't use surrogates for mentoring; that is done in the field by faculty members, adding cost. Besides, "you can have 75 persons in a business class, but we can't do that because there is not that much just to lecture about."

CUP Dean Pavlak turns the "cash cow" charge around by saying that yes, that has been true, with the result that departments of education have not gotten their fair share of university revenue. But that needs to change, he adds, as colleges of education concentrate on becoming professional-development institutions for school systems in their areas, at increased cost.

But even if teacher-preparation institutions carry out the reforms being proposed, that may not be enough

to meet the challenge of “getting the best teachers into the classrooms.” There still is the all-important matter of the mixed-bag hiring practices of all too many school districts. We turn to that subject next.

## Chapter 6 Hiring Headaches

It's teacher hiring time in one Allegheny County district. . .

One school superintendent recalls years in which he was inundated with phone calls on behalf of candidates, including bribe offers from a car dealer to obtain a new car at a whopping discount. His children were threatened; his tires were slashed, probably by a disgruntled teacher candidate who had lost out.

And at subsequent school board meetings his ability, ethnic lineage, and even allegations concerning his sexual preferences were brought up by people whose relatives, friends, or political proteges had been passed over. Needless to say, he was glad to be hired by another district.

It's teacher hiring time in another district. . .

Under a “hire the best” policy, when vacancies occur, there is an aggressive advertising program in newspapers and professional journals and with universities and colleges. Candidates are invited to pick up an application form, allowing district officials

to put a face with a name. Principals paper-screen applications for academic success, extra-curricular achievement, honors earned, literacy in speech and writing, performance on the National Teacher Examination (NTE), and unique experiences. Invitations are sent to the best of those.

If there is a position with a lot of candidates, 40 or 50 may be invited to this district, Quaker Valley, for a one-day blitz of interviews. Committees of principals and two or three teachers who would be working with the eventual winner for a given open position interview the candidates.

The list is weeded down in stages until there is a semi-final interview with three or four, including a request for a writing sample. At that point, the two or three finalists conduct a demonstration lesson with a small group of children. (Some districts schedule the demonstration with a “class” composed of adults, i.e., teachers. Some request submissions of videos and portfolios.) A committee watches and the principal debriefs the students afterward.

The final one or two names go to the superintendent for a personal interview and the final choice. Finally, there is an induction program with a teacher-mentor for the first year.

This example undergirds a point made by Stinson Stroup, executive director of the Pennsylvania Association of School Administrators, that Pennsylvania's “lighthouse districts” put candidates through a rigorous pro-







cess that includes assessments of sample teaching, portfolios, and videos as well as interviews.

Another example: Canon McMillan in Washington County, uses a point system as part of the initial screening process. For example, a college grade point average (GPA) of 4.0-3.6 earns 2 points; 3.59 to 3.0 is 1 point and below 3.0, no interview. A similar GPA in a certified area receives 3 points and so on down. Scores on the NTE are graded similarly. Of a possible total 11 points, an applicant must have six or more points to be considered for even an initial interview.

In a fourth district, computer literacy is an initial requirement, with a unique way of fulfilling it. The *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette* of May 10, 1997 under the headline, “Teachers Wanted: Web Surfers Only,” described a new policy initiated by the Keystone Oaks School District. To apply for a teaching job, a candidate must find the district’s web page on the Internet and download the application and selection criteria. “We are not interested in interviewing teachers who are not computer literate,” the article quoted Superintendent Chet Kent as asserting.

These examples, all in the Pittsburgh area, underline the variations in what George De Simone of the Allegheny Intermediate Unit calls a **\$3 million decision** in hiring a teacher. That’s the price a district will pay over several decades in salary, health benefits and support costs for the teacher

selected, bad or good.

Moreover, these differing instances illustrate how the Workforce Advisory Committee of Pittsburgh’s Working Together Consortium appraised school-district hiring practices in Western Pennsylvania:

— Western Pennsylvania school districts vary considerably in whom they hire in terms of initial experience.

— About half of newly hired teachers have no prior teaching experience.

—But, at the same time, the wealthier districts tend to hire experienced teachers, paying somewhat higher starting salaries. (This practice, of course, may be viewed by losing districts as “sheep stealing.”)

— Few districts report conducting extensive searches for teachers. School superintendents will tell you that in some cases they will receive as many as 1,000 applications for five or six open positions. But with a large pool of teacher candidates available, districts have little difficulty filling positions. The paradox all too often is that because of quantity, quality gets short-changed.

— Few districts look beyond the minimum requirement of state certification when selecting teachers.

— Localism is the norm. Surveys show a majority of new hires are from within 70 miles of the district. And the majority of districts hire teachers only from schools of education in Western Pennsylvania, most from those closest at hand.

— All too often, nepotism and patronage intrusions by school board members play a role in the hiring of new teachers.

A 1995 study by Cooley and George is instructive at this point. Here are excerpts concerning hiring from the work of these two researchers for Pitt's LRDC:

Hiring practices vary among the many different school districts. The two largest districts, Pittsburgh and Philadelphia, are required by state code to rank applicants using a numerical score, and then use this placement list to select teacher candidates for final interviewing. According to the personnel office of the Pittsburgh Board of Education, criteria used to award points are based upon: interview results; review of the applicant's credentials including references, transcripts, GPA, advanced degrees; and rating based on their previous professional or student teaching experience.

Other districts are free to develop their own procedures for hiring. The screening and interviewing procedures differ among the districts, especially between larger and smaller districts. We found that districts that had either a personnel director or an administrator in charge of personnel had a well-defined hiring process and were able to involve more district personnel in the interview-

ing process. But smaller districts, which had no personnel administrator, seemed to depend on their principals, with the aid of clerical staff, to screen and interview. The hiring processes in these districts varied among the schools because principals defined the interviewing team and process in different ways.

Districts that used more rigorous criteria for selecting teachers included as many as three sessions of interviews with various members of the hiring team, review of writing samples, as well as screening based on credentials. The hiring team from some districts included administrators, coordinators, and teachers, while less demanding selection criteria included screening of applications by the principal and clerical staff, followed by an interview with the principal. All districts that were contacted indicated a final interview with the superintendent.

But the first example cited at the beginning of this chapter shows the hiring pressures applied in some districts, including from school board members. The superintendent quoted in that instance, when asked, "Why?," gave this answer (paraphrased):

In some communities where job opportunities are scarce, local politicians and sometimes board members want to show they have clout by having their relatives or





protegees fill vacant teacher positions. Job-filling, i.e., patronage, is “a source of power, a way to control the local environment and the people within that environment.”

Such interference can occur in a wealthier district, too, although there a superintendent usually can count on the backing of elements in the community committed to a professional approach.

But a hazard for professional educators in school districts of any size or socio-economic makeup is that of the school board and the fact that virtually anyone can run for the board and change its composition, virtually overnight. (More on this subject in Chapter 10.)

Residence requirements are another hurdle in the case of Philadelphia and Pittsburgh. These two are the only districts in the state requiring teachers to live in the district. While outsiders can be and are hired there, they must move into the district to hold their jobs.

It should be noted that even in “hire the best” districts, all other factors being equal, a local candidate will be given the nod. Some districts have that built into their manuals.

Also, these districts may give preference to long-term substitute teachers, whose work they have had a chance to observe over a considerable period. Often, hometown candidates passed over the first time take substitute positions, hoping to move into

full-time employment at some point.

Districts also may give preference points to candidates who have been their interns from teacher-training institutions. Again, the rationale is that administrators and teachers have a known quantity. Note: This, of course, can make for difficulties if the intern is a “local boy or girl” who just doesn’t measure up, creating a negative-decision situation that can make for trouble in a public meeting of the school board.

Actually, a manual, “Teacher of the Future,” developed under the leadership of an Allegheny County educator, could be useful to any district, particularly those without personnel directors. He is A. Richard Pitcock, retired personnel director for the Mt. Lebanon School District who, as president of the American Association of School Personnel Administrators, in 1995-96 appointed panels to study the subject. From their deliberations came the manual which offers a detailed description of what the “teacher of the future” should be like and provides step by step procedures for interviewing and hiring teachers who will fit that ideal.

Pitcock says the manual “tells colleges and universities what we are looking for with teachers in terms of knowledge and skills.” The book lists nine “knowledges” and 11 skills, with 67 “evidences” to show that the candidate has them. “We have specific ‘look fors’ for each evidence. When you apply these yardsticks to all candidates alike, it is easy to judge which

is the most competent. You can structure the interview so the interviewer doesn't dominate. All too often, interviews turn out to be nothing more than conversations."

Interviewers need to be trained, Pitcock believes. Frequently, administrators and school boards don't have the necessary background.

Returning to the Cooley-George report for a moment: In noting that Pennsylvania's school districts have been hiring an increasing number of first-time teachers, they speculated:

"This trend could mean that the pool of unemployed, experienced teachers is beginning to dry up, or that because of budget constraints, districts prefer to hire the less expensive, inexperienced teachers when they have a new opening." Concerning an especially high turnover rate in 1993, following changes in retirement rules under the so-called Mellow bill, the researchers noted another interesting aspect: "This turnover of teachers results in considerable savings in teacher salaries across the state. The total salaries for the teachers that terminated in the summer of 1993 was about \$315 million, while the total salaries of those who were hired to replace them was only \$175 million, a difference of about \$140 million in salaries alone."

The Mellow bill, named for State Sen. Robert J. Mellow of Lackawanna County, first opened a 30-and-out window in 1984, a process refined, extended and/or re-opened in July 1986, July 1987, October 1988, August 1991,

April 1994, and April 1998. The system has allowed a teacher with at least 30 years of service to take early retirement with continued benefits.

An explanatory note sent to the 1997-98 session of the Legislature by the Public Employee Retirement Commission said the original intent of the 30-and-out windows was that "during a period of reduced student population in the public school districts, changing government services, and of fiscal restraint, to avail the school districts and the Commonwealth of cost savings opportunities to reduce the need for the school districts and the Commonwealth to furlough employees by granting eligible employees a temporary option for early retirement."

The Mellow process has opened up hiring opportunities in many districts as older teachers took the option to retire early.

One problem for school districts pointed out by the Allegheny Intermediate Unit's De Simone is that retiring teachers don't have to submit retirement papers until the last minute. That can mean a scramble to obtain a suitable replacement after the cream of the crop is gone. Here a new clearinghouse should be a help.

Of course, there are advantages for Pennsylvania which need to be taken into account. Pay, for one. Werlinich of Pitt's School of Education tells of a Pennsylvania-born teacher he knows who doubled her salary by moving from the Charlotte-Mecklenburg District in North Carolina to the North





Allegheny District.

And the well-known propensity of Western Pennsylvanians to want to stay in the region plays a role. Werlinich describes a request he received from the affluent Highland Park District in the Dallas suburbs for a principal, with pay at \$110,000. Yet, when he talked to the three principals in Allegheny County he considered the best prospects, not a one wanted to move, even though their present salaries weren't two-thirds of that amount.

Given all the varying factors in hiring practices described above, it is not surprising—unfortunately—to learn from deans of colleges and schools of education that too often their best graduates are not hired because they don't fit some local “template.” Indeed, many such star students go out of state where their record is more appreciated.

Joseph Oravitz, executive director of the Pennsylvania School Boards Association, concurs. “Too often the not-better students are hired, discouraging the best.”

Then we wonder why California and other states with quality-based recruiting programs are able to siphon off Pennsylvania's best. And add to that locations with climate advantages such as San Diego, Miami, Tampa and Virginia Beach that can overcome lower pay scales with climate advantages. And, as described in Chapter 5, Slippery Rock University has an arrangement with Clark County, Nevada for internships and potential hiring,

which often works for its graduates. One can speculate that if hiring conditions for the best don't improve in Pennsylvania, other colleges might follow the same route.

One glaring negative is that the region has had no clearinghouse arrangement for matching talent with job openings. The establishment of such an entity has been repeatedly recommended in reports by CMU's Strauss, Pitt's Cooley and George, and the Working Together Consortium's Workforce Advisory Committee.

The Cooley/George report argues that “if there were a clearinghouse for prospective teachers in Allegheny County, it would be more efficient than the present state of affairs, in which 43 districts try to figure out who the most qualified applicants are, and thousands of prospective teachers are trying to find out where the openings are. . . Such a clearinghouse would also be an excellent way to monitor the size of the applicant pool in the region, something that is very difficult to do today. It would make it less likely that we would suddenly be faced with a serious teacher shortage.”

York County already has established such a clearinghouse.

In 1998, the Grable Foundation of Pittsburgh supported the formation of such a regional clearinghouse that should help with the dissemination of “the best” hiring information, including to districts using less rigorous practices. Under the plan, the Allegheny Intermediate Unit is leading a consor-

tium of intermediate units, school districts, institutions of higher education, and major educational organizations to create an Internet-based clearinghouse that will provide over 100 school districts in eight counties of Southwestern Pennsylvania with access to a pool of candidate applications.

Candidates would submit one application to the clearinghouse and become eligible for positions in any participating district. School districts would electronically screen the applications to identify teacher candidates that meet their hiring needs and start the interviewing process.

The advantages for students, including the best, and for school districts are obvious.

Finally, to round out the hiring picture, here are some observations from a classroom teacher who has participated in pre-hiring screening in her “lighthouse district,” who asked to remain anonymous. First, she says she is constantly impressed by the caliber of both intern and full-time teachers coming into her district. She frequently is involved in on-campus interviewing teams for both categories.

This teacher said the interns know they are entering a rigorous period, working for the district 40 hours a week on a \$4,000 to \$5,000 stipend, and going to teacher-training classes at their home college at night.

As to teacher candidates, this teacher with 20 years of experience says it is impressive to see people from business and journalism (but not from

the medical arts or from science) moving into the profession. They are mostly people in their 20s who went through college without taking any education courses. Some have been successful—she cited an arts major—but are not happy and have decided to try teaching. “Some turn out to be star teachers, but some find teaching is not as glamorous as they thought. They are shocked at the hard work the job entails.”

But there remains the task of retaining these new teachers—especially the best— including programs that continually improve their skills in helping students learn. In our next chapter, we will discuss the professional development programs that also keep them—and older teachers—from becoming bored or rusty.

## Chapter 7 Resisting Rustiness

The instructor at the front of the room tries her best. But the conversations and the giggles went right on in a distracting, disruptive way.

A class of teenagers? No, a room full of teachers on an in-service professional development day held by the Allegheny Intermediate Unit and conducted by Patricia DiRenzo, a staff development/curriculum specialist for the AIU.

“They were just like students out there,” DiRenzo recalls. She says one





of the teachers explained to her later by way of a half-apology, “We work hard all the time so that an in-service day is just a blow-off day for us.” Another said teachers consider such in-service days a waste of time. “It seems to be the norm of the culture,” DiRenzo comments wearily.

Of course, this session is not typical of all in-service training. But it points up a problem for the professional-development scenarios that almost everyone in education considers vital for keeping both new and veteran teachers up to date in a culture that increasingly demands learning results in the classroom.

The issue is of importance as the State Legislature moves toward requiring a certain number of in-service training hours and/or college credits for teachers to maintain their certificates. This comes against a background of veteran teachers questioning the value of many graduate courses at teacher-training institutions and of casual attitudes toward in-service days, such as DiRenzo experienced.

DiRenzo echoes the sentiments of many in the field who say ways must be found to link in-service training directly to student performance. That is the point of the collaborative ventures that some teacher-preparation institutions are inaugurating with school systems (see Chapter 5).

A union official agrees, saying that the stress should be on teachers showing classroom competence, “not just going to school two more times.”

A growing practice in quality-aspiring school districts is to find ways for teachers to aid each other, such as through establishing ways for the best teachers to help other teachers improve. Pitt’s Werlinich says that the time was when this was considered intrusive, “But not now.” He adds wistfully, “Still, many teachers have never observed another teacher in action.” The use of videos is but one way to pursue this goal.

Such a peer-to-peer approach has been developed in the Quaker Valley School District, a program called TACT, the acronym for Teachers Assisting in Coaching Teachers.

Holding good teachers is a continuing problem for any educational system. A Lou Harris poll asking former teachers why they had quit teaching elicited answers that they were disappointed with working conditions that interfered with instruction, discouraged by low pay, and demoralized by their lack of professional prestige. The Harris report continued:

As workplaces, schools fell far short of their expectations. In some cases, those who left the classroom were probably not cut out to be teachers; they were not loving, versatile, patient, insightful, or tireless enough. In too many cases, though, successful and committed teachers have left the profession because their workplaces were inferior, confining, disheartening environments that prohibited them from doing

the work they set out to do and that most people believe they should do.

There is general agreement that an induction process for a new teacher should include mentoring and a plan to assess and map progress. Such a procedure is the likeliest way to keep good teachers and, perhaps, weed out those who come to realize teaching is not their forte.

Note: The Pittsburgh Federation of Teachers collaborates with the Pittsburgh District on a teacher induction program in which, in PFT President Al Fondy's words, "All new teachers are pulled out for a day or two with classroom observation with truly competent teachers."

If you are a physician or a lawyer or an accountant, you are responsible for keeping current in your discipline through supplemental training courses and, in some cases, recertification requirements.

But not so with the teaching profession. The only incentive for professional development, early in a teacher's career, is to obtain a master's degree in order to move up a step on the salary scale. After that, a teacher may coast, although most districts provide in-service opportunities.

But a foundation official in Pittsburgh contends that, unfortunately, too many districts do not validate good teaching. Good teachers want to be even better teachers. But the incentives go the other way, all too often.

Recertification practices up

through 1997 offered little in the way of holding teachers accountable for new developments in the teaching profession or in the content areas they teach. In Pennsylvania, tenure can be obtained after two years for any teacher having 24 post-graduate credits. After that, there are no requirements for further upgrading of skills.

One reason questions of certification and recertification are so important is because of the inherent difficulty of assessing teacher performance and effectiveness.

Even such a skeptic of the operations of the schools in Pennsylvania as CMU's Strauss makes this important point: "Evaluation of personnel in any large organization is quite difficult, and especially so when one cannot readily measure outcomes as in the private sector. Simply ascribing student achievement to the efforts of an individual teacher ignores the obvious reality that student achievement is cumulative and dependent on those who taught the student earlier, as well as the student's own intellect, motivation, and home environment."

For many teachers, "professional development" is often viewed simply as acquiring graduate-level credits in order to obtain salary increases, rather than as professional growth. The emerging view, however, is that all teachers—not just those who show interest—should be expected to engage in professional development opportunities, keep abreast of current educational reforms and innovations,







and continually reflect upon their own teaching strategies and their subsequent impact on their students' learning.

However, course work or educational workshops for teachers often have little connection to classroom practice. An elementary teacher from a "lighthouse" district interviewed for this *Issues* brief says, "Some in-service training is quite good. But, frankly, some of it is horrible."

Often, the result is a large gap between what is offered as professional development and the responsibilities and expectations that are placed upon teachers. As that same classroom teacher puts it: "Teaching has changed. There is a lot more accountability. And a lot more paper work that consumes a lot of the day. Not the teaching day—you have to do it after hours, staying until 5 p.m. or 6 p.m. You have early morning meetings, at 7 a.m., before the day officially starts at 8 a.m. And you are observed formally every year by a supervisor.

"The other thing that has changed and improved is communication with parents. But that takes time, too. We do a lot more of that in conferences, in newsletters, and by telephone in the evening. It can't be done during class time; there are no phones around in a classroom! And we have welcomed parents in the classroom."

Professional development, such as workshops, has to be worked into busy schedules such as this teacher describes. That helps account for the re-

sistance DiRenzo encounters. No wonder one superintendent says that in-service training is "like driving a bus down a hill while you are still building it."

The 1995 report on Pennsylvania's classroom teachers by Pitt's Cooley and George notes:

Recent polls of teachers have indicated that the typical staff development days that districts offer their teachers tend to be empty rituals which teachers suffer through because they are obligated to do so. Most teachers admit that they could improve their teaching with better support and training, and are not as current as they would like to be in the subject matters they are expected to teach. Those who have looked into this problem have concluded that teachers must have a larger role in designing their own professional development if things are to improve.

Earlier, we discussed the high turnover in teaching expected in the next few years. But there is a flip side to that—the number of teachers who will continue in the classroom during and after that period. As Cooley and George phrase it:

The fact that over three-fourths of those presently teaching will **not** be terminating their positions for at least five years has implications for the professional development of teachers. So does the fact that half of today's teachers are in

their fifties, which means that it has been at least 20 years since their undergraduate preparation. Teachers, as in the case of all professionals, must have the opportunity to advance their knowledge and skills, particularly in a climate of educational reform.”

It is this factor that elicits from former House Education Committee Chair Ron Cowell the comment that the prospective recertification law is “particularly important for those who most desperately need it—teachers with master’s and doctoral degrees already but not motivated to continue learning.”

It should be noted that numerous institutions are stepping up to the plate at this point. For instance, Lock Haven University is offering what is called “long-distance education” for elementary teachers. Through two-way video setups in Renova and Coudersport, teachers can interact with a faculty member on the Lock Haven campus updating them on mathematics and science, both on content and on current teaching methods. In this “virtual reality” setup, teachers can obtain credit hours without having to travel several hours to a campus.

With a \$500,000 grant that the State System of Higher Education received in February, 1998 from Bell Atlantic, it is providing computer training programs for teachers from kindergarten through college faculties. Indiana University is the hub, with

satellites at Clarion, Edinboro, and Slippery Rock Universities, with hopes of making the computer-competency service available to faculties of all kinds in colleges, public and private across the Commonwealth. With students, the idea is to teach youngsters that computers are not just a high priced toy but can be used to access the Internet as a research tool. One State System official explains, “A school this way can have an electronic encyclopedia, so you don’t have to spend \$2,600 for the Encyclopedia Britannica.”

In the State System, only Indiana University can offer a PhD program. But Shippensburg University has a collaborative arrangement with Duquesne University, as California University has with Pitt for offering PhD degrees in educational administration for persons to be certified for school district superintendentcies.

The buzz word nowadays is “collaboratives,” where teacher-preparation departments are working actively with public school systems to focus and improve both of their faculties in a joint effort to carry out reforms based directly on student-learning.

For example, four institutions are involved in working with the Pittsburgh Public Schools in the “Pittsburgh Collaborative.” They are Duquesne University, Indiana University, Slippery Rock University, and the University of Pittsburgh.

Another collaborative in this area involves California University with





the Charleroi Public Schools. Steve Pavlak, CUP's education dean, says such efforts are important as reforms come into play because there will be veteran teachers "trained the old way, when the new way is already installed in the classrooms."

Pavlak said an asset nowadays is that there is a two-way advantage in the mentoring process. That is because new teachers have computer and other technological skills they can impart to veteran teachers in exchange for the experience of the latter. Both sides have reasons to respect and learn from each other.

This factor may help relieve some of the angst and fears that LRDC's Resnick says she detects among older teachers facing reforms, including recertification rules. She has been active in standard-setting efforts at the national level.

Dean Pavlak notes the paradox that "about 20 years ago we got rid of the old laboratory schools. They got the stigma that they were just college profs' schools, and they failed when districts pulled out their kids. Now we're back to something like that, but in the new form of professional development schools."

In its Charleroi effort, CUP is involving not only its faculty and the school districts but "we are bringing the school board and the community, including business people, into the process."

Another quite interesting collaborative involves the PFT and Slippery

Rock University. PFT President Fondy explains that teachers are most receptive to further training when it is done by their peers. It is for that reason that the PFT has established a teacher-training facility in its headquarters building on Pittsburgh's South Side. Called Educational Research and Dissemination, it offers courses on a volunteer basis to members, taught by especially trained PFT members who themselves are classroom teachers. Held after school, from 4 p.m. to 7 p.m., they are designed to relate directly to what instructors are teaching in their classrooms.

Fondy noted that his members feel this is better than having training from faculty of a teacher training college. But the PFT has an arrangement with Slippery Rock for graduate credit for students who pay the requisite tuition.

In a sense, Fondy said, this is a substitute for the former Teacher Centers that the Pittsburgh School District had for a time until they were dropped for budgetary reasons. "We feel this is our responsibility as a union, the reason we are using some of our dues for this purpose."

Speaking of those Centers, an insight on how they differed from the new approaches comes from Judy Johnston, who directed the Center at Schenley High for high school teachers and is now program development director for the LRDC. That teacher-training reform instituted in the Pittsburgh system in the 1980s by former Superintendent Richard Wallace in-

volved pulling teachers out of their classrooms to attend a course at one of three Centers. While that effort produced several gains, Johnston says, it did little to change the school and classroom situation from which the teacher came and to which he or she returned. One positive out of it—Pittsburgh led the nation in the use of student portfolios as a method of learning and of tracking students' progress.

The new teacher-development efforts use collaborative methods to nurture the learning process directly in the classroom, such as the ones already described in this chapter. Johnston notes that unions are critical to the success of any such reform efforts because of union rules requiring teacher assignments on the basis of preference and seniority.

A September 1998 conference at Harvard addressed the subject of union relevance with the topic "Teachers' Unions and Educational Change." As reported in *Education Week* for October 7, 1998, the group had trouble reaching a consensus about teacher unions. One presentation by Harvard's Susan Moore Johnson about teacher contracts in 11 districts around the country found six "reform contracts" that showed willingness to work with administrators to improve performance, while the rest were "industrial-style" contracts that offered little flexibility.

The *Education Week* story touched on Pennsylvania with this analysis:

A case study of the Michigan

and Pennsylvania state teachers' unions concluded that after two decades of successfully pushing for better salaries and working conditions, the unions find themselves defensively fending off school choice initiatives and efforts to rein in their strength at the state and local level.

In both states, the study found activist Republican governors have successfully pushed their own education agenda by either ignoring the teachers' unions or by exploiting a public perception that unions stand in the way of reform.

Returning to the discussion of collaborative efforts, we find that the LRDC, through its Institute of Learning, established in 1995, has embarked on creating what it calls "nesting communities." Its initial efforts have been in four urban school district—San Diego Unified School District, the Pittsburgh Public Schools, the School District of Philadelphia, and Community School District #2 in New York City—as well as two clusters of smaller Western Pennsylvania districts.

The concept of "nesting communities" means that everyone in a school is a constant learner, not just the students but also their teachers and the principal. As explained by Resnick and Johnston: "We envisage teachers as learners, becoming increasingly expert as conductors of classroom learning by functioning regularly as members of a





community of adult learners who focus on improving their practice as educators. The logical community of learners for practicing teachers, the community that shares accountability for student achievement, is other teachers in their school. Such school-based learning communities produce improvement in student achievement when they develop individual teaching capacity and when they facilitate a common learning culture in a school as a whole.”

The principal is the logical conductor of a “nesting community” in his or her school. Resnick and Johnston say that “it is clear that the role we envisage for principals will require substantial change and new learning on their part. Principals, in other words, need to be ‘students’ in their own Nested Learning Communities.”

And, finally, the superintendent’s role is to “create a high-performance learning community for principals” and so on down the line. The whole object, the LRDC officials say, is “focusing everyone’s efforts on the ultimate goal of student learning.”

National attention is bound to be focused on this project to see whether it bridges the gap between the theories developed at institutions like the LRDC and their implementation in the cold world of multi-problem classrooms. And whether the results can be replicated beyond the initial “test tube” districts chosen for willingness to collaborate.

Turning from efforts concerning

the future teaching force, there is another matter in the educational realm that deserves mention.

### **Persuading Principals**

A looming question mark in today’s educational equation in Pennsylvania is that of principals, or the prospective lack thereof. With a growing realization of the importance of the principal as an instructional leader, this problem could become basic to hopes for educational reform.

Joseph Oravitz, executive director of the Pennsylvania School Boards Association, says the pool for principals and superintendents definitely is drying up. “We used to see 70 to 90 applications for superintendents’ jobs. Now we get 20 to 25 applicants. In fact, we now are seeing administrators moving back into teaching to get away from the pressures.”

A number of educators interviewed for this *Issues* brief, speaking from different perspectives, talked about how increasingly difficult it is to persuade teachers to advance into assistant principal positions, the initial step up the administrative ladder.

Stinson Stroup, executive director of the Pennsylvania Association of School Administrators, reports, “For many people, moving up is difficult. The impact on spouses and children, the rights you give up. You become a public figure, like a coach or a politician, and it’s not always positive.”

Stroup adds that a lot of teachers

who are principal-material say, “With the way the civic conversation is diminishing, it’s not worth it to be treated like that in the public and the press.”

A. Richard Pitcock, retired as personnel director of the Mt. Lebanon District, reports this as a major problem as administrators across the commonwealth are retiring. “It’s very hard to get a top-flight principal.”

Another education official said that moves to site-based management, however worthy, have put extra pressures on principals. They find that the power-sharing that involves scheduled consulting with parents councils and teachers not only takes time but erodes their authority, while not diminishing their responsibility.

Oravitz says that the emphasis on having principals as instruction leaders means that “with 60 teachers in a high school, if you are going to improve the quality of instruction, it means more supervisors for assessment and critiquing, all time-consuming activities. And this at a time when the public rails against too much of an administrative slice and the unions say, ‘This means just more administrators, not teachers.’”

Pitt’s Werlinich says, “Historically, we looked for somebody who could manage the building. Now, 90 percent of the work is personal, working with people.”

Salary is a consideration. Assistant principals may make only \$5,000 more than as a teacher. They think,

“For that, who needs the grief?” Werlinich, a professor of administration and policy studies in Pitt’s School of Education, directs the Principals Academy.

The really hard step, Werlinich says, is the move to assistant principal, because that is so identified with handling a school’s discipline. “Moving up to principal or superintendent is easier because, even if you are awfully busy, you have more control over your time.” Also, by now, superintendents in Allegheny County may summon as much as \$95,000 or more.

The answer for persuading teachers to move up, Werlinich holds, is to broaden or balance the role of the assistant principal, so that he or she has duties other than discipline. Make that person part of the instructional team and/or the management team with responsibilities—such as directing extra curricular student activities, or scheduling, etc.

A hindrance for reform-minded principals, as well as school systems, is the building-seniority element, something that in some districts may require the cooperation of the teachers union local to change the contract. We now turn to that subject.

### **Building Seniority**

In a Pittsburgh high school recently, the principal faced a dilemma when she was required to downsize her staff.

One teacher she particularly





wanted to keep was a bright young African-American who had great rapport with students of all races. But the principal was thwarted when an older, white teacher with fewer skills was able to bump the black teacher because of a “building seniority” clause in the district’s union contract.

The point is that in an era with so much emphasis on the importance of the principal’s leadership role, principals often are thwarted in their efforts to build and keep a strong staff.

Building seniority comes into play more in multi-building systems, such as Pittsburgh’s, rather than in suburban districts. So there are districts with high marks for quality that do not have building seniority requirements in their labor contracts.

PFT President Fondy, who is also president of the Pennsylvania Federation of Teachers, explains that his union wants to see a balance in a school—age, race, gender. But it insists that whenever there is a vacancy, the most senior person is placed first—but not necessarily with his/her first choice. When there are layoffs, a younger person is laid off first, but with the first right to return to that particular school if another vacancy occurs.

A variation of this problem is pointed out by a former principal in the Pittsburgh schools and now a professor in a teacher-training institution. He says that often the best teachers are not assigned to teach the most difficult students. “There’s more honor in teaching honors students.”

It would seem that better answers need to be found than presently exist if the principal-as-instructional-leader principle is to flourish.

Three other hindrances to effective utilization of professionals should be noted. One will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 9—that of disciplinary problems in the classroom because of the presence of certain types of **special-needs children**. The second is a continuation of the discussion earlier in this chapter of the **time factor**. And, finally, there is the question of what to do with incompetent teachers, including **firing** them.

### The Time Factor

In the life of a school and of a teacher, there are inevitable conflicts between the time required for 1) professional development, such as in-service training and 2) consultation with students and parents and, on the other hand, 3) hours in the classroom.

All are important. The trick is to reconcile them. That will take cooperation among school boards, superintendents, and teachers unions.

“Time? We fight that battle constantly,” sighs one superintendent. “Take a teller; if she’s gone from the bank for a day or two of training, there’s no loss. But a first grade teacher? If she’s gone from her class for a couple of days, it does make a difference. So you have to balance things.”

Some board members and administrators blame the unions for obstruc-

tionism on the “time factor,” contending they nuzzle over extra pay for every hour of additional training time. One former school board member said, “It’s the CIO mentality—everybody goes up the same elevator. And you don’t lift a finger without another buck on the table. They never mention all the time they use up for union or association work. What about the idea that professionals don’t watch the clock?”

But from Robert Baldis, assistant executive director of the Pennsylvania State Education Association (PSEA), comes a contrary opinion. He contends his organization strongly endorses the idea of professional development but adds: “This is a hard sell with some school boards, especially allowing the appropriate time. Some do it well; some don’t.”

He points out that it took a legislative effort in the 1980s to push through, with Act 178, the concept of districts establishing professional development committees that would include teachers. Baldis said the success of that requirement varies from district to district.

Baldis feels that in-service training can’t thrive if it is confined to after-school programs, where students can’t be involved.

Some districts have been able to work out union contracts that squeeze out a few minutes here and there during the classroom day to allow teachers to have planning sessions, including within teacher groups, both before and after school hours. Teachers let

their union leaders know that they approve of such changes in the contract, one superintendent said, because they know it helps their professional competence.

Frederica Haas of the PSEA says she and others pursue the idea with members that “you can bargain for quality issues as well as for bread and butter items.”

One solution being pursued in quality-aspiring districts across the nation is to institute 12-month contracts for teachers. The summer could be used for several purposes for which there doesn’t seem to be time during the regular school year. Examples:

- In-service training that doesn’t cut into class time.

- Devising curriculum plans to take into account new knowledge.

- Remedial teaching to bring slower students up to speed. For instance, a once-a-week course in writing to give students of any level of ability much more detailed critiquing and subsequent rewriting than is possible in regular classrooms with many students.

The advantages for students are obvious. But what advantages for teachers? One argument is that, given increased taxpayer resistance to improving what many citizens consider as salaries high enough already (as much as \$72,000 in Upper St. Clair, for instance), the best hope for teachers to raise their incomes in the future would be going to 12-month contracts.

Union president Fondy says his or-







ganization is not opposed to a 12-month schedule if instituted “on a reasonable basis,” provided no one assumes it can be implemented without more pay. He notes that teachers instructing summer school classes receive regular pay; those performing other duties—such as curriculum writing—get lesser pay.

Fondy said one problem with talking about in-service training in the summer is that an important component is observing other teachers before actual classes. In many cases, that possibility wouldn’t be available outside the regular school year. He adds that much curriculum writing is done on contract by teachers using their own time. Also, some educational research is available in after-school hours, something that Fondy said newer, younger teachers seem to relish.

And, as outlined above, Fondy said that teachers are most receptive to further training when it is done by their peers, a reason the PFT established its own teacher-training facility.

The National Education Association, of which the PSEA is an affiliate, has established a Center for Innovative Teaching in Washington, D.C. and a National Foundation for the Improvement of Education. The latter, funded by dues dollars, gives out grants across the country for innovative teaching.

One of the most interesting NEA ventures is the Center for the Revitalization of Urban Education, because

in Pennsylvania the PSEA is working with its sometimes rival organization, the Pennsylvania Federation of Teachers, on prospective projects around the state.

The PSEA also has launched a “League for Educational Advancement,” with pilot programs across the state

Baldis says the PSEA continues to push for expanding summer internships for teachers within the business community—“a way to expose our members to what is going on in the private sector.”

The PSEA executive makes the point that “a lot of good things are going on in the public schools.” Baldis adds that the sad fact is that there is “an unprecedented amount of teacher-bashing going on. It’s really unfortunate that society beats up on people who are critical to the country’s future.”

### **Firing Poor Teachers**

An obviously touchy subject in any school system is what to do about poor teachers. Firing incompetents is difficult in any system, private or public, business or government, and is all the more so in an educational system that is unionized and has tenure restrictions.

Clearly, nothing can be more damaging to a school’s efforts to improve instruction than to be dogged with a teacher who is incompetent in content or “people skills,” or who is

burned out. In Pennsylvania, two successive unsatisfactory annual ratings for competence as a teacher are grounds for dismissal, even of a tenured teacher. But who bells the cat in terms of initiating and carrying out a dismissal in a manner fair to all, including the teacher under scrutiny?

One approach has been worked out by the PFT within the Pittsburgh system. PFT President Fondy said, "We won't defend non-performance." But the union holds that having the principal alone responsible for firing a teacher is not a good idea.

The method as devised in 1989 and updated since then is called Instructional Teacher Leaders (ITLs). Holding that "the traditional approach to determining ratings for competence can sometimes have a significant degree of subjectivity attached to it," the ITL outline includes the following about this collegial system:

The PFT/Pittsburgh School District ITL-centered approach for intervening with a teacher who is having substantial difficulty in the classroom and/or whose teaching performance is unsatisfactory or bordering on unsatisfactory is a sensible and workable form of peer intervention/peer assistance. It is a way to implement accountability for substandard teaching performance, but it does it in a professional manner—by employing the ITL structure and through working with the principal, who identifies where intervention is

necessary and who retains the actual rating responsibility.

In the Pittsburgh intervention approach, the ITL assists the teacher who is having classroom/teaching problems and, hopefully, can help the teacher to overcome whatever difficulties he/she may be experiencing in the classroom. In those cases where the teacher is not able to overcome his/her difficulties despite the ITL's assistance, the ITL will indicate to the principal that the intervention process has not been successful. If the principal issues an unsatisfactory rating, then the ITL will confirm, if requested, that the ITL has no rebuttal to, nor disagreement with, the conclusion concerning unsatisfactory teaching performance. If the entire rating procedure is followed properly, then there normally will be no Union challenge to, nor grievance of, the unsatisfactory rating that has been issued.

But a final factor in holding young teachers comes from LRDC Director Resnick. This is what she calls the "socialization" factor, that is, whether teachers find themselves comfortable in the milieu in which they operate. She said from experience that some in the Pittsburgh schools talk about wanting to teach in, say, Montgomery County in the Philadelphia suburbs where they think the social climate would be better.

School systems and their commu-





nities will need to find some better answers on this score, especially if brighter young people with wider horizons enter the teaching force. In that respect, more than just teacher-preparation schools may need to heed the advice listed in Chapter 5. That was where a foundation official called for “opening the box” with programs to encourage travel, theater-going and other high-culture experiences.

We now turn to one of the most flammable topics of all in school reform discussions across the country—that of proposals for tax-supported vouchers for students to attend non-public schools. It couldn’t escape attention in this *Issues* brief both because it is an integral part of the Ridge administration’s school-reform effort and because its inclusion jeopardizes the success of that endeavor.

## Chapter 8 Voucher Ventures

For some, vouchers for students to attend non-public schools are an essential element of school reform. For others the concept is anathema, something that undermines public education.

An initiative that is roiling the education picture in many states, vouchers are a particular catalyst for controversy in Pennsylvania because Governor Tom Ridge has made them an integral part of his school-reform

package. They set on edge the teeth even of Ridge’s allies on almost every other portion of the governor’s program to improve the quality of Pennsylvania public education.

The argument for vouchers is that they give an alternative for parents who feel their children are trapped in wholly inadequate schools. Proponents point to the generally high standards of private and parochial schools, both in scholastic and discipline terms. An official of the State Department of Education in an interview said that it is a shame that minority parents in particular are not allowed the choice of having a way for their children to escape inner city schools by having their way paid to attend higher-achievement non-public schools—such as parochial schools right in their neighborhood.

This rationale lies behind the one voucher plan which so far has withstood legal challenges in the courts. That’s the Milwaukee plan which offered 1,500 vouchers which public school students have used to attend non-public schools. The Wisconsin Supreme Court approved the plan, and in 1998, the U.S. Supreme Court refused to accept an appeal.

At the same time, Ohio appellate courts on constitutional grounds have barred a similar plan in the Cleveland schools. So educators and lawyers say it is an open question as to whether the Wisconsin ruling constitutes a permanent seal of approval on vouchers or whether the high court is waiting

for a more “suitable” case before making a final decision settling the question once and for all.

But many persons up and down the education system consider that however benevolent voucher proponents may consider their motives, the voucher idea is a “divide and conquer” strategy to split parental and taxpayer support for public education to its ultimate undermining.

So Pennsylvania legislators in recent years have experienced the unusual sight of groups opposed to each other on many issues—school boards, teachers unions, school administrators, teacher-preparation institutions—banded together to battle this particular Ridge initiative. Often the most effective spokespersons have been school board members who are Republicans—even Ridge Republicans—but worried about the impact of vouchers on their districts.

An often unspoken argument is that, rather than helping poverty kids, the real motive is to bail out parents financially who already send their children to private or parochial schools.

This particular aspect of the battle harkens back to the 19th Century when the concept of free public schools first surfaced, with Thaddeus Stevens of Pennsylvania a vigorous proponent. Before long, however, the Roman Catholic clergy and parents began to suspect that, rather than these public schools being non-sectarian, Protestant principles were too often being promulgated in them, either

openly or covertly.

In response, the Church began a system of parochial schools. But Catholic efforts to obtain tax funds for their schools met rebuffs by the courts on grounds they violated the “separation of church and state” guaranteed by the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution. When Catholics pointed to historically Protestant societies, such as The Netherlands, where tax money went to Catholic, Lutheran, and Calvinist schools alike, it seemed to make no difference in an American legal system where, Catholics suspected, the Protestant viewpoint was going to prevail anyway.

At the same time, the courts upheld the concept of non-public schools to operate as against challenges by some groups who wanted them outlawed as somehow violating that same First Amendment clause. So the upshot was an uneasy solution—parents could send their children to non-public schools so long as no tax dollars were involved.

As waves of immigrants arrived in the period between the Civil War and World War I, both sides were strengthened. Catholic immigrant children helped swell the parochial schools. Jewish and Orthodox parents threw in their lot with the public schools on the basis that they were less sectarian than their parochial counterparts. Also anti-Semitic prejudice kept even well-to-do Jews out of most private schools for years.

In recent decades, the courts have





held that public school systems using buses had to provide transportation for private and parochial students too. Other concessions that bothered strict backers of the “separation of church and state” doctrine have been allowed by the courts, leading up to the current climactic struggle over vouchers.

A good summation of arguments for and against the voucher concept comes in an article in the 1998 fall issue of *Daedalus* magazine by Karen Seashore Louis, a professor of education at the University of Minnesota. She writes:

Although those who find themselves within this broad [pro-school choice] coalition emphasize their differences, they share the belief that families should have opportunities and resources to choose and create schools meeting their needs and personal preferences. Although this perspective is premised in American individualism and the assumption that education is a private good, it also comes with a market-oriented hypothesis that private choices lead to a stronger society. If parent choice exists, less attractive or less effective schools will be motivated to change or risk “going out of business” due to declining enrollments. Market reasoning begins with the premise that competition between alternative providers will increase quality. Of course, the different voices within this varied constituency

each have different answers to the question of why the quality of educational experiences and achievement will increase as a result of greater choice.

Louis writes that some questions on choice have been answered by the growth of charter schools within public school systems. The experiments “have taken off exponentially in the past few years, beginning with a handful of schools in Minnesota, and now including more than 500 schools enabled by legislation in a third of the states,” including Pennsylvania.

Giving the arguments on the other side, Louis comments:

Opposition to choice is based on value-based commitments to the “common school” (each child should receive the same educational opportunities) and on practical issues (moving to a voucher system would increase the cost of education because it would provide new public subsidies to students whose parents currently pay for private education). Suspicion is endemic on the part of state and national professional associations, who see charter and voucher proposals as undermining hard-fought battles to establish professional influence over content and pedagogy... Finally, of course, a predictable “separation of church and state” argument arises becomes some charter schools and voucher programs may indirectly subsidize

religiously based education.

In Pennsylvania, an additional argument comes from Joseph Oravitz, executive director of the Pennsylvania School Boards Association. He posits: Suppose a voucher program took care of 10 percent or, a wild guess, 20 percent of the school children in the state. “You still would have the other 80 or 90 percent of the children to educate. The voucher idea is no answer for educating the vast majority, and Governor Ridge should recognize that.”

Dean John Butzow of the College of Education at Indiana University of Pennsylvania contends that with vouchers, non-public schools will attempt to recruit the best youngsters “just as they do athletes.”

A final anti-choice argument comes from an administrator in one of the state teacher universities, who asked to remain anonymous. His daughter is mildly retarded, and he and his wife decided it might be helpful to transfer her to a private school to be “mainstreamed.” All went well with the application until interview time came. At that point, the couple was told that the private school administration didn’t believe their daughter would “fit in.” So it was back to the public schools which, by law, had no option but to take her.

That university administrator said this experience should underscore why private schools can make themselves shine in contrast to a comparable public school, thus casting doubt on the

competitive-model argument for vouchers.

What can be said with some certainty about the voucher debate is that it clearly has snapped the public school system to attention, call it competition or whatever.

But speaking of mainstreaming, that laudable move in the nation’s public school systems in recent years has caused its share of anguish for many classroom teachers. Its impact on school reforms, as well as teacher development and retention, is the reason for inclusion in this *Issues* brief and for discussing it next.

## Chapter 9 Mainstreaming Mel ee

The high school history teacher had a daily problem. At some point during the lesson, a girl in the class would get up and begin circling the room, singing or chattering as she went.

Before long many in the class were joining the girl in clowning, completely disrupting the efforts of this veteran teacher to transmit any kind of knowledge. He felt helpless.

He had complained to the principal’s office. But the response was that the administrators’ hands were tied. It seems the girl was classified as emotionally disturbed and therefore was protected under the federal Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Had she been an “ordi-





nary” student, she would have been sent to the principal’s office and duly disciplined.

A law tightening IDEA rules was passed in 1997 with the most humanitarian intentions. How, then, did affairs come to pass in this classroom in one of Pittsburgh’s elite high schools?

Back in 1975, Congress passed Public Law 94-142, the Education for All Handicapped Act. It required free, appropriate public education for all students with disabilities with inclusion in the “least restrictive environment.” The process of compliance came to be known as “mainstreaming.” In 1991, it was revised as the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)

Some districts placed youngsters directly in the regular classroom full time, or part time along with special-education classroom opportunities. Some established special centers as part of a continuum. In Pennsylvania, the Intermediate Units initially took this responsibility.

But under P.L. 94-142, parents had input as team members as to what they considered “the least restrictive environment.” In Pittsburgh, for example, many requested to have their children go to special centers at Conroy, McNaugher and Pioneer or, under additional program options, into private schools, such as Pressley Ridge, Craig House, Wesley Highland, and PACE. Others, especially in recent years, wanted their children placed directly in the regular classroom

with other students, in order to have the benefits of socialization.

To aid compliance with P.L. 94-142, Pennsylvania responded with an “excess cost” formula for state funding. For every student identified in the special-needs category, the state picked up the cost beyond the typical tuition cost in that district. Say the average tuition cost was \$7,000 and it cost \$13,000 to educate a special-needs child, the state would pick up the “excess costs,” or \$6,000.

But the impact on the state budget mounted steadily, until Harrisburg began complaining that this amounted to a blank check—that school districts must be loading all their “problem” cases, including disciplinary, into the special education category to capture state funding.

So, Step 2, the 1991 session of the Legislature, during the Robert Casey administration, began cutting state funding to the point where it is now closer to 25 percent of the costs of special education across the state. That move, in turn, has increased the burden on the local taxpayer, especially property owners in the less wealthy districts.

But the Legislature made a travesty of fairness by the revised subsidy formula it passed. That formula embodied the supposition that about 15 percent of the youngsters in any district would be special-needs children. Every district got a subsidy—now \$13,000 per child—times 15 percent of its school population.

That might sound equitable, but it often turned out to overly subsidize the rich districts and to hijack the poor ones which, because poverty and special-needs children often go together, must spend more proportionately from their tax base to fill the gap. That's because a wealthy district with only seven percent of its enrollment in the special-needs category still got a subsidy based on 15 percent, which meant it could rake in a lot of money (in some cases, 105 percent of its actual special education costs). On the other hand, a poor district with, say, 19 percent of its pupils in special education had to foot the bill for the difference.

This has had an especial impact upon the poorer districts in rural areas or in the mill valleys of Southwestern Pennsylvania hard hit by the closing of steel and other industrial plants (see below for an example). And major urban districts, such as Pittsburgh, also have lost millions of state dollars, with corresponding impact upon their tax base.

Then, Step 3, on June 4, 1997, a further revision by Congress strengthened the provisions of the 1991 IDEA legislation, making it a priority that *all* children with disabilities be placed in a *regular* classroom, with appropriate supports. Previously, school districts could look first at separate classes or at the so-called center schools.

It was this requirement that, for teachers without special-education training, brought problems with emotionally disturbed youngsters, such as

the one described at the beginning of this chapter.

In the past, such disruptive young people would have been sent to the principal's office for disciplinary measures. But teachers say that under IDEA, the disturbers are untouchable, especially if their parents don't want to cooperate in placing them elsewhere. Not only does this upset classroom demeanor but it stretches students' perception of fairness as "normal" students continue to be subject to disciplinary action that the IDEA students aren't.

Dean John Butzow of Indiana University's College of Education said "we are doing well with preparing to teach the able," but that the addition of special-needs children has made it a new ballgame. "In the past, many of these kids would have been excluded from classes in physics, science, languages, advanced English."

Also, Butzow said, society has changed in the past 30 years. "Back then, you had two-parent families, kids had three meals a day, and came to school in decent clothes. Now things are different, even in rural areas. A kid comes to school on a cold day with only a T-shirt and no breakfast. We are having to train our [teacher-preparation] students to deal with multi-problem school situations."

Interestingly enough, it is not so much the students with physical and mental disabilities who cause the trouble, even though some are on ventilators and require nursing aides.







“Most of those kids are sweet and try hard,” a teacher said.

But Kaye Cupples, coordinator of special education and gifted programs for the Pittsburgh School District, vigorously disputes the idea that the problems are insoluble. He makes it clear that he strongly supports the idea of inclusion. And he says the Pittsburgh District has many success stories of the inclusion of students with disabilities in every one of the district’s 92 school buildings.

Under IDEA, a school district must fashion an Individual Education Program (IEP) for each special-needs student. Decisions on the IEP are made by a team consisting of the school’s principal as chairperson, the child’s special education teacher and regular classroom teacher, sometimes a school nurse or social worker, and—important—the parent or parents.

Under the “least restrictive” doctrine, the IEP will call for inclusion in a regular class, with supports where necessary, Cupples explains. If the IEP team decides that is not appropriate, it can move the child into a more restrictive pattern, such as pulling him or her out for a few hours a week in a special class. Or in Pittsburgh, the IEP team may decide the student should go to one of the district’s special centers (Conroy, etc., listed above).

The rules on suspensions are that IDEA children may be suspended for no more than 10 days for one incident, with no more than a cumulative 15 days in any one year. However, IDEA

teams can continue to suspend a child after 15 days, but, if so, must have permission of the parents. An explanation for the rule is that in the past in some districts across the nation an unusually high percentage of students suspended for any reason were of color.

Cupples agrees that students under IDEA may have rights beyond what typical kids enjoy. But he thinks the problem is exaggerated. “Kids with disabilities are suspended no more frequently than typical kids in school. Sometimes the impression is given that special-needs kids are causing all the problems.”

Still, he feels there may need to be some modifications to the restrictions on disciplining kids. The process was designed in the beginning to make sure that special-needs kids got the education they needed. Therefore, IDEA was written to insure that students with disabilities are protected against long term and serial suspensions when facing disciplinary measures. “But violations of firearms and weapons rules should be dealt with seriously and effectively where the behavior is not related to the student’s disability. He or she should be moved immediately to alternative placement until the IEP team can decide what is the proper placement for this child.” Cupples says forthrightly.

To make inclusion really work, Cupples holds, “There needs to be support for regular teachers—who for most part have not had special training—in the form of human resources

and specialized instruction. In addition, inclusion practices work most effectively when regular teachers have the time and opportunity to collaborate and consult with special-education teachers in order to develop appropriate strategies and techniques in the regular class setting.”

To that end, Cupples says the district provides a week of training in the summer for any teacher wanting it. The district’s special education programs offer day-to-day and week-to-week help to teachers through support professionals, such as inclusion facilitators and special education specialists.

All of this activity requires money, and here is where the state government is faulted.

Steve Tamaino, superintendent of the McKeesport District, produces figures to show what the impact of the state’s funding retreat has been. That district’s millage rate has remained at a high 99.4 throughout the 1990s.

In the 1991-92 year, the state furnished 51 percent of the district’s special education expenditures of \$3.7 million. By 1994-95 the expenditures in that category had risen to \$4.1 million, with the state by that time furnishing only 41 percent. By 1997-98 the state was funding only 30 percent of the \$5.8 million spent on special education.

To meet the special education requirements with all the added mandates, Tamaino explains, the amount of money going to regular education needs has been reduced by two mills’

worth. That is robbing Peter to pay Paul, he contends.

No wonder this irate comment comes from William Schofield, an insurance man who served on the Shaler Area School Board, and is a past president of the Pennsylvania School Boards Association:

“The state is walking away from its obligation on special education, way down from when it paid 51 percent of those costs. There’s no way a local school district can handle it. Some are being hammered to their knees. And this at a time when the hands of school authorities are tied so they can’t deal with disruptions, can’t discipline certain kids or kick them out. This financial situation is really undercutting basic education in this state.”

Indeed, this state of affairs is but one of a number of factors combining to raise questions about the very workability of a foundation stone of American democracy as it has developed over the past 150 years—the system of elected local school boards. We turn to that subject in our next chapter.

## Chapter 10 School Boards Battered

It’s perhaps a measure of the seriousness of the debate on teacher effectiveness and the necessary accompanying school reforms that questions are being raised about even so vener-





able an institution as elected local school boards.

It has not yet risen to the point where politicians, whether governors or state legislators, want to tamper with it. But the matter has gone beyond just disgruntled critics, whether they be school administrators, or parents, or taxpayers.

That last sentence isn't quite correct. For, truth be told, it is the activism of some parental and taxpayer groups that has made a shambles of some school boards. That is, some single-issue groups— whether they champion “no more taxes” or are against sex education, or want to get rid of a superintendent or a particular coach, or just wish a greater voice on the board for this or that—can run candidates pledged to their one concern and completely change the complexion of the board.

Sometimes this can be for the good, but too often it brings into office inexperienced citizens so intent on their goals that they are unwilling or unable to indulge in the give-and-take necessary to get things done in any legislative body. It's worse if they see their post as an opportunity for patronage ploys, including the hiring of teachers.

People talk about Washington, D.C. and worry that the intensity of combative talk there is sapping the underpinnings of democracy. But in all too many school districts, board bickering over subjects large and small has undermined public confidence, too.

“People on some school boards know all the answers, but don't know the questions,” asserts former PSBA president Schofield.

An interesting yardstick comes with the occasional situation where for financial reasons a “distressed” district under state law is placed under an appointed Board of Control. Talk to a superintendent who has been involved in such a process and he is likely to say, off the record, that he relished it. Not just because the financial tangle was unknotted. But because the appointed Board of Control usually was composed of experienced educators, it was much easier to work with for improving the system as a whole.

National attention has centered on Chicago since Mayor Richard M. Daley took over running the school system. The English weekly, *The Economist*, in an article on this son of the more famous Richard J. Daley described what happened this way:

In 1995, the mayor struck a deal with the Republican-controlled [Illinois] state legislature to wrest control away from the city's semi-independent school board and its impenetrable bureaucracy. “I'm the only mayor that wanted the responsibility,” Daley reflects.

No wonder. The system was chronically in debt; students performed abysmally by national standards; striking teachers were a ritual of autumn...

His reform team has deflated the bureaucracy, sacked teachers

at the worst-performing schools; and demanded that students actually learn things before being promoted to the next grade.

Test scores are up. After years of fiscal crises, the budget is balanced. The city has just negotiated a new agreement with the teachers' union, almost a year before the old one was due to expire.

Note: It's not just school boards that have been affected by new thinking—superintendents too. Seattle has had a retired Army brigadier general as superintendent. A revitalized San Diego system is headed by a lawyer, a former U.S. attorney with plenty of political savvy.

Still, with all the failings of some school boards or of individual board members, the system remains a pillar of American democracy. School directors are representatives of the public at large, providing lay local control of the education system, or bureaucracy, as some would have it. And in many Pennsylvania districts, boards of their own volition have added representation from students in a non-voting, advisory capacity.

What, then, are possible improvements?

One sometimes proposed by non-compensated, harassed board members themselves is some kind of pay for all the hours they spend for the community.

But Joseph Oravitz, executive director of the PSBA, says most school

board members don't want that, even at some nominal rate like \$500 a year. They revel in offering their abilities to the community and, besides, can't imagine what level of compensation would be adequate for what they do.

Oravitz also makes an interesting point: "When board members tell me how many hours they are having to spend, sometimes with meetings once or twice a week, I suggest to them that maybe they are micro-managing the system. They get involved in disciplinary matters or where bus stops should be placed. If they stick to policy and let the staff carry out the operational end, they would find they don't have to have that many meetings."

The PSBA official wishes the media would send someone besides green reporters to cover school board meetings. He said that because of inexperience, they often seize upon something inconsequential, rather than the significant things a district is doing, thus denigrating the board in public opinion.

But school boards often are guilty of the same "tenderfoot" mistake, Oravitz says, when they assign the newest school board member to handle labor negotiations, on grounds the older members have served their turn at that sometimes grueling task. "But you can bet that the union doesn't send its greenest staff member to the bargaining table," where decisions are made that involve the largest slice of any school district's budget.

At this point, the PSBA execu-





tive director offers an interesting contrast between a corporate board of directors and a school board. It's one that Oravitz says he often uses to answer businessmen who say, "Why don't you run this like a business?"

**A business:** The CEO for all practical purposes picks his board, including CEOs from other corporations who know what it's like to operate a business.

You pay them.

They can stay until they die, providing institutional memory for successive CEOs. They have an understanding of the position of your company within your industry as a whole, and within the increasingly complex global framework.

And you have a strategic plan, providing continuity.

**A school board:** As CEO (whether board president or superintendent) your board members certainly aren't handpicked. They only have to be citizens and at least 18-years-old. They come from all walks of life through the election process, including persons who have fought each other in election campaigns. And there likely are few, if any, with CEO experience.

They are unpaid.

With no financial or other ties, they have no fiduciary responsibility to the system. As elected officials, each can decide what represents the lauded "public interest," which means they often are adversarial toward each other. And that can include

unbusinesslike undercutting of the superintendent, including in teacher selection.

With staggered 4-year terms, there can be a turnover of 60 percent of the board in some elections, scuttling continuity. In fact, in Pennsylvania the average length of service isn't even four years—it's closer to 3.9.

That turnover can bring the firing of a superintendent, no matter how competent, making hash of the business concepts of continuity and strategic planning.

Try to run a business with such a system and see how successful you would be, Oravitz concludes. That is the advantage of an unchanging "top" that a charter school or a parochial school—"where the priest runs the show"—has over a public school board.

One basic change the PSBA would like to see is a return to the 6-year terms school board members had before the State Legislature, in 1978, reduced the term of office to four years. Oravitz says the unions were involved in propelling that effort, apparently on grounds that directors facing the electorate more often would be easier to influence.

The PSBA white paper on educational reform gives this view of the results of that change:

The average length of service has declined markedly. The result has been enormous turnover at the local level, in turn producing frequent changes in superintendent

cies and vast, sudden shifts in the policy direction of public schools. PSBA believes school reform would be aided considerably by a return to six-year terms of school directors.

What about training for school board members?

There is no legal requirement to that end. However, the PSBA offers numerous training opportunities for new board members at differing times and locations, and on a voluntary basis. But it resists mandatory training as a condition for holding office on grounds that it “likely would pose a significant barrier to attracting people to hold the unpaid position of school director.” The PSBA in a white paper on school reform goes on to note: “Pennsylvania does not impose training requirements for elected policy makers at any level of government, including members of the General Assembly or the governor, who are salaried officials.” Ergo, why school board members?

Finally, given the present system, is there any way to square the circle of tradition, localism, and elections and yet provide stature?

Here, James Henderson, dean of the Duquesne University School of Education, has a novel idea involving Pennsylvania’s 29 Intermediate Units. He suggests a two-tiered arrangement. 1) Elect the policy-making board at the Intermediate Unit level and 2) turn the 501 boards elected at the district level into strictly advisory committees.

Within that system, both localism and the election aspect would be continued. Yet, at the same time, the 29 Intermediate Unit-level boards should be able to attract a superior type of candidate able to rise above the provincial to set creative policies for a wider region.

How does all of the material in these chapters to date add up to the paramount question of having the best teachers in the classroom? We now turn to that subject.

## Chapter 11 Observations

There is no lack of suggestions for educational reforms to improve the quality of teachers and of classroom teaching. They have poured out in recent years from blue-ribbon committees, research institutions, and from within the education establishment itself.

And actual reforms have come about in different ways in different states, frequently by initiatives by a governor, or by the state legislature, or by educators themselves. So far, there seems to be no silver bullet.

Therefore, no point would be gained by rehashing those lists of do’s and don’ts, let alone by reinventing the wheel with a new list. Let us, rather, emphasize a few high points from the previous chapters in this *Issues* brief.

First, the Ridge Administration is on the right track with its regulations





to improve student standards in teacher training institutions leading to certification. The State Board of Education in shaping its November 18, 1998 regulations seems to have achieved a remarkable consensus among sometimes adversarial groups. Particularly important is its “transparency” requirement that the placement records of teacher-preparation institutions be made public, information valuable to potential students, their parents, and the taxpayers.

However, second, the governor would be wise to back off the voucher effort, which seems to antagonize almost all of the groups that formed the consensus that made possible the November 18 action, the ones in public education vital to making any reforms work. The answer on the voucher concept ultimately is going to come down from the U.S. Supreme Court on cases in other states. Why not wait for that conclusion before subjecting the educational system and the State Legislature to bloody-nose confrontations?

Third, such restraint by the Ridge administration would make easier the necessary task facing the Legislature, that of changing the law to require periodic recertification of **all** teachers, not just those certified since 1987.

Fourth, the Ridge administration should take a second look at its disdain of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards process for offering a master-teacher certificate for highly qualified teachers (see Chapter 3). If it is good enough for Republican

and Democratic governors and legislatures in other states, why not Pennsylvania? If nothing else, the NBPTS provides a nationally recognized yardstick against which aspirants to being “education governors” and “education states” will increasingly be measured.

The Ridge Administration and the State Legislature, fifth, must give a serious look at the funding of special education. Particularly to give relief to big urban districts and smaller poverty-burdened districts, the state should reassume some of the burden it shucked off during the Casey era in 1991. And, as noted in previous chapters, there need to be additional support mechanisms for regular teachers having to deal with emotionally disturbed students in their classrooms under federal mandates. Even though this may add to costs, it is necessary for fairness to students as a whole, as well as to avoid teacher burnout.

If nothing else, there must be a change in the current unfair formula that can enrich some wealthy districts to as much as 105 percent of their special education costs while cutting the state’s subsidy to as little as 25 percent in the poorer districts. A starting point would be to decree that no local district would have to pay more than 50 percent of its special education costs, with the state making up the rest. Politically, this may require a “hold harmless” clause—that is, that no district, even the wealthiest, will end up with less state subsidy in the future—but that price would be worth it in terms

of achieving overall fairness.

Sixth, the current innovations of “collaboratives” between some teacher-preparation institutions and school districts are to be encouraged. They are one way to test whether the theories coming out of research institutions will bring meaningful improvements in the learning of youngsters in the nation’s classrooms. But those initiatives, too, will require more funding, including state and local tax dollars.

Pennsylvania school districts, seventh, should give serious thought to the idea of 12-month contracts for teachers as a way to provide time for professional development without cutting into classroom days so much.

The idea of a clearinghouse, eighth, where prospective teachers can link directly to school districts and vice versa is welcome. If it works in Southwestern Pennsylvania under the Grable Foundation initiative, it should be duplicated elsewhere in the state.

Ninth, the suggestion that educational institutions should “open the box” for teachers to include not just in-service training but encouragement for cultural and travel opportunities is meritorious. That not only will attract and retain the best young people in teaching but unquestionably will stimulate them as they seek to widen the horizons of their students.

Tenth, with the role of school boards receiving increased attention, two suggestions are worth looking into. One is the idea of returning terms to

six years, instead of the present four years, to bring greater stability. The other, moving in a new direction, is the proposal by Duquesne University’s Henderson that 29 boards be established at the Intermediate Unit level and given the policy-making authority, with the school boards in the state’s 501 districts assigned advisory roles (see Chapter 10 for the rationale).

Finally, if teachers and teacher-preparation institutions and the associations and unions connected to them really begin to show reform progress in the coming years, there should be public recognition of that fact by appropriate civic groups. Because—regardless of charter schools or vouchers—the overwhelming bulk of students will continue to be educated in the public schools, the fate of the state’s future lies with the the latter. The media can play a role in emphasizing the positive aspects of public education, quite as much as the squabbles which they also need to report in order to keep the public informed of all aspects of the changes and the resistance and support thereto.

The goal all around should be not only to get the best teachers possible but to to enhance conditions for their success in the classrooms of Pennsylvania.







---

**Clarke M. Thomas** is a *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette* senior editor (retired).

---

The views expressed in *Issues* are those of the author, and are not necessarily those of the University of Pittsburgh or the Institute of Politics.

For information regarding reproduction in whole or in part of this publication, please call the University of Pittsburgh Institute of Politics at 412-624-1837.



# University of Pittsburgh

*Institute of Politics*

*4200 Fifth Avenue*

*Pittsburgh, PA 15260*

Nonprofit Org.  
US POSTAGE  
PAID  
Pittsburgh, PA  
Permit No. 511

The University of Pittsburgh is an affirmative action,  
equal opportunity institution.

Published in cooperation with the Department  
of University Relations, PR 1905-399