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Trustee William R. Cast: I am pleased to welcome you to this discussion on forging a better future for K-12 education. It is good to see that we share this interest. Before we begin I would like to note that this morning’s conversation will be limited to the panelists and members of the board. We decided on this approach so that we could make the best use of our time and that of our distinguished panelists. An audio recording of this morning’s conversation will be posted on www.broadcast.iu.edu.

The board will hold a follow-up program at its October meeting when representatives from the IU School of Education will have an opportunity to talk with trustees.

This panel discussion is the brainchild of Trustee Cole, and I am delighted to turn the program over to him.

Trustee Bruce Cole: Thank you and good morning everyone.

Few issues arouse greater concern than the state of K-12 education in the United States. This is certainly true in Indiana, where 90% of our children are enrolled in public schools, and where Governor Mitch Daniels in 2011 signed into law what may be the most sweeping school reform bill in the nation.

My trustee colleagues and I closely followed last year’s discussion of the reform bill, and we have an acute interest in ongoing efforts to improve K-12 education. Many former trustees have been teachers themselves, and some of our current trustees have been active in local school boards, so our interest is active and deep.
As part of our efforts to remain abreast of the most current thinking in K-12 reform we decided to invite three nationally recognized experts to talk to with us. In extending the invitation we asked them to touch on national trends, the most promising ideas and what is working and what is not. In particular, we were interested in the roles schools of education are playing in this effort and how Indiana University can make solid contributions to the national reform movement.

We selected our three panelists for their nationally recognized stature as leading thinkers for reform in K-12. They all have held important leadership positions in schools of education, government, foundation and private sectors and all of them are authors of groundbreaking studies in education and reform. You will meet them in a moment.

Now it is my pleasure to introduce our moderator, Jane Pauley. As I am sure all of you know, Ms. Pauley is one of the most respected figures in broadcast journalism, and she is a familiar face on morning daytime and prime time TV. She served as co-host of NBC’s Today Show from 1976-1989 and anchored Dateline NBC for more than a decade. Ms. Pauley is also a highly respected advocate in the fields of mental health and children’s wellness and education, and it is this latter interest that made her a natural for this morning’s panel discussion. She is a member of the board of The Mind Trust, which was created in 2006 and is dedicated to improving public education for underserved children by empowering education entrepreneurs to develop or expand transformative educational initiatives. She was born in Indianapolis -- a fifth-generation Hoosier on both sides -- raised in Warren Township, and earned her degree from IU in 1972. We were delighted when she accepted our invitation to join us this morning. I am pleased to present Ms. Pauley.

Jane Pauley: I was delighted to have had a class with Dr. Elinor Ostrom, our Nobel Laureate, and she gave me an A. I do have experience in education other than being a student. After learning that I did not have a future in encyclopedia sales, I was a substitute teacher for three weeks at Warren Central, where I discovered that among the aspects of teaching that I lacked were stamina, patience, and expertise in any subject matter. I don’t come to you as an expert; I come to you as an interested layperson who cares very deeply, and I am a little unnerved at the number of you who have open laptops and are taking notes.

I get back to Indianapolis often and Bloomington as often as possible. My son Ross is beginning his third year as a high school English teacher. I would not have predicted that, but then nobody can see the future. The best you can do is open your eyes and study the present very carefully. What does a classroom teacher today see in the classroom? To paraphrase Peggy Hinckley, who until last June was the superintendent of the Warren Township public school district and one of the most distinguished public school educators in Indiana, we must be able to teach the children we have, not the ones we used to have or the ones we wish we had. She reminds us that it is a different world, and as we discuss K-12 education let’s bear in mind that the future is already here.

Before I get too deep into this talk of the future, let me introduce our distinguished panelists. Dr. Levine is the sixth president of the Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation. Before his appointment at Woodrow Wilson he was president and professor of education at Teacher’s College, Columbia University. He has also served as a faculty member and chair of the Institute for Educational Management at the Harvard Graduate School of Education, president of Bradford College, and Senior Fellow at the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. He is the author of scores of articles and reviews, including a series of reports for the Education Schools Project on the preparation of school leaders, teachers and education researchers. He is a member of the American
Academy of Arts and Sciences, and sits on the boards of Educational Testing Service and Say Yes to Education. He received his bachelor’s degree from Brandeis University and Ph.D. from State University of New York in Buffalo.

Dean Steiner is the founding director of City University of New York’s Institute for Education Policy and is dean of the Hunter College School of Education, CUNY. Many in this room may be familiar with the Hunter School of Education which in the last few years has focused on teacher preparation. It has formed major partnerships with three of New York City’s best performing charter school organizations and has put in place a nationally innovative program using video analysis of student teaching. I have to interrupt just to say that one of the most impressive teachers I have ever seen in my life was a second grade teacher who taught at Hunter. She was awe inspiring.

Hunter has also created several new programs and initiatives in collaboration with the New York City Department of Education in New York State.

Prior to his appointment at City University he served as commissioner of education for the state of New York where he took the lead role in the state’s successful Race to the Top application. Race to the Top brought about $700 million to New York state which was used to implement statewide curricula in all major subjects, aid in reform of state standards in assessments, redesign teacher certification from a system centered on course work to a performance-based, clinically focused approach, and create a comprehensive program to address the state’s lowest performing schools. Dr. Steiner has also served as the director for Arts Education at the National Endowment for the Arts and is chair in the Department of Education Policy at Boston University. He received his bachelor’s degree from Balliol College at Oxford University, and his Ph.D. from Harvard.

Our third panelist is Prof. Stotsky, nationally known advocate of standard-based reform and strong academic standards in assessments for students and teachers. Dr. Stotsky is professor of education reform at the University of Arkansas where she holds the 21st Century Chair in Teacher Quality, and is engaged in examining issues surrounding teacher quality in her state. In prior years she was a senior associate commissioner at the Massachusetts Department of Education where she was responsible for strengthening the academic standards for students and perspective teachers. Four years later, Massachusetts scores for reading and math in Grades 4 and 8 on the national assessment of educational progress tests led the nation. The education scholar, researcher and consultant has written or co-written four books, more than 50 articles, more than 100 scholarly publications. She has taught at every educational level and she serves on the National Mathematics Advisory Panel, a group appointed by President Bush to work with the U.S. Department of Education to make recommendations to the Secretary of Education on ways to improve mathematics education in K-12. She received her bachelor’s degree from the University of Michigan and an ED.D. from Harvard.

We have asked each of our presenters to make an opening statement for the benefit of the trustees. The idea here is a learning opportunity, and it is my expectation that while I may get the ball rolling, I may not get it back until it is time to say goodbye. Dr. Levine, would you begin please.

Arthur Levine: It is really a pleasure to be here, and in terms of my Indiana credentials, I’m a Hoosier wanna-be. I’m probably here once or twice a month because I have been working on a project recruiting math and science teachers for high-need schools in the state, and trying to transform teacher education in several universities around the state. I realized just how strong my commitment was to Indiana the day I watched a football game
and realized I wasn’t rooting for the Patriots but the Colts. I had lived 18 years in New England.

I want to talk about five forces that I think are going to dramatically change the nature of schooling in America. The first is demography, and it is true around the country, it is true in Indiana.

The population is aging, moving south, changing color, coming from abroad and has more learning disabilities than we have ever seen before. The end result is that the fastest growing student populations in this state, and also around the country, are those with which we have been least successful. The aging is also likely to produce a real change in the politics of education. We baby boomers have been the driving force in education reform. We wanted good schools for our kids, but our kids have finished school, and our focus is now on taking care of ailing parents, which means Social Security, healthcare, eldercare. And many of us are looking at those same services for ourselves. We represent a very powerful voting block and while we once demanded that every politician running for everything from dogcatcher to president of the United States have an education platform, we're less interested now.

The second force is the economy. We are shifting from a national analog industrial economy to a global digital information economy. What that means is that low-end education jobs are disappearing. There aren't any jobs that you can support a family with without a high school diploma. The jobs that are growing require much more education than we have ever required before, the levels of necessary skills and knowledge have accelerated, and high school graduation requirements are rising. The more important change is a result of the economy. As we have moved from an industrial to an information economy we have asked for very different things from schools. Industrial economies care about process; we want the same process in every school, and schooling looks like an assembly line because of the era from which it came. In contrast, information economies only care about learning and outcomes, which means we have made a revolutionary change from a focus on teaching to a focus on learning. The question is not how long kids have been taught, but how much they have learned; not the process they have gone through, but the outcomes they have achieved. We have seen states across the country focus on standards for those outcomes, and we have seen them shift or add assessment tools to measure where students are achieving those standards. States are demanding more accountability of schools, and when they haven’t found what they wanted, they’ve turned to alternatives like charter schools and alternative routes into the profession.

The third force is technology. I look around my house and see things I didn’t grow up with. We have iPhones, iPads, iPods, DVDs, CD’s, microwaves, light bulbs. (I just wanted to see if you were paying attention.) We are going to see some major changes because of the technology. The textbook is a dinosaur. We can now create all kinds of media geared to a particular class. I visited a place called Wireless Generation and saw their newest textbook. Let’s say Dean Steiner and I are both studying division by fractions, and the dean nails it, but I’m having real trouble. The new textbook figures out the mistakes I am making and provides new material to get me to the point at which I actually understand what is going on. We are going to see more and more of that in the future. We are also going to see new means of instruction. I was on a plane not long ago and I had finished my work, I had finished the book I brought, and in desperation I turned to the airline magazine, which contained an article about the travel agency of the future. The article said that rather than reading brochures, travelers are going to be able to visit places virtually, to see if that is actually where they want to go. We are going to do the same things in schools I suspect. If we can create virtual vacation spots why can’t we create Athens in the 5th Century or
America on the eve of the Declaration of Independence? Imagine taking a kid to 14th-century Paris; how does a stand-up lesson compare to that?

Finally, we have the technology that will allow us to reach around the world. We will be able to give a lecture in Bloomington that is watched by students in New York City and Tokyo. I can nudge the person in Tokyo electronically and say I didn’t get the last piece. Can you tell me about that. Get it back, translate it into English and we are in business again. That student from Tokyo and I can be asked to make a presentation in class next week. Beyond that I can ask the student from Tokyo to have tea with me after class. Where does the physical plant that we call “the school” stand among all that?

The fourth force is brain research, biology. We are now learning how people really learn, and what we are going to be able to do is gear instruction to particular students. We are going to be able to create the software that will educate them. We will be able to provide an individualized education that we have never been able to provide before.

Convergence of knowledge producers is the fifth. What we are seeing now is media software, hardware, museums, libraries, universities all beginning to move into the same area. They are all beginning to produce things that look like courseware. What we are going to see as a consequence is a huge increase in the number of people and organizations providing schooling. Schools of the future are going to be outcome based and focused on learning, and they will replace the focus on process and teaching. Time will no longer be fixed, students will advance by mastery, education will be individualized, and there will be multiple methods of instruction geared to what the student learns best and their learning styles. The teacher will not be the person at the front of the room; the teacher will be a diagnostician, a prescriptor, an instructor, an assessor. It’s going to look much more like your GPS, giving you moment-by-moment feedback on how you are doing and the corrections that need to be made rather than an end-of-course assessment.

Such schools are already beginning to appear. The question is not whether schools will change, but when and how those changes will be accomplished.

**David Steiner:** Dr. Levine has given you a vision of hope, rightly, a vision of possibility. I am the scrooge. I’m the person here who is going to tell you something about the formidable barriers we face before we get to the promised land.

Teaching should be easy. You are passionate about your subject, you know your subject, you are articulate, and you want to change lives. How has it gotten so difficult? The first reason is that 50 years ago the smartest women in America were going into teaching. Thank goodness those same women have a thousand choices today. Some of them still go into teaching, far too few do. With few exceptions, we do not recruit the smartest into our classrooms, in contrast to many of our international peers. Without really smart teachers you have a problem.

Second, we have one of the most socially unequal societies on earth. We cannot pretend that those social inequalities stop when they come through the schoolhouse door. Most of our passionate debates about education are proxies for the ones we won’t have about our political economy, and the teachers have to pick up the pieces. In New York City, an inner-city kid in our public schools has heard 3 million fewer words spoken to her by the age of four than her upper-middle class peer. That is a gap that is extraordinarily difficult to make up, and it is usually not made up ever to the detriment of the life prospects of that first-year student.
Third, we have a totally misguided vision of how to finance public education. In New York State, as we sit here, we have students who are being covered by public money to the effect of $8,000 per year, and four miles away we have students being covered by public money to the tune of $35,000 a year. Multiply $8,000 by 500 students, multiply $35,000 by 500 students and very quickly your head starts spinning and you realize we don’t have an education system. We have 15,000 education systems in each of our schools. This is not acceptable.

Fourth, we have schools of education that were modeled on schools of arts and sciences. Faculty are rewarded for research and for writing papers. The problem is that with the kind of economic disparities in our students, the 160 languages spoken by them in New York City and elsewhere, the challenges we see every day in special education, in ESL, and malnutrition and everything else we know about, the schools of education are largely helpless to prepare teachers to face those kinds of environments. By the way, it is true of rural schools, too, with their own unique problems, this is not just about urban education. Schools of education have been very slow to realize that their moral responsibility is to graduate effective teachers. Whatever else they do, that is the first, second, and third desiderata, if you will, and it is not their fault. Very, very few schools of education have the faculty who know how to create that result. They did their Ed.D’s, they did their research, many of them haven’t been in school since they were in school, many of them don’t go into schools a great deal. They were prepared for, and promised, a different career. That is going to have to end if schools of education are going to remain relevant to producing importantly effective teachers.

Fifth, and this is incredibly important, unions secured very, very important vital rights for teachers. You only have to look at the history of American education to see how critical unions were to elevating the profession. They dug in and perhaps now are reaping the sad rewards of having dug in a little too hard. Because we could not dismiss ineffective teachers with very tiny exceptions we had to go to a very tough accountability system in New York and across the country. The risk is that we infantilize the profession by trying to measure everything. We had to go there because we had no other choice, and I’m being very frank with you. There was no other way of moving this forward. We have well over 120,000 teachers in New York City and in an average year, three may be removed for academic underperformance. That is too damaging to too many students.

At the same time, management is equally to blame. We have a school board structure that is inane. It is voted for by 20% of the population; in many cases, it has almost no expertise as to how run an education system, and its budgetary systems are totally misaligned with outcomes. There is enough blame to go around. The structure of education is dysfunctional.

Those are some of the issues on the surface. Underneath all of that is something else. Hannah Arendt, the great American political theorist, said that once you decide to love the next generation you have no choice but to take responsibility for your work. What she meant by that was that in all of the white noise that is our culture, teachers must select what is worth teaching. As a country we can’t agree about that, we have no national curriculum, we don’t even have state curriculum. We have not agreed as a population about what is worth teaching. We have no set texts, and no other advanced industrialized country would imagine the possibility of teaching literature and then reading in the AP exam guidelines that no advantage will accrue to any candidate for having read any particular books. This is insane but it is also understandable because we are a heterogeneous society with very different values and very different belief systems.
The problem is that those sometimes very creative differences land at the schoolhouse door and leave teachers with a totally fragmented set of instructions, and the teachers have to pick up the pieces and do the best they can. The common core standards are a start, but they do not prescribe a curriculum, and all the struggles are ahead. Whether we will make use of this opportunity is yet to be seen. If we produce more little gobbets with multiple choice questions we will have punted one more time. Can we actually ask something serious of our students? We have a very deep and intellectual culture in this country, but we do not spend a lot of time worrying about deep ideas, we are too busy getting things done. That is the glory of the United States. It does it superbly, but when it comes to education we can talk all we want about creative thinking, cognitive skills or buzzwords about 21st century learning, but if our students don’t have the basic skills, they will end up without jobs. You cannot critically think about nothing. You have to critically think about something. If you have nothing to think about it is difficult to be critical about it.

The fundamental challenge, then, is to actually come to some kind of consensus, at least at the state level, about what is worth teaching, and get serious about preparing teachers to teach it in two ways. One, give them pedagogical skills so that they are not unable to communicate effectively. We tried to lead that work at Hunter, where we videotape again and again and we hone in on very, very important skills that seem trivial until they add up to a lost classroom, or lost children, and then the depth of content knowledge so that you have something to say. That involves our arts and science colleagues, but it also involves bringing in master teachers who can do it and teach the craft to those who learning it.

We have an enormous challenge in front of us and I am not convinced that the new digital revolution will be the silver bullet. I think the technologies that Dr. Levine spoke of, and which I have had the privilege of seeing, can be helpful. But just as the CD player doesn’t actually teach more about listening to good music than the record player and the LP, so the digitization of education is a tool, not a net for a teacher who doesn’t know the content or isn’t passionate about conveying it. Putting children in front of a computer screen 10 hours a day will create massive social pathologies and will break down public education’s one great gift: the experience of interacting with other human beings. Technology, whether it is the quill, the fountain pen, the typewriter, or the computer, is a double-edged sword. The risk of technology is that it will be socially isolating. We will have to be very, very careful how we handle it.

Here we are, we have a lot to do. We have to raise the standards for our candidates to be teachers, and Indiana can take the lead there and begin very quickly to make it an academically challenging entryway, not an easy one. We have to be serious about accountability, to find out where graduates are going in the schools, how many of them are going to high-need schools, and how they are doing, and then trace it back to your schools of education and see how they are doing. As a dean of a school of education, I want to do something good for my faculty. I want my faculty to be more effective. I don’t know how to do that if I don’t know how my graduates are doing in the classroom. I need that information, I am hungry for it, let’s get it.

We need to be clinically focused, to be teaching our teachers in the schools in which they are going to teach, not in classrooms removed from those schools. We need master teachers to be with us, not distant. We have to train our observers who we send out to the schools to actually know what they are looking for. In other words, we have to put clinical preparation at the center along with the depth of content knowledge.

This is not rocket science but it is 100 years of practice that we are battling against in terms of teaching preparation. It is a sea change to say to faculty: You are morally and
intellectually responsible for your graduates being effective in the classrooms, not for trying to be professors of arts and sciences. That is not easy but we have no time to waste.

**Sandra Stotsky:** Thank you very much for the opportunity to be here. I am certainly grateful to be following talks by Dr. Levine, whose two reports you should all be familiar with on preparing teachers and preparing education researchers. I will have more to say about both of them as has Dean Steiner. I am very grateful for the innovations that Dean Steiner himself has put into effect in his own School of Education.

I come from having been almost everything. I've taught at all levels, been a professional development provider and an academic researcher, have worked as a bureaucrat in the Department of Education in Massachusetts, so I have had the opportunity to think about all the different pieces that need to be addressed.

There is that old saying that death and taxes will always be with us, and to them, I'm afraid, we can add schools of education. They seem to be a piece that is very hard to do anything about. I say that with a little humility because I have not been the dean of a school of education. I only had to work with all of them in Massachusetts for the years that I was busy writing regulations and trying to upgrade the teacher. The teacher has been the last focus in the era of reform in education, and I am going to talk about some specific things that could be done to upgrade the teacher, who is still going to be needed despite the new focus on learning. We still need teachers, but teachers with certain skills.

I am going to suggest some specific changes in admission policies for perspective teachers and doctoral students. I am going to give you some specifics that I see needed for the structure of teacher preparation programs, and also for the supervision of student teaching. I have scars from all the battles I fought when I was a bureaucrat writing regulations, teacher licensure regulations and teacher tests in all of these areas.

First of all let me begin as a researcher. There are many forces that want to discard the kind of research that produces findings that they don’t care for. I am going to draw on the findings of the national mathematics panel that I was on. It had many distinguished academics, particularly psychologists and mathematicians who could read the research, and they read through abstracts provided by a company that was hired to give us what was high quality research so that out of the 16,000 studies that were looked at, less than 1,000 ended up being reviewed. That was one of the first shocks we got when surveying education research. Only a miniscule amount is even worth looking at, which raised the question, what were these people doing when they were writing it, how were they being supervised and how did this even enter into the picture for consideration.

If you are at all familiar with, “Foundations for Success: Final Report of the National Mathematics Advisory Panel,” which came out in 2008, you may know that it was sharply criticized by mathematics educators because we reviewed only high-quality research. Why, some asked, did you limit the field. That was stunning to us, but that was the point.

What the research showed was that there was no relationship between student achievement and traditional teacher education programs, certification status, and mentoring and induction programs, which meant that teachers who had completed a traditional program, held a teaching license and had been in an induction program had no better student performance than other teachers. This didn’t mean these other things weren’t relevant, it simply means that as they were structured they simply didn’t have an effect.
We also found no evidence that professional development programs increased student achievement, and this is a big one to this day because there is a lot of push right now to look at something called “professional development” as if it were the silver bullet for our current teacher core.

What we found was that there was almost nothing in a vast body of research on professional development that would suggest what made it effective, if it ever was effective, but it typically wasn’t. We had mostly negative correlations or relationships. The only thing we found – and I keep saying this because it was highly resisted and still is by a lot of people, but it fits with what has been said – the one body of research we could find with some correlations that suggested we had something about the characteristic of an effective teacher, and it was that they knew the subject they taught. In other words, you can’t teach what you don’t know.

Where you could get a measure of teacher’s knowledge of the subject, yes there was a relationship to student achievement. There might be other characteristics of an effective or good teacher, but given the state of research it would be highly unlikely that they could tell us what they are. Most of it wouldn’t inform us about anything so I am going to give you a few reforms based on a few propositions that I think we could all agree on.

First, I think we could all agree that all teachers should be fully academically qualified at the beginning of their teaching career, not backload but frontload. That is what all other countries do. You start with an academically qualified person before you give them whatever training you think they need. That would mean a suggested reform for Indiana would be to continue upgrading the qualifications for admission to a graduate teacher preparation program. This is something Illinois has been wrestling with. Illinois worked out a test of perspective teacher skills, set a high bar, and saw a huge drop in the numbers of students passing it, leading the schools of education to complain that some programs would have no students in them. But this past June they voted to maintain the high bar. We will see how long it lasts because the numbers do matter to schools that are told that they must stand on their own legs, or support themselves, as opposed to the arts and sciences, which in many cases get far better support from the state legislature if they are public universities.

Another specific suggestion is to eliminate undergraduate teaching programs altogether, a step that had been recommended in 1986 by a reform group of education school deans. That could be done very easily by a board of trustees by simply not counting undergraduate education courses towards a BA. What they should get that BA degree in is something we can argue about later, but at least let them have all of those four years nourishing their minds as opposed to taking what almost everyone would say is mostly empty coursework. This is not to say they shouldn’t be out in the schools, which is a separate issue.

We also need a second proposition to strengthen our doctoral programs to improve the quality of both education and research and public policy. I speak now as someone who is in a department of policy making at the University of Arkansas. It is a brand new Ph.D. program, and our goal is to use the tools of social science to make sure that our policies have a basis in something that we can point to as evidence which is required in the new common course standards. For example, you might say that if you are going to allow anyone into a doctoral program they should have an M.A. or M.S. degree, which means they have not only spent four years of an undergraduate program in a discipline, but they have also done graduate work in that discipline. That is something that many other countries insist all secondary teachers have. We abandoned that practice long ago, to the detriment of our public schools. I have been told by many large city school systems that they can no longer find anyone with expertise beyond a major in the subject to act as a K-12 curriculum
specialist or assume responsibility for overseeing course content and sequence. Years ago it was expected that, for example Boston or Springfield, would have a Ph.D. in charge of the science program, the math program, or any other area. Now they can’t even find someone who has a master’s in those disciplines, so they have no knowledge for the textbooks.

We have a third proposition to consider and those are structural changes in the schools of education. Here, I again go out on a limb.

I think we need to do what many other countries do, and take the subject teacher and attach them to the discipline, particularly in math and science. Peel them from the School of Education so that they work with the discipline during their entire training, with the help of pedagogical adjunct faculty. This means that at the very least the discipline itself will be taught correctly, with the surveillance of those in the discipline who are at the secondary level going to be able to see how the curriculum leads to the college level. This is not going to be abandoned. I don’t see any of the changes, for example, altering what the engineering school has to expect for students going into an engineering program. They still have to know math, they still have to know science, and after four years if you want a licensed engineer, civil engineer, you want them to have some connections to what is required at the high school level to get them into whatever the program is at the four-year undergraduate level in a school of engineering. Otherwise you are pushing it to the post-graduate level, which means that we are way behind our competitors in a competitive world.

My final major suggestion is that, yes, we need student teaching taking place more than it has, but it should be supervised by disciplined-based faculty as well as pedagogical faculty. This was a serious issue in Massachusetts. The prospective eighth-grade algebra teacher, who was supervised by someone who doesn’t know very much algebra, is ill served. Although one could see whether the students were engaged, one couldn’t tell if the algebra knowledge was adequate to begin with. We need ways of releasing time for discipline-based faculty to get them more involved in what they abandoned maybe 100 years ago.

Ms. Pauley: I will ask the first question by taking something that Dean Steiner said and turning it into a question for Dr. Levine. The mission, he said, should be to graduate “effective teachers”. How do you know what an effective teacher is in a school of education when we have also heard from Prof. Stotsky that the only attribute we can, by current research, establish as a correlation of effectiveness is academic proficiency. So, how would you reach that mission of graduating effective teachers?

Dr. Levine: I really see only one measure that matters. It is student learning. An effective teacher is somebody who promotes student learning to the levels we expect those students to achieve. It doesn’t matter what the process is, it doesn’t matter the pieces we put together, all that matters is that this person is effective in educating students.

Ms. Pauley: But how do you know that, how do you establish that?

Dean Steiner: Many states will have data in the next three years that tracks the graduates of education schools into the classroom. It will look at the performance of their students and then will backtrack it to the education schools. We already have done so in New York City; we have results for all of our Grade 3-8 English/Mathematics teachers, we know how they are performing compared to peers in similar schools, and we have backtracked that to the Schools of Education department.

Ms. Pauley: These are recent graduates?
Dean Steiner: Recent graduates. The data will become available for more and more of our graduates as the states gear up their data systems. There is a great controversy, as you well know, about using value-added data. There are some issues with it, but Louisiana has been tracking education school performance now for five years using value-added data in the classroom, tracking it back to the education schools and after initial strong opposition from the deans of the schools of education, ironing out issues on statistical matters that we won't get into now. Those same deans now say they believe in it. They use it to push on programs that are weaker, and they are sharing best practices for performances that are strong.

Ms. Pauley: I will turn my attention to the trustees. Would you introduce yourself as well?

Trustee Derica Rice: Dean Steiner, how does this value-added data compare to things like test scores, which have driven some good behavior but also some bad behavior when they were being used as the metric in terms of evaluating teachers or the proficiencies of schools themselves.

Dean Steiner: No state in the country is using student scores as the only measure, and when we talk about tracking back results to the education schools we are talking about a package of multiple measures. In New York, the state tests are 20% of those measures, 20% are locally developed assessments by teachers in districts, and 60% are made up of principle observation, peer observation, student observations. By the way, it turns out students reviews of their teachers are the most accurate. No one would advocate measuring education schools, or anything else, solely based only on the test scores of students. The error rates are too high.

The best research we have, and it looked at thousands upon thousands of data points, is the Measures of Effective Teaching (MET) Project that came out about eight months ago. MET looked at student evaluations of teachers, principal evaluations of teachers through observation, and test results. When you put all three of them together you have very robust picture of the effectiveness of a teacher, and it is that combination of multiple measures that I am talking about tracking back to the education schools.

Ms. Pauley: It sounds like a big portion of that metric is subjective.

Dean Steiner: Yes, a good point. The training or preparation of principles to do effective observation is a huge challenge. When we put five-minute videos of teachers in front of our faculty at Hunter at the beginning of our work and asked them what would they say about this candidate, how would they grade them, the answers, essentially, were all over the map. They had never had to do this before. We have never had to worry systematically about the quality of observations. It is a huge professional development challenge.

Prof. Stotsky: To respond to both the question and the comments, I should say first that the MET has been very seriously criticized by some of my colleagues at the University of Arkansas. This huge Gates-funded study, which cost many millions of dollars, has some serious flaws. It doesn’t necessarily lead to the conclusion that student evaluations of teachers are better than others, and it also raises the question about the costs involved in training observers to evaluate teachers. There are other issues, and I am not going to go into a critique of the study itself, only to suggest that it should not be solely relied upon for what people thought were the conclusions or what were announced as the results of the study when people have actually looked at the data in the tables. It turns out not to be the case that the right conclusion or the logical conclusions were necessarily drawn.
The first question I want to get back to, because I thought it was right on target and I thought it was absolutely critical, is how do you know how good a person will be before they begin teaching. This is the biggest issue we face. We have had virtually almost open admission policies to schools of education for 50 years and we no longer can count on strong high school preparation, which is what other countries rely on for those they admit to a teacher preparation program. They rely on the fact that the students they have admitted have come from very strong academic high schools with very strong scores. We simply have not done that. As Dean Steiner pointed out before, the very able women who used to go into teaching in the 50’s 60’s and maybe earlier are now doing other things, but there are still more able people out there. It’s just that they have not been required to go into an education program. We have demoted in many ways what the teacher was seen by parents and others as by having this virtually open admission policy. That’s why the academic bar becomes critical.

Trustee Rice: Dr. Levine, you said that the only measure of effective teaching is student learning. But then I heard that there are a number of factors that must be considered when evaluating the effectiveness of a teacher. So let me come back to you. How do you tie outcome-based results with the other two streams that have been discussed?

Dr. Levine: The testing we are now using is relatively new. What we used to care about was how well these people were teaching. You would go in and you’d watch them teach, but that is not good enough anymore. What we want to know now is how well are their students are learning. So, many states have put together sets of standards detailing what we want students to learn, and then have come up with ways to measure whether they are actually doing it. The move toward national standards is a good thing. It means that we will have a clearer sense of what we want our children to learn and be able to do. The assessment devices are going to get better and better, and we are going to do a much better job of figuring out what kids are learning. The big debates we are having now is how to report the findings. Some people say we ought to do value added, some people say we ought to do a straight comparison, some people say we ought to watch growth and development. The reality is that we are having these arguments now because it is all so new and because we are trying to figure out what works. Anything that anybody puts up gets shot at right now. It’s a developmental phase, and the tests are really important and really worth looking at now, even given the flaws. I think, however, they are going to get much better.

I also think the tests will change. What happens now is that we give a test at the end of the term, the end of the year, and we see how the students are doing. Imagine if your GPS worked that way; every hour it gives you a report on how you are doing and it says after an hour you are off by 80 miles and you are driving in the wrong direction. That is laughable because that is not the way a GPS works. Testing is going to move in the direction of our GPS, but what we are going to see is real-time testing, seeing how kids are learning. It means we will be able to provide the kinds of skills, knowledge and materials directed exactly at the kind of mistakes they are making, the things they have failed to understand at the moment in which they have made that mistake before that mistake grows and stops the student from achieving whatever our goals are for that area.

Dean Steiner: The disagreement that you heard between Prog. Stotsky and is useful because there isn’t a piece of educational research in this country that doesn’t have its critics. Not one. The teacher, the principal, the superintendent, the commissioner of education is always faced with the same questions: what do we know and how well do we know it. Sometimes, all one can say is that it’s the best evidence we have. For example, Prof. Statsky’s colleagues at the University of Arkansas find difficulty with the MET project. I come back and say it underwent severe peer review by the top professors at Harvard and
Stanford. We could go on for half an hour and you are left wondering who’s got the credibility here. That is a fundamental problem with education. We have very bad research, and then we have research, including the MET study in my opinion, that would make it into a small category of stronger studies. Sandy wouldn’t agree, so that is one problem, the research.

And then there’s the question of testing. I am not nearly as optimistic as Dr. Levine. I was brought up in a culture that actually honors seniority. The computer assessments will be terrific at telling you that you have a misspelling. They will be terrific at telling you that you have mishandled the quadratic equation, and they will be excellent in honing those skills in which you have erred, but that isn’t why we are 24th in the world on our PISA studies and 18th on TIMS, and why our students can’t write analytic essays. We are flunking not because our students can’t add four and four or because they can’t write single-sentence answers to single multiple-choice questions, we are flunking because we don’t teach them how to do sustained thought. We don’t teach them how to do sustained analytic work. Computers are quite a ways away from being substitute teachers for that kind of thinking, and that is why I want to press the issue curriculum and reading. It is not about the simple skills only I am afraid, if it were I would be more optimistic.

**Ms. Pauley:** I would like to press the issue of admissions and higher admission standards for teachers. In 1969 my older sister, a Phi Beta Kappa math major at Indiana University, taught in a public school for three years. She probably was among the last women with her credentials to become a teacher, and left after three years, which now is typical. As I mentioned previously, I have a son who in his third year as a classroom teacher expects to go the distance. We shall see, but speaking as a layperson, I expect you experts to figure out how to achieve better outcomes. I expect you as public representatives to figure this out so we’ll get talented men and women to want to be professional teachers. My son teaches in the San Francisco area, across the bay from Silicon Valley, and you can imagine the status of a public school teacher in that environment. How can we raise the status of the profession to draw teachers who will, regardless of your metrics, deliver better outcomes? How we are going to draw the line on who gets to major in education, assuming an education department even exists?

**Prof. Stotsky:** One solution, certainly not the only one and certainly a controversial idea, is to give a greater salary to those particular areas where you have shortages, such as math and science. We know we have shortages of math and science teachers at the high school level. Universities do this. Such a suggestion would go against the collective bargaining contract of the union, and we lost the double- or triple-salary schedule years ago. We now have a single salary scale schedule which is a big mistake. The kindergarten teacher and the senior high school teacher of calculus get the same amount. This is something, by the way, that is not done in other countries. Having different salaries would not solve the whole problem; it’s just one of the many pieces.

I’d like to return to the research issue because it is a huge ongoing argument. I know that there is no single body of research about which everyone will agree. What that can lead to is a little humility about what any one study can tell us, and it means that when you establish policies, they should be flexible. You shouldn’t include everybody in a major move in a state, for example, so that you can get independent feedback from certain indices, yet that is what I fear is now happening. We are not allowing for ways to get independent feedback so that we know whether a policy is going to work or not. That is part of what you need to be able to do, and this is the answer to the uneven quality of research. You simply don’t establish across-the-board policies without triangulation of data.
Trustee Philip Eskew: I’d like to turn this a little bit. The world is changing and today’s students have all kinds of learning abilities and disabilities. What, in your expert opinions, should the curriculum be in a school of education in this day and age? I want your thoughts on what we should be teaching our teachers to make them effective.

Dr. Levine: I need to speak to a point that pertains to that question. We fundamentally disagree about the nature of teaching in America. We can’t decide whether it is a craft or a profession. For a craft, you take relatively little education and you learn on the job. In a profession, such as medicine, you need a lot of education before you ever enter the profession.

I think teaching is profession, and I think you need a lot of education. We are working with a number of institutions, including IUPUI, and we are asking them to transform their programs. We have told them that they need to focus on outcomes, that we care about learning. We’ve also told them that programs must be school based. Programs must be moved out of the university and into the schools. We have said that in terms of content we want students in schools from the day the school year begins, to the day the teachers leave. We want the courses that are taught to be integrated with that experience.

We are doing a project with the University of Indianapolis, in which all coursework has been eliminated, and modules have been created. The modules have been imbedded into the field experience with the end result that when a student comes to class at the school they may have studied the subject they’ve gone to see the next day or the day before, and they may go over that subject that afternoon. What we are talking about is an education that is tied into the field experience. What do they need to know? They need to know how kids learn. That’s critical. They need to know how to teach in their subject area, and they need to know how to manage a classroom. They need to understand assessment and how you carry that out. They need to understand curriculum design, and how one designs a curriculum that’s tied to the subject matter. We can keep adding subjects to this list, those are the most important.

Dean Steiner: We agree. At Hunter, every student is in the classroom in every course. Fieldwork starts from the beginning. At Hunter, we are moving toward an individualized education program for every one of our candidates. In other words, we will have an IEP for every student. Their skills and their content knowledge will be mapped, and we will constantly revisit their progress against those metrics with formative assessments. We will, for our resident program, insist that they show a full year of learning on the part of their students as a minimal requirement for graduation. We have our Arts and Science faculty working with our School of Education faculty on content, but as Dr. Levine said, the key is that the clinical is at the core, and we are providing practice, practice, practice on the core skills of teaching. Malcolm Gladwell isn’t wrong. It’s not enough to see a video of a master teacher. We can identify with Doug Lemov’s 49 crucial skills, but reading about them in a textbook is next to useless, and you don’t get it right the first time. We talk about stretching the question, for example. That means that if the students get it right, the question you asked is too easy so you learn to stretch it. How do you do that? You watch a great teacher like Lemov do it on the video, and then you try it in the South Bronx tomorrow morning, and you flunk, so you try it again and again and again and you get better. I think we are all in this work right now and it is a sea change and it is not overnight but it is flipping the logic so the clinical comes first.

Ms. Pauley: I’m confused. The only research that is solid so far ties teacher effectiveness with competence in a subject. At the age of 18 a high school English teacher is going to spend the whole day in a classroom watching an English teacher teach? When are they
going to get to read Huckleberry Finn, when are they going to read Moby Dick? When are they going to take geography?

**Prof. Stotsky:** That’s the education program as opposed to the academic content of the undergraduate years.

**Dean Steiner:** Remember that they are doing an undergraduate degree in something else at the same time. They are learning to be teachers. In the state of New York there is no undergraduate degree in education. None. So they are studying mathematics, English, social studies and then their education training is on top of that as an undergraduate.

**Dr. Levine:** We all agree on this one point. For each of us teacher education would be postgraduate, and what we are basically saying is undergraduate education is a time in which you gain a subject area, in which you really specialize. The person who wants to become a teacher studies physics or chemistry or history or English in the same way that anybody would. They take a regular major, and then they specialize in graduate school, learning how to effectively communicate that subject matter to people so they can learn it. It’s an add-on not a subtraction.

**Trustee Tom Reilly:** I’m starting to picture the university of the future, and I’d like to consolidate several of these thoughts. I think we are talking about the entire university, not just the school of education. I’m sensing that we have to be very selective because you cannot work without high-quality teachers of a high intelligence level. Next, there is a question of content and how that content is delivered, and I gather that the amount of content that a good teacher needs is essentially represented by a B.A. of some form. The next thing is that field work is very, very important.

We have a number of schools of education at Indiana University and I remember one of the smallest had a dean who said that the best professors of education were the ones who liked to sit on the floor, meaning they went out into the elementary schools with their students. From what you are saying, I guess that is an important piece.

I’m also hearing that observation is very important. You sent us the Gates study, which was fascinating, but observation is very difficult, so you not only have to develop observation, you have to rate the observers, and that is something that is probably not being thought of much in the schools of education.

Finally, I gather from all of the material you sent that you are all somewhat critical of the status of the research that is being done within schools of education. It appears that maybe we are not working in a relevant fashion on the real problems today. Dr. Steiner had a list of questions and reviewed the work that was being done on them, and found that in many cases only two or three studies had been done, leading him to ask, how can I come to an answer on this when there hadn’t been any good solid research done.

That’s the model I’m seeing, based on what the three of you are saying.

**Ms. Pauley:** By happenstance you are describing my son’s preparation, because he didn’t decide to be a teacher until after he had earned his B.A., and then he had classroom experience, not as a teacher, and the goal of his training was to make a first-year teacher look like a second-year teacher.

I’d like to tell you a story. My husband and I were having dinner at a New York restaurant in the late spring. Two women were sitting nearby, the younger of whom was flushed and
weeping. I realized I was listening to a first-year teacher who was crawling across the finish line and didn’t know if she was going to make it. She told her mother about classroom management, disruptive situations that day after day prevented her from doing her job, and she said she was bereft because there was no one to help her. I reached out to both of them, and told the young woman, “You are not going to be a first-year teacher next year, you are going to be a second-year teacher, and you are going to spend the summer regaining your strength, and finding a network of people who can help you learn how to handle disruptions in your class.” How can that young teacher, that devoted and talented young woman, be trained in such a way that she won’t be driven from the field after her first year? She needs to be there 10 years from now, but I don’t know if she’s going to be a teacher in the fall.

Dr. Levine: I think there are two things we can do. The first is a training issue. We are talking about bringing them into real schools for a major part of their time. They ought to go into schools like the kind they are going to be teaching in, and they ought to have really good counseling as to how we do it.

Secondly, I don’t know of another profession like teaching. There are several doctors on the board. When you finished medical school did you rush out that afternoon and go into an operating theatre? No, that’s not the way it works. In professional education, we need to prepare people to do the job. We don’t do that with teaching. When the student arrives, we shove them into a classroom and we tell them they’re on their own, pointing out that they should be doing the same things Mrs. Jones down the hall is doing. The difference is that Mrs. Jones has been a teacher for 20 years. We have a fellowship program in Indiana, and one of the things we require is three years of mentoring. Once that person gets into the classroom we assume they have been prepared in a manner that makes them as good as that second-year teacher even though they’re in a classroom for the first time.

Dean Steiner: Agreed, but there is a second half to the equation. In Hong Kong prior to the Chinese takeover, and it’s largely still true, teachers spent 50% of their time planning together, reviewing the results of their students’ work, reimagining their teaching for the next week. In the top charter schools in New York, which are outperforming our regular schools, there is an hour and a half of planning every day. We massively mistreat the teachers in our schools. Our professional development for our teachers is often 50 hours in a year; in a year. We must do better at teacher preparation and we must mentor new teachers, of course, but we have labor rules, work rules, structural rules that are devastating to high performance. We are misstructuring our schools, and that is part of the challenge here. We need to get around the table with the unions, with management, with teacher prep and begin to rethink this from the ground up. It is outrageous that two public schools -- one charter and one not -- located within a block of one another right here in New York City, teaching in some cases siblings from the same family, are sending 75% of one group to college, and 11% in the other case.

Trustee MaryEllen Bishop: Dr. Steiner, you have talked about your school’s ability to do videography and critiques in the classroom. Doesn’t that translate to increased costs for teacher education?

Dean Steiner: Not a lot. Hunter has 130 flip cameras to use in the education of 3,000 teacher candidates. They cost less than $100 each, which is less than the cost of a science textbook. We have a $4,000 server on which we load 16,000 video clips. Using an online tutorial, we have trained our students how to best photograph themselves. We don’t send videographers into the classroom. We have letters in 50 languages in New York City’s Department of Education that go to the schools for blanket permissions to do the videing.
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In 15,000 cases, only two or three parents objected to having their child in a video. Twenty-five states are now committed to using a video-based performance assessment for teacher candidates. The most famous was developed in Stanford by Linda Darling-Hammond and is the one that most of the states are using. There are even 360-degree cameras that can capture a whole classroom.

**Ms. Pauley:** Did you have to train a coterie of people to analyze the videos?

**Dean Steiner:** That is the key. We have been developing a clinical subset within our faculty, individuals who have expertise in analyzing teacher performance.

**Trustee Bishop:** Does our society need to change the way it looks at these vital people who touch our lives every single day? Do we need to change our perceptions about how we treat teachers and how we pay them? It seems as if ideologically we have got things kind of skewed.

**Dr. Levine:** When I was at teacher’s college, an alum came to see me. He was a third-grade teacher in New York City and he loved it, but he said he was going to leave the profession because at his college reunion, he discovered that he had the lowest-status and the lowest-paying job of all his peers. His parents kept urging him to get on with his career, and interesting women lost interest when they learned what he did. The fact of the matter is this is a low-status job, and if we are serious about this we need to do several things.

First, this is a wide open profession, with no standards for entering it. We can afford to be more selective in terms of who we bring in to our programs. Our salaries and incentives are entirely in the wrong direction, they don’t encourage people to enter the profession. They encourage people who have been there for 20 years to stay in the profession. If we took some of the money that we are putting into pensions and moved to defined contribution plans, we could pay much higher salaries on the front end. We could pay bonuses, and we could provide prestigious fellowships for students who choose to go into this field.

**Ms. Pauley:** Do you think that if you built a school that was difficult to get into, a school like the IU Kelley School of Business, and raised the bar so that it was an honors program, that it would draw more people to the profession?

**Prof. Stotsky:** The numbers are a critical issue because, as several people have remarked, you can’t have an honors program or the kind of training you are talking about with huge numbers. Medical schools produce how many students a year compared to how many teachers are produced a year? The question is, how do you find the practitioner, the cooperating teacher in the classroom, those good classrooms? We are restricted by the huge numbers, particularly at the elementary school level, but often for certain areas such as social studies. We simply overproduce, and then you will find resistance to paying increased salaries when you have got so many numbers to consider. It doesn’t work out.

**Dean Steiner:** You are both right. The proof can be seen in Teach for America, which in controversial in some quarters. Wendy Kopf’s genius was to make it unbelievably difficult to get hired, and your next stop was Goldman Sachs. It is more difficult to get into Teach for America than it is to get into Harvard Law School as a Harvard undergraduate. It became its own story because it was prestigious. I think the deep challenge, as Prof. Stotsky said, is numbers. We are producing in New York far too many elementary school teachers, far too many principals who never become principals so there is an excess in the system. The reason Finland can take the top 10% of its college graduating class as its only candidates to be teachers is that it only trains to the sorts that it has. In other words, if you are good
enough to get into the program and there is very little leakage because they take the top of
the top you are basically guaranteed a job at the end of the rigorous preparation program.
Supply and demand are matched. We have been running not just in the education schools
but throughout the American education system a massive adult employment agency that
often has little to do with delivering high quality education to children.

Dr. Levine: I think it is even worse than that to the extent that we are charging people to
go through this program in fields in which they can’t possibly get a job. I think that is a
gross error. I think there is room to create the West Point of teacher education. I think the
lesson from Teach for America is that it is idealistic to think that teaching can be made sexy,
that people will come if it is regarded as selective. If tomorrow IU became that institution,
if IU Bloomington created West Point, I think you would see an incredible influx of high
quality students. What we found was by offering fellowships we could bring in students who
had extraordinary backgrounds, who had undergraduate degrees in math and science, and
were ready to become teachers if you could just hand them some prestige. By the way,
don’t stop at teaching; school leadership programs that prepare principals and
superintendents are much worse than teacher education programs in this country.

Dean Steiner: Just be alert to working with your school districts because otherwise you
may push the bar up and get better students, but you have to actually do something with
them in the schools, and that’s not so easy because you need principals and mentor
teachers who are of high quality. Those teachers are now going to be under much greater
stress because they are being held accountable for their results in a way they never were
before. Now you are asking them to mentor student teachers in their classrooms and to
turn over their students to another student while they are being measured for their
outcomes. Part of our problem is that the various parts of our education system don’t
speak to each other. Our best work is being done with one of the big groups of public
schools in New York City because we can sit down with the principals, with those who are
helping in that subdistrict with the education school, and think this through as an integrated
experience.

Trustee Rice: How do we balance the extended time it will take to earn a B.A. in content
plus a year or two developing teaching skills, with the cost meter of attending college for an
extended period of time? If you are not able to balance that with differentiated salaries,
how will you attract the top people to enter the field?

Dr. Levine: It all depends on how serious you are about this. If this state is serious about
it, if you think you need world-class teachers, then provide financial aid for people to do
that last year. Create prestigious fellowships for people who enter the field, and tie them to
labor market needs. We have 50 states that are competing against each other for economic
development, and those teachers are going to be key to making that happen. We are
finding that 60% of the people who come into our fellowship programs, which are fifth-year
programs, are career changers. It’s a way to turn people into teachers and it could be
a huge economic boom.

Prof. Stotsky: The extra years don’t seem to affect most other professions. I think there is
some sabre rattling that we need to deal with. Librarians, for example, typically come from
post-B.A. programs. Then there is the Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT) program, which
was developed in the 1930’s by James Bryant Conant, then president of Harvard University
who, with others, was thinking about how to draw more talented people into the profession.
At the time, a MAT degree was comprised of half graduate work in a discipline, and half in
education course work, which would give a student options. They could go into teaching or,
if they decided they didn’t like teaching after a year or two, they could pursue graduate work toward a Ph.D. in the area they had already done graduate work in.

Dr. Levine mentioned mid-career people. They have completed their undergraduate training and they have had a career. We had plenty of them in Massachusetts, mainly engineers or others who wanted to become science or math teachers. They wanted short programs. By the way, one of the great appeals of Teach for America is not only its prestige but the fact that it’s short.

**Trustee Patrick Shoulders:** It seems that if you all agree on anything it’s the de-emphasis on pedagogy, even eliminating departments of education and that sort of thing. I remain unconvinced. In his opening remarks, Dean Steiner touched on social inequalities and the finance system. In my lifetime, I’ve watched our public school system cope with societal ills, such as segregation. Desegregation was accomplished in our public schools. I am not convinced that an education degree for a K-4 teacher shouldn’t be more about malnutrition, societal ills and classroom management than calculus. My daughter was a second grade teacher who would have struggled with calculus, but I’m proud to say she was a damn fine teacher in a school system in Evansville that has 54% free and reduced lunch children at the poverty level. I am not buying into the de-emphasis on classroom and pedagogical skills.

**Dean Steiner:** I think there may be a misunderstanding. The misunderstanding would be to say that we are de-emphasizing the clinical skills. In fact, I’m saying the opposite. The role of the education school should be precisely to work with mentor teachers in the schools to ensure those skills. I think you are raising a bigger point and it is one that as a critic of education schools for many years I have faced many times and which is usually captured by the phrase, “social justice.” The best and most meaningful civil rights we can give as schools of education are effective teachers. I am passionate about social justice, but the social justice I am passionate about as a teacher preparer is to prepare effective teachers. I have to be very blunt about this: Reading lots of Paulo Freire, fascinating as that work is about Brazil and the Gregorian Revolution, doesn’t prepare you for Monday morning in the Bronx when it is your job to teach vocabulary and numeracy to the child who was not born into a middle class family. I am absolutely convinced that we have to work much harder to do something to remedy in small part the massive social inequalities that we face, and that is why this situation is so desperate. The reason the best charter schools in New York blow the results off the charts isn’t rocket science; they spend 9½ hours a day with those students. The average public school in New York City spends 5½.

**Trustee Reilly:** Indiana University is looked upon as a leader and a thought leader in the state, and when it takes a position on something people do listen. It is clear from what we have all seen, and from your comments, that the system itself has a lot of structural problems, starting with the way state funding is organized, the way school boards are elected, and the demands on superintendents, who really are businessmen, to balance the books of the enormous financial organizations. Some of the school districts are among the top 500 businesses in terms of the amount of dollars flowing through them. The principals have their own agendas, and alumni teachers have developed their positions, as have the unions. From my perspective, schools of education look upon the alliance of all of those forces out there as their customers, and being thoughtful people, they pay attention to what their customer does, and they don’t want to make their customer mad. But there are problems in the alliance, and I think the schools of education are very timid in terms of commenting on that. Isn’t there a role at the highest level of the schools of the universities to try to rectify some of the basic problems that have arisen, and to try to get them to modernize?
**Dean Steiner:** Yes.

**Dr. Levine:** If one looks at the power in Indiana and asks who’s having the greatest influence on education in the state, I say the Mind Trust if I were focused on Indianapolis. Such organizations spring up because universities aren’t playing the roles they need to play. I am not one of those people who thinks education schools need to be done away with; I do think they need to do their job better than they are doing it. If an education school turned out superb principals, turned out superb teachers and went on to do the kind of research that focused on how to improve the schools, it would be a treasure trove and it would do an enormous service, not only to education in Indiana but would set a model for the country.

**Ms. Pauley:** I think our time is about up. This has been full and rich and, in closing, I would like to echo something that Trustee Shoulders said. I don’t think we do the social inequity problem quite enough justice. My son works with underserved populations of children and has seen a kid arrive at school with a bag of chips, which was breakfast, and there was no lunch, no dinner because mom didn’t come home last night, a kid who is distracted because his brother was picked up for drugs the night before. The stories go on and on, and come to rest on the shoulders of a young man who is trying to be a successful first-year teacher. I would suggest there is a need for a major that combines social work and education. Maybe this already exists, but if it doesn’t I think that in the 21st century, this could be a growth field.

**Trustee Cole:** I want to thank our wonderful panelists, and Ms. Pauley for doing a terrific job of moderating and contributing to the discussion. This discussion has raised the stratosphere of major cultural issues and systemic problems in schools, and covered some very practical suggestions for improvement. Thank you all for coming.