

E24
1983n
v.2

PUBLIC HEARING

before

ASSEMBLY EDUCATION COMMITTEE

and

ASSEMBLY HIGHER EDUCATION AND REGULATED PROFESSIONS COMMITTEE

on

ASSEMBLY, NO. 3851 and ASSEMBLY, NO. 3974

Held:
October 17, 1983
Kean College
Union, New Jersey

MEMBERS OF COMMITTEES PRESENT:

Assemblywoman Mildred Barry Garvin, Chairwoman
Assembly Education Committee

Assemblyman Joseph V. Doria, Jr., Chairman
Assembly Higher Education and Regulated Professions Committee

ALSO PRESENT:

John A. White, Research Associate
Office of Legislative Services
Aide, Assembly Education Committee

New Jersey State Library

Kathleen Fazzari, Research Associate
Office of Legislative Services
Aide, Assembly Higher Education and
Regulated Professions Committee

* * * * *

ASSEMBLY, No. 3851

STATE OF NEW JERSEY

INTRODUCED SEPTEMBER 15, 1983

By Assemblywoman GARVIN and Assemblyman ROCCO

AN ACT creating a commission to study recommendations of the several national commissions and task forces on education, and making an appropriation.

1 BE IT ENACTED *by the Senate and General Assembly of the State*
2 *of New Jersey:*

1 1. The Legislature finds and declares that:

2 a. We take justifiable pride in what our schools have historically
3 accomplished and contributed to New Jersey and the well-being
4 of its people;

5 b. Several national reports on education recently have proposed
6 that certain changes be instituted in the public schools; and

7 c. It is incumbent upon the Legislature to ensure that New Jersey
8 is ever vigilant in identifying alternatives to enhance the educa-
9 tion of its citizens and to strengthen the public school system.

1 2. There is created a commission to consist of 35 members, all
2 of whom shall be citizens and residents of this State, two to be
3 appointed from the membership of the Senate by the President
4 thereof, no more than one of whom shall be of the same political
5 party; two to be appointed from the membership of the General
6 Assembly by the Speaker thereof, no more than one of whom shall
7 be of the same political party; the members of the Senate and
8 Assembly Education Committees; the Commissioner of Education,
9 ex officio, or his designee; the State Treasurer, ex officio, or his
10 designee; the President of the New Jersey Education Association;
11 the President of the New Jersey Principals and Supervisors As-
12 sociation; the President of the New Jersey Association of School

13 Administrators; the President of the League of Women Voters of
14 New Jersey; the Executive Director of the New Jersey Taxpayers
15 Association; and the President of the New Jersey Association of
16 School Business Officials.

17 The remaining members of the commission shall be appointed
18 by the Governor with the advice and consent of the Senate, pro-
19 vided that there shall be equal political representation of member-
20 ship, and shall include two school superintendents; two secondary
21 school teachers; two elementary school teachers; two academicians
22 whose expertise is in the field of education; two members of local
23 boards of education and three members of the general public.

24 The members shall serve without compensation, but shall be re-
25 imbursed for necessary expenses incurred in the performance of
26 their duties, subject to the availability of funds.

1 3. The commission shall organize as soon as may be practicable
2 following the appointment of its members and shall elect a chair-
3 man from among its members and a secretary, who need not be
4 a member of the commission.

1 4. The commission shall conduct a comprehensive study and
2 examination of the concerns and recommendations of the several
3 national commissions and task forces on education giving special
4 attention to the preparation, training and retention of quality
5 teachers and other recommendations that may enhance or expand
6 the State's goal of maintaining a thorough and efficient system of
7 public schools.

1 5. The commission shall be entitled to call to its assistance and
2 avail itself of the services of employees of any State, county or
3 municipal department, board, bureau, commission or agency as it
4 may require and as may be available to it for these purposes, and
5 to employ stenographic and clerical assistants and incur traveling
6 and other miscellaneous expenses as it may deem necessary, in
7 order to perform its duties and as may be within the limits of funds
8 appropriated or otherwise made available to it for these purposes.

1 6. The commission may meet and hold hearings at any place as
2 it shall designate during the sessions or recesses of the Legislature
3 and shall report its findings and recommendations to the Legisla-
4 ture on or before January 1, 1985, accompanying the same with
5 any legislative bills which it may desire to recommend for adoption
6 by the Legislature.

1 7. There is appropriated \$75,000.00 to the commission in order
2 to effectuate the purposes of this act.

1 8. This act shall take effect immediately.

STATEMENT

This bill creates a commission to study the recommendations and concerns of the various national commissions and task forces that have made recommendations to improve the schools.

ASSEMBLY, No. 3974

STATE OF NEW JERSEY

INTRODUCED SEPTEMBER 15, 1983

By Assemblymen DORIA, DOYLE, Assemblywoman GARVIN, Assemblymen ROCCO, PALATA, BENNETT, WOLF, MEYER, HENDRICKSON, BOCCHINI, ROD, SCHUBER, KOSCO, HAYTAN, Assemblywoman COOPER, Assemblymen KAVANAUGH, KELLY, MARKERT, LITTELL, MUZIANI, CHINNICI, ROONEY, SHUSTED, MAZUR, NAPLES, VAN WAGNER, OTLOWSKI, PATERNITI, CHARLES, ADUBATO, JANISZEWSKI, COWAN, T. GALLO, PATERO, DEVERIN, LONG, RILEY, MARSELLA, McENROE, FORTUNATO, Assemblywomen KALIK, PERUN, Assemblymen BRYANT, PANKOK, PELLY, VISOTCKY, HOLLENBECK, GORMAN, JACKMAN, GIRGENTI, FELICE, WATSON, SCHWARTZ, HERMAN, ZANGARI, BAER, KARCHER, THOMPSON and BROWN

AN ACT concerning teacher certification and supplementing Title 18A of the New Jersey Statutes.

1 BE IT ENACTED *by the Senate and General Assembly of the State*
2 *of New Jersey:*

1 1. In order to be recommended for a New Jersey instructional
2 certificate after the effective date of this act, an individual shall,
3 in addition to fulfilling all of the standards and requirements estab-
4 lished pursuant to N. J. A. C. 6:11-7.1 et seq. adopted on August
5 16, 1982, meet the following criteria:

6 a. The maintenance of a cumulative grade point average of at
7 least 2.8 on a scale in which 4 is an A, and achieves at least a 3.0
8 in student teaching;

9 b. A comprehensive evaluation including but not limited to the
10 successful performance on a nationally validated examination that

11 tests the individual's general knowledge of teaching and education;
12 and

13 (1) if teaching in a secondary school, a subject matter examina-
14 tion in any area of teaching for which he will be responsible as
15 part of his full-time teaching duties; or

16 (2) if teaching in an elementary school, an examination that
17 tests the individual's knowledge of teaching and the subject matter
18 in elementary schools.

1 2. In order to be approved as a program for the preparation of
2 teachers, the institution offering the program shall, in addition to
3 meeting all the standards and requirements established pursuant
4 to N. J. A. C. 6:11-7.1 et seq., demonstrate that the professional
5 education component of the curriculum adequately reflects the most
6 recent research available on effective teaching and effective schools.

1 3. Beginning on January 1, 1984, no individual shall be per-
2 mitted to teach in a New Jersey public school unless that individual
3 holds, as a minimum, a bachelor's degree from an accredited four
4 year institution of higher education. In the event that it can be
5 demonstrated by the chief school administrator of the employing
6 district that no such individual is available, the Commissioner of
7 Education may issue a temporary certificate; however, that cer-
8 tificate shall be valid only so long as the individual is enrolled and
9 is in good standing in a degree granting program and is making
10 reasonable progress toward the bachelor's degree.

1 4. The Commissioner of Education and the Chancellor of Higher
2 Education, in consultation with the president of the institutions
3 in this State offering approved teacher preparation programs,
4 shall take all necessary action to implement the "Standards for
5 State Approval of Teacher Education" adopted on August 16, 1982
6 (N. J. A. C. 6:11-7.1 et seq.) and, by January 1, 1984 shall advise
7 the Education and Higher Education Committees of the Legisla-
8 ture of the status of these regulations.

1 5. This act shall take effect immediately.

STATEMENT

The purpose of this bill is to ensure that programs in New Jersey colleges for the preparation of teachers meet rigorous standards and that individuals entering the teaching profession are of the highest quality.

Under this bill, an individual will be required to maintain a B-(2.8) average and to pass a nationally normed standardized test in professional education and in a subject area in order to be

certified to teach in New Jersey. It also requires all approved programs to demonstrate that they reflect the latest research in effective teaching and effective schools.

In addition the bill directs the Commissioner of Education and the Chancellor of Higher Education to implement the reforms adopted on August 16, 1982 and to report to the legislative committees of Education and Higher Education on the status of these reforms.

Essentially, as of September 1, 1983 no individual can be admitted to a teacher preparation program unless they (1) demonstrate proficiency in basic skills, (2) have a 2.5 average and (3) demonstrate aptitude for teaching through a supervised field experience. In order to be certified an individual must (1) maintain a C+ average, (2) complete an academic major and (3) demonstrate competency through successful student teaching.

These regulations, based upon years of study, were promulgated in August 1982, when they were heralded as major reforms of teacher education programs. Although effective on September 1, 1983 they have yet to be fully or effectively implemented.

The implementation of the State Board standards, and the more rigorous requirements contained in this bill will effectively insure that the future teachers of our children meet the standards of excellence which we all desire.

I N D E X

| | <u>Page</u> |
|--|-------------|
| Dr. Frank J. Esposito Dean of the School of Education Kean College | 3 & 1x |
| Evelyn McGill New Jersey State Federation of Teachers | 10 |
| Kathleen Britt Classroom Teacher Middletown Township | 15 |
| George Stang Kean College | 17 & 5x |
| Dr. Donald J. Silberman President of the AFT Jersey City State College | 25 |
| Delores Shiposh Professor of Physical Education Kean College | 30 |
| Giovanna Musto Classroom Teacher Middlesex County | 33 |
| Dr. Sean Healy Kean College | 35 |
| Dr. Barbara A. Wilson Research Physicist AT&T Bell Laboratories | 41 |
| Sue Miksza Principal of an Elementary School | 46 |
| Dr. Walter Eliason Associate Professor of Education Rider College | 49 & 12x |
| Dr. Michael Knight Kean College | 52 |

INDEX (Continued)

| | <u>Page</u> |
|---|-------------|
| Dr. Stanley Geschwind AT&T Bell Laboratories | 55 |
| Dr. Phyllis F. Kavett Department of Educational Arts and Systems Advisor to the Secondary Education Program Kean College | 61 |
| Barbara Tanis Classroom Teacher Passaic County | 64 & 14x |
| Michael Johnson Classroom Teacher Camden County | 66 |
| Dr. Douglas D. Osheroff AT&T Bell Laboratories | 68 & 17x |
| Gertrude Clarke Teacher | 73 |
| Ken Lyons Research Scientist | 78 |
| Jeanine LaRue Teacher | 80 |
| ALSO SUBMITTED: | |
| Statement from: Dr. Nathan Weiss, President Kean College of New Jersey | 19x |
| Additional letter from: Marcoantonio Lacatena President Council of New Jersey State College Locals | 22x |

ASSEMBLYMAN JOSEPH V. DORIA, JR. (Chairman, Assembly Higher Education and Regulated Professions Committee): We are going to call the hearing to order at this point. We want to thank everyone for coming out. I want to begin by thanking the people here at Kean College for their hospitality, especially Dean Frank Esposito of the School of Education, and Laurie Herzik, who is the Director of the theatre here. I want to thank them for all their help and cooperation.

What we will do is begin by having a few opening comments from me and from Mrs. Garvin, and then we will ask the various individuals who have asked to testify to come up here. We will ask everyone to please be as brief as possible. We would like you to stay within a five minute time frame. The reason for this is that we have a list that goes up to thirty at the present time, and that does not necessarily include people who might come in without having notified us beforehand. Obviously, we do not want to be repetitious. We want everyone to have an opportunity to express their opinions and go on record, and we would like to be able to ask questions. So, we would ask you to try to limit yourselves to five minutes. If you have written comments or statements, please hand them to us, so we can put them into the record, and then you can just comment on them, because we will print the entire statement as is. Those are just a few ground rules we can begin with.

As you know, this is a joint hearing of the Assembly Education Committee and the Assembly Higher Education and Regulated Professions Committee, the purpose of which is to review two bills, one of which is Assemblywoman Garvin's bill, A-3851, and one is my bill, A-3974. Both of these bills deal specifically with a review of education here in the State of New Jersey. I will comment briefly on my bill, and then ask Assemblywoman Garvin to comment on her bill.

My bill is specifically a restatement of the present guidelines, the guidelines which became effective as of September, 1983, for educational certification in the State of New Jersey. The purpose of the bill is, one, to elicit discussion concerning the guidelines as they presently exist and, two, to elicit discussion concerning the various proposals made by the Commissioner of Education and the Governor as they relate to teacher certification and the possible alternate means of certification in the State of New Jersey.

We have major concerns over some of the suggestions that have been made. This bill is not the solution to all the problems, rather it is a point from which we can depart and discuss what presently exists and how we can better improve what exists. I do not think that anyone disagrees with the premise that there is a need to improve education in the State of New Jersey. I think there is disagreement over exactly what will do that and how we can do that. I think at the present time we are saying that the Commissioner's proposals are proposals that are, in my opinion, "throwing the baby out with the bath water." They go too far.

There is a need for some of the suggestions, but the suggestions have just gathered to a point where we are not creating an alternate system, but rather we are replacing a system, and that, obviously, is not what we want to do.

With those comments, I will end my statement and ask Mrs. Garvin if she would like to make her statement.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MILDRED BARRY GARVIN (Chairwoman, Assembly Education Committee): Thank you, Assemblyman Doria. First, I would like to thank Dr. Esposito, and the marvelous young people who have the responsibility of manning this marvelous theatre. I arrived here early today not knowing the conditions we would be faced with, and here we found all these extraordinary young people to assist us in this whole arrangement. So, I would like to thank them and, also, Laurie, who I am sure had a lot to do with it.

I think that even though Assemblyman Doria's bill and my bill are scheduled today, since many of the persons who have requested to be heard are interested in Assembly Bill 3974, which I am one of the cosponsors of, we will perhaps restrict the testimony to that bill. I, for one, would like to thank Assemblyman Doria, because when we had this idea to have a hearing statewide after working hours-- May I share with you that this idea is not popular in Trenton, but I think Assemblyman Doria and myself are really interested in hearing the views on a statewide basis, and the only way we are going to be able to do that is to have hearings after working hours, especially when there are issues affecting teachers. It is very difficult for teachers to get off during the day, so we felt we would have a hearing here, and we are

also planning one in South Jersey, but the date of that hearing has not yet been firmly established. But, Joe, I would like to thank you. You know, we are such a team, one would not believe we are two separate heads of two separate Committees, because we do work so well together, and we are concerned.

I think the comment I would like to make on Assembly Bill 3974, which has to do with certification, is that since our last public hearing in Trenton, the type of mail I have received, in addition to telephone calls, many from people who will not be here today, indicates, I think, that we have a ground swell of opposition to the bill, but not just opposition for opposition's sake, opposition for clarification's sake. So, we are hoping that with these public hearings, the kinds of suggestions you bring to us will somehow be used in the process of my bill, Assembly Bill 3851, which is to form a statewide commission -- and I think I have already named it. I am going to call it the Garvin Commission.

ASSEMBLYMAN DORIA: That's very good; I think that is an excellent name.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GARVIN: Then I'll be sure it will have broad representation to deal with all of the issues concerning education in this State. We cannot afford to deal with decisions that impact on the diversity of this State without hearing from the people who these reforms or recommendations will affect. So, again, Dr. Esposito, I would really like to thank you for this environment. We are quite impressed with it. With that, I will turn the hearing over to the people who are here. John White is my Legislative Aide, and Kathy Fazzari is the Legislative Aide for Assemblyman Doria. Kathy, I think what we are going to do is let John handle the list, and let you just sit back and relax today. Oh, I love to do that. John, would you call the speakers for us?

MR. WHITE: Dr. Frank Esposito, Dean of the School of Education, Kean College.

D R. F R A N K J. E S P O S I T O: Thank you. Let me welcome you to the campus on behalf of President Weiss, who cannot be here. He did ask me to extend his welcome to you, and we are very pleased that you chose Kean College as the site for this hearing. We know it will benefit our students and our faculty just to be part of this process.

I have two statements, one I will make, and the other one I would like to distribute to you, with your permission, which is the statement of President Weiss on the issue of an alternative route to certification.

The Kean College faculty is very supportive of the active role of the Legislature in dealing with this emerging crisis. Unfortunately, I think the crisis could have been avoided. The crisis is really caused by a rather poorly conceived proposal for alternative certification. It kind of plays to the fears of people in the education community that things will be rammed down their throats without consultation. Some of these fears are justified based on past experiences. I think it is important that the Legislature, and these two Committees, play a role in allaying these fears, by letting people know that they do have input and that the opinions of people, especially people in the field of teacher education, are valued.

But, the entire way this particular proposal has been handled by the Department of Education, I think, has been, either consciously or unconsciously, designed not to get the support of people in teacher education, but rather to rally the opposition. If I were to pick out a way of trying to solidify opposition to something I wanted to do, I would follow exactly the scenario adopted by the Department of Education. They did not consult with any dean in any school of education in the State, public or private. I am not sure if they consulted with any teachers; it is certainly not evident. This particular plan was apparently conceived in private and announced in public without the benefit of questions from the audience, other than the press. It does, unfortunately, convey a lack of respect for people in the educational business. It has two main assumptions. The first one, that the deans would oppose the change because of their vested interest. The second assumption, that the best route for certification reform in New Jersey is through the creation of a climate of conflict between districts and colleges, and various groups.

Both assumptions are inaccurate. College deans in New Jersey have expressed for years their dissatisfaction with the course-counting method of transcript evaluation for certification. They have been on record for years as complaining about the misuse of the emergency

certificate. The transcript evaluation approach, as you know, allows students to accumulate credits from several institutions, and then be certified in a particular area. In that way they are able to avoid what we like to think is a more rigorous approach, and certainly a more monitored approach, by taking an approved program at a college, a program that has been certified by accrediting bodies, and a program that has, especially now under the new standards, rather tight academic standards.

I believe you will find, and that the Commissioner had he sought advice would have found, that the faculty and deans of schools of education in the State are supportive of the change of certification. As Assemblyman Doria mentioned in his earlier remarks, the opposition is to this particular reform, and I think we have to stress that, because the press has a tendency -- in fact, this tendency was evident even before any dean in the State spoke against this plan. It was portrayed in the Star-Ledger as, "It is obvious that the deans will oppose this because of their vested interest." As I mentioned directly to members of the Department of Education about a week ago, this puts the deans in a rather terrible position, because then if you comment, you are commenting because of vested interest. So anything you have to say is immediately written off. I do not think this is the way to go about bringing collective change in the State of New Jersey.

The document itself -- we could spend time with it, but I won't because it would belabor it. It is replete with exaggerations and inaccurate information. There is even some evidence that some of the quotations in the document are not accurate quotations. There has been a repudiation of one quotation in the document by the author of the book published by AACTE. The author has said that the quotation misrepresented his thinking. I think the plan itself is really a disaster. It would unleash into the classroom people without any prior training, people who conceivably would go into an elementary classroom with nothing more than a subject matter background. They could conceivably go into specialized areas without any kind of background.

Had this proposal been submitted as a plan for bringing super-talented people into secondary teaching, it probably would not have been opposed. It certainly would not have been opposed as

effectively and as strongly as it is being opposed. But, none of those provisos were written into the document.

I also want to mention that a number of people who are unhappy with the way in which this has been handled are working together as an unofficial coalition. It probably will become an official coalition very shortly. The purpose of this group will be to come up with constructive alternatives to this Cooperman plan.

I want to make a few comments also on the two Assembly bills under discussion. Assembly Bill 3851, which would create a commission to study education in New Jersey -- I endorse that. I think that is a very good idea. We have had a lot of study, we had a lot of commissions, but I really don't know of any commission, at least in this State, where there has been a synthesis of what it is we do know, and what we should be doing in education. I think there is a need for that, and I heartedly endorse it.

One suggestion I would like to make is, under the membership listing an AFT representative would be appropriate, given the importance of that Union to New Jersey and to the nation. Just as an additional comment, both the AFT and NJEA, in all of my workings with both organizations, are actively interested in coming up with viable alternatives to the Cooperman plan. There is not the kind of wild opposition that is sometimes portrayed in the press.

The second bill, A-3974, reaffirms the intent of the minimum standards, and I have what I guess would be typical misgivings of any dean about legislation regarding academic standards and curriculum. But, I recognize that given the situation we're in, where it does seem clear by the proposal of the Commissioner that there is an attempt to certainly cut out the basis of the minimum standards through this alternative plan, there may well be a need to reaffirm what is in the minimum standards, because there is a danger that if the Cooperman plan is adopted as is, it would virtually destroy undergraduate teacher education in New Jersey. I can't conceive of any student opting to take the programs under the minimum standards, which now require an academic major in addition to professional education course work, in addition to three field experiences, sophomore field experience, junior field experience and senior student teaching, plus maintenance of at

least a 2.5, and in many programs a higher average. I cannot see students taking that very rigorous road, when all they would have to do would be to take a comprehensive subject matter examination, and walk into a higher paying job in a school district.

The issues, as you know, are very complex. They cannot be blamed, and the problems cannot be blamed just on the courses that teachers are asked to take -- or prospective teachers are asked to take. We must bear in mind that under the new standards, professional education is limited to thirty credits, and that even if you look at that thirty credits, at least half of those thirty credits -- in many cases more -- are tied into field experiences. So, the reports of massive "Mickey Mouse" education courses being prevalent are not very accurate when you look at the substance of the new programs.

As the higher education community responded favorably in the past in terms of responding to the call for higher standards represented by the minimum standards, I think we can and will respond favorably to this challenge. It is just unfortunate that the process, as initiated, has not been as cooperative as it should have been, and it has not been based on sound information or very good judgment. The process should not be one of conflict, innuendo and disregard for the opinions of faculty and public school teachers. We are not the enemy as conceived by the Commissioner, but neither will we stand idly by as he criticizes schools of education and public schools for the past failures of his own Department.

We look forward to further improvements in the training of teachers. We will work closely with you and with all other groups in the State to build better programs. By building coalitions, I think we can develop alternative plans to what has been proposed thus far. We hope to place all of this process on constructive change and well thought out alternatives. The students in our schools and in our colleges require no less than our best. Thank you.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GARVIN: Thank you. I just have one question if you don't mind, sir. I would like to state for the record that I have already directed the staff to amend my bill so that the AFT will definitely be included. I just wanted to state that here to you in public. because I also have PTU's, PTA's and Home Schools. But, that

will be an amendment that I have totally accepted, and they will be a part of the commission.

I have another question, how broad is the coalition you spoke about? Are you just going to deal with certification, or are you going to deal with broader educational issues?

DR. ESPOSITO: Initially, the coalition was created as a group to respond to the Cooperman alternative certification. Whether it will go into broader areas, I don't know. The coalition did have a meeting roughly two weeks ago and agreed on a statement of principles. The idea was that the statement of principles would first be presented to the Governor, and that was done last Friday, and then they would become public information through a press conference. But, it is a very broad-based coalition.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GARVIN: May I ask that the schedule of meetings of that coalition be disseminated to both of our Committees through either John or Kathy. I know Joe and I would like to be kept abreast of it, because it is just that kind of a broad-based coalition that perhaps we need in our efforts to have broader representation. So, if you would just share it with us, I would thank you.

DR. ESPOSITO: Yes, I would be glad to do that.

ASSEMBLYMAN DORIA: I would just like to echo Mildred's comments with reference to the coalition. I know I have been invited to participate in the past, but I have not been able to make it because, unfortunately, a few of the days were legislative days where both Mildred and I couldn't make it. However, it would be good to give us the dates and we can then disseminate it amongst our own Committee members.

I have just one or two comments and then questions. The first would be that I agree with you about the setting of academic standards in legislation. I think they belong in regulations. I think my bill basically is a bill that should be regulations; they are regulations now. The problem is, we felt that in order to prevent things happening that we had no control over, we wanted to at least bring it up for discussion, so there will be no question in my mind that this should not be regulations. It should not be law, but it should be regulations.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GARVIN: That's right.

ASSEMBLYMAN DORIA: However, because of where we are at this point, and the lack of dialogue which exists between the Department of Education and the Legislature over this specific issue, we felt we had to assert our control because, obviously, the State Board of Education is a creation of the Legislature and, as such, it has the power to make regulations. But, we just want to point out to that State Board that we do sit above them and are the elected representatives of the people. So, I agree with you there wholeheartedly.

I would like you to comment on what you see as -- at least in my opinion I see as a contradiction between the guidelines as developed for this year and the proposed program that Commissioner Cooperman is developing. To me, and you brought it up to a degree in your presentation, one is very stringent, and the other seems to go the opposite way. So, there seems to be a contradictory message being sent out to students. One says you have to work harder, get better grades, follow a much more concise, much more restricted curriculum, demanding curriculum, and the other says, all you have to do is pass one test and you can teach. To me, that seems very contradictory. What is your comment on that?

DR. ESPOSITO: My feeling is that the Cooperman plan is definitely a step backward, and is a lowering of standards. In fact, I think it is almost the opening of a floodgate for the lowering of standards. The number of questions one can raise about that are, I think, enormous -- whether we can show that there is, indeed, a correlation between subject matter knowledge and an ability to function in an elementary classroom, for instance, or an early childhood setting. That seems to be an assumption of what is being proposed by the Commissioner. I am not sure that is valid at all. Not to say that subject matter knowledge is not important, it is. It is critically important, but it is not the whole thing.

ASSEMBLYMAN DORIA: Thank you.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GARVIN: Have you had any reaction from the students enrolled in teacher education? I just wondered if they are in any way aware of this possible reform.

DR. ESPOSITO: I'm aware of student reaction in terms of the students I come into contact with in class and elsewhere, and generally

their reaction to the proposal has been hostile. Without, I guess, speaking for the majority of students, but just my perception of what they are thinking, they seem to be saying that this, in a sense, erodes what it is they are doing in professional education.

ASSEMBLYMAN DORIA: I would just like to make the comment that I have gotten some feedback from some faculty members, who tell me that students are asking them if it is possible for them to just stop taking education courses, and decide if they want to become teachers after they graduate, if this becomes the law of the State. I think, again, it is being looked upon as a way out, you know, a way to beat the system. I think that is very bad and we have to try to discourage them, because I don't think the Commissioner intended this to be a way to beat the system. But, unfortunately, people are beginning to look upon it as a way of beating the system, and I think the way it has been presented, without any controls, without any definition as to when a person can apply to take part in this, has done that. I think that that is a part of the proposal which was not put together in a very well planned manner.

DR. ESPOSITO: That's right; I agree.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GARVIN: Thank you, Dr. Esposito.

DR. ESPOSITO: Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN DORIA: I just want to point out that President Weiss' comments which were presented to us will be included in the transcript of the public hearing.

MR. WHITE: Evelyn McGill, New Jersey State Federation of Teachers.

EVELYN MCGILL: Thank you for the opportunity we have this afternoon to speak. Now, in recent weeks there has been much published favoring and opposing the Cooperman plan for teacher licensing. We have read statements by State Department of Education officials, who seem to feel that teacher shortages in vital areas can best be filled by opening classroom doors and allowing masters of subject matter to dispense their knowledge without the necessity of having to undergo professional preparation. The road to sweeping educational reform has been paved by journalistic proponents of the Cooperman plan, and the public has frequently been subjected to one-sided presentations by some of these self-appointed educational gurus of the New Jersey press.

While the Commissioner's plan may have some merits, many of its flaws, which seem quite evident to those engaged in the day-to-day processes of education, have been largely overlooked, or perhaps deliberately underplayed, by some of those whose responsibility it is to keep the public intelligently and objectively informed. As a result, citizens who are genuinely interested in the welfare of public education are ready to take the "high road on education reform," as one journalist dubbed it in the Star-Ledger last week, because they remain uninformed about many of the likely adverse ramifications of the Cooperman plan. This is why I feel forums of this type, which we are participating in today, are so essential to the true democratic process, because here people who are intimately involved in education at least have an opportunity to come out and have some input.

As one who has had twenty-five years of teaching experience in New Jersey secondary schools, I'd like to offer some insights gleaned from that particular vantage point and, also, some general perspectives that seem to be getting lost in the hubbub of the moment.

Many of you are probably familiar with a report published this summer by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. According to an article which appeared in the Daily Journal, the report concluded that, "The teaching profession is in a 'jumbled mess' as inferior students enter a field marked by low salaries, loss of status and lack of recognition." Particularly noteworthy are comments by Ernest Boyer, President of the Carnegie Foundation, "Poor students are going into teaching, teacher pay has actually declined in relation to other professionals and public employees, credentialing is a mess and teachers do not receive recognition and reward." Boyer also points out that recruiting better new teachers will not solve the problem. He says, "Whatever is wrong with American public schools cannot be fixed without the help of those teachers already in the nation's classrooms. Most of them will be there for years to come, and we must view today's teachers as part of the solution, not the problem."

Now, if talented people are going to be attracted to the teaching profession, serious attempts must be made to remedy these other problems immediately. Certainly, we have to increase salaries,

New Jersey State Library

we have to increase benefits but, also, we have to do something to increase the status of the profession and give teachers recognition. Government officials, for example, and the press should stop demeaning teachers and schools of education. and focus on some of the good that is being done in public education today, in order to win public support for education.

The Federation's position, which has been stated by the President of the State Federation, Ray Peterson, in a statement prepared and delivered on September 7, is that we recommend as an alternative proposal to the Cooperman plan that instead of offering this on-the-job training program to potential teachers, the State should offer scholarships to graduates of other disciplines so that they might be trained as teachers before they enter the classrooms. Such courses could be offered on weekends and in late afternoon or evening classes that would not interfere with the current employment status of the new teacher candidates. Any person planning to change his career should expect to make some sacrifices. For its part, the State should be willing to bear the cost of training such applicants, if not in every field of education, at least in the fields in which there are shortages of qualified teachers. The Administration should also consider offering scholarships to outstanding college students who will agree to teach in the public schools for a specified period of time and that, I think, is important too, this idea of teaching for a specified period of time, rather than having people coming in and out of the profession.

The Commissioner's plan overemphasizes what is, in reality, the unproven value and effectiveness of these "subject masters" in the classroom; yet little is being done for or solicited from those who have proved their capabilities and are currently employed at teaching. Exploiting some of them -- and this is what it is, exploitation -- to serve on a certification evaluation team or "to provide peer support to provisional teachers" distracts from what should be each teacher's prime goal, to keep on improving the quality of education within his or her own classroom. Training and supervision of teacher candidates falls within the purview of our schools of education. It is obvious that Mr. Cooperman did not consult with the leaders of our schools of

[Faint, illegible text]

education in constructing his alternative plan and internship program. Experienced teachers constitute a major resource. Instead of misusing them, we should encourage them to remain in the classroom in order to do the job for which they have been trained and have developed an expertise.

As a teacher, a parent and a taxpayer, I am personally disturbed by the thought of opening classroom doors to those who have not been adequately prepared to teach. Four years of teacher training and preparation requires a certain sense of commitment and dedication. How many of those using the alternate route to certification will have a real commitment to teaching? There are just too many people with college degrees today who cannot get jobs and who might decide that getting paid for one or two years' work in a schoolroom is more beneficial than doing nothing. Only those who are truly committed to the profession will be willing to sacrifice most weekends between September and June in order to grade papers, plan projects and chaperone school events. Only those genuinely dedicated to youngsters will stay up past midnight most week nights in order to plan lessons and bulletin boards, or stay long hours after school to counsel troubled students, or sponsor a time-consuming club activity without benefit of extra pay. How many of those who are entering the profession as an afterthought will permit the disruption of family life that teaching often entails?

Some of those taking the alternate route to certification will undoubtedly use the profession as a stepping stone to more lucrative and prestigious forms of employment. There is nothing to induce these people to remain in teaching. While a starting salary of \$18,500 might appear attractive to some, the overall salaries, benefits and pensions are poor when compared with those offered by industry. If the Cooperman plan were adopted, teaching could easily become a "revolving door" profession -- people in for one or two years, then out. And, it must be borne in mind that very often a teacher does not realize his or her full potential until after four, five, or even six years of experience.

Mr. Cooperman is seeking to attract top quality people to teaching, but brilliance in an academic area does not necessarily

indicate an ability to teach. This has been proven time and time again. In fact, often the reverse is true. Some of those who are truly bright may lack the tolerance and patience required to deal with lesser mentalities. This is even true on the secondary level, where subject matter masters cannot communicate their ideas to students. I have personally witnessed numerous cases where brilliant individuals were unable to communicate meaningfully with the majority of their students. These were frustrating experiences for students and teachers alike, yet these teachers continued to plod on for years in their careers.

Successful teaching requires a mastery not only of subject matter, but also of a specific body of professional knowledge and skills, including such things as child psychology and methodology. I wonder, for example, how many of those people coming in using this alternate route would know:

1. How to construct test questions in order to elicit valid and meaningful responses from students;
2. How to construct tests for diagnostic and evaluative purposes;
3. How to interpret test scores and utilize their results in lesson planning;
4. How to structure a lesson plan within a given framework of time, including experiential background and motivation, a lesson with specific objectives in mind, summary, assignment and/or evaluation;
5. How to organize a unit of studies, sequentially, thematically, etc;
6. How to adapt materials to the level of the students;
7. How to vary manner of presentation and classroom technique;
8. How to diagnose learning problems, perceptually, neurologically, etc;
9. How to teach to the "whole child," psychologically, emotionally, intellectually, socially, etc; and,
10. How to deal with emotional and behavioral problems that are unique to any particular stage of child development.

These are the types of things you learn in teacher preparation.

If purposeful reform is to occur in education, it must take place from within. It cannot be sought outside the profession or imposed from above by those who have lost touch with contemporary public school classroom experience. Local school districts need to provide stronger incentives for the continuing education of those teachers who are currently employed. Inter-district or regional forums for exchange of ideas and curriculum planning among teachers should be encouraged. Boards of education need to become less authoritarian and more receptive to teacher suggestions for educational development within the schools. State colleges need to review and revise their education programs in order to make them more meaningful to students. And, the mandating of higher entry and exit standards in the schools of education is a necessity. Assemblyman Doria's proposal, A-3974, I believe, is a big step in the right direction.

Thank you for listening so patiently, and if anyone has any questions I will attempt to answer them.

ASSEMBLYMAN DORIA: Thank you very much. We appreciate your taking time out to come here, and we appreciate your comments. Thank you.

MR. WHITE: Kathleen Britt, classroom teacher from Middletown Township.

ASSEMBLYMAN DORIA: We would just like to ask everyone to try to be as brief as possible. Obviously, your comments are very worthwhile: I just don't want to have people waiting here for three or four hours. So, if you could limit your comments, we would appreciate it.

KATHLEEN BRITT: Good afternoon, I am Kathleen Britt, special education teacher in Middletown Township, Chairperson of NJEA's Exceptional Children Committee, and a teacher member of the Commissioner's Advisory Council on the Handicapped.

It is a privilege to be able to speak to you today. I am also pleased that New Jersey wants quality teachers, and that Assembly Bill 3974 has been introduced. But, I do have some very deep concerns on the proposed certification of teachers.

First, will we be getting quality, as well as qualified teachers in the classroom? I feel you would not get the best. Having book knowledge does not preclude that you can teach children who differ so very much and also learn in different ways.

Second, I am a recruiter for the Pennsylvania State University. Would reciprocity still be in effect when our standards would be much lower than that of Pennsylvania's? I have spoken to Thomas M. Shea, an admissions counselor at Penn State. He has said that the automatic reciprocity for teachers would no longer be in effect if the certification was changed in New Jersey. Anne Diffendall, from the Department of Education in Pennsylvania, Certification Department, said that in no way could there be reciprocity between Pennsylvania and New Jersey, if New Jersey changed its certification to the proposed way. Anne Diffendall said that New Jersey would have substandard teachers in their estimation if the new certification proposal went through. Is this what we really want in New Jersey?

Thank you for this opportunity to speak.

ASSEMBLYMAN DORIA: Thank you. This question that you presented, Kathleen, concerning certification and reciprocity with other states, is one which we have been very concerned about. Mrs. Garvin has asked this question a number of times. I know, Mildred, that you have been very concerned about this whole question of reciprocity, and I think it is a very legitimate question, one that has to be answered before anything is done. So, thank you for bringing it out.

You are in the area of special education, and I would just like to ask you a question. Do you think it would be possible for someone with a liberal arts major -- I'm a history major, so let's say a history major -- could a history major go into a classroom after taking some type of a subject matter test, and after having three days of orientation as proposed in these guidelines, and be able to handle, let's say, a class of emotionally disturbed children?

MS. BRITT: No way. It would be absolutely impossible. Number one, the teacher would walk out -- the so-called "teacher" would walk out emotionally disturbed within a few hours, probably by lunch.

ASSEMBLYMAN DORIA: You mean she would become emotionally disturbed?

MS. BRITT: Yes, the so-called "teacher" would become emotionally disturbed. There is just no way. It really concerns teachers as well as parents, because it does take-- I chose to be a special education teacher, and it does take a certain kind of stamina. Even I have days that are hard on me. I am trained and I want to be with them, but it is difficult. So, with a history background they just could not handle a classroom. They would not have the knowledge, and eighteen credits -- what eighteen credits?

ASSEMBLYMAN DORIA: I am very concerned, because one of the things I find difficult to understand with the Commissioner's proposal is how we could create a blanket certification system for every area, whether it be special education or social studies, whether it be grade "K," kindergarten, or first grade, or twelfth grade. To me, it seems there is a lack of specificity, or a lack of direction in the proposal that really does a disservice to all the teachers in the State, and all the future students in the State. I think it does a major disservice in special education. Thank you.

MS. BRITT: Thank you.

MR. WHITE: George Stang from Kean State College.

G E O R G E S T A N G: I would like to thank you for this opportunity to testify on the subject today. Assemblywoman Garvin, you mentioned the ground swell in opposition to your bill. I have attached a document which lists the strategies Commissioner Cooperman has used in trying to gain opposition to the two bills. This might be of interest to you at a later time.

I am strongly in support of Assembly Bill 3974, for the reason that legislation is needed to maintain the integrity of our State system of teacher certification against the whims of inexperienced State appointees who may have the power to do irreparable harm to a generation of children in our school system. It is far too easy to make administrative code changes, as compared to removing good legislation from the statutes. and I think that is an advantage in having legislation.

There is very little in the statutes that has to do with certification of teachers, and I really think there is a need to shore up the amount of material in the statutes. Assembly Bill 3974 establishes high standards for certification which will assure outstanding teachers for future generations of New Jersey children.

Commissioner Cooperman has stated that he doesn't know what good teaching is, and he doesn't know what beginning teachers need to know about the profession of education. This has been stated by the Commissioner at several public meetings which I have attended. This statement which he has made repeatedly is cause for great concern, since the Commissioner is in charge of State certification; and, he has been a district superintendent for some years in charge of the evaluation of teachers in his local district.

The Commissioner proposes to employ a national panel of experts to tell him what good teachers do, and to spend taxpayers' money in "reinventing the wheel."

New Jersey is blessed with twenty-three teacher training colleges and universities which have been training our teachers for as long as a hundred and twenty-five years. The professionals who are employed in the profession of teacher education know what makes good teachers and what beginning teachers need to know. Not only do these professionals contribute to the research and literature of the profession, but they are also bound to follow the dictates of our national associations for the accreditation of teacher preparation. The standards of the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification, known as N.A.S.D.I.E.C., give us the basic program curriculum principles and patterns to follow. Among these elements we are inclined to follow are included:

a. The beginning teacher shall have completed a program that provides for the development of insights into child and adolescent psychology: the teaching/learning process; the social interactive process of the classroom, school and community; the methods and materials of instruction; and, the broader problems of the profession as they relate to society and the function of the school;

b. The program shall require study of research about teacher characteristics and behaviors as they affect the learner;

c. Methods of teaching reading in the prospective teacher's area of specialization;

d. Study of techniques for diagnosing the capabilities of the learner and for designing instructional programs for all pupils in the least restrictive environment; and,

e. Studies of skills and strategies to be used in classroom management of individual, small and large groups under varying conditions.

Commissioner Cooperman can hardly be expected to program all of this in his five-day orientation for untrained interns before they are placed in full-time teaching positions. But, more than telling us what beginning teachers need to know about teaching, the standards also assure that the professors who teach the courses are updated and experienced with what is happening in the public schools, the curriculum is current with school practice, and that input and feedback is obtained systematically from practitioners in the schools.

These standards state that each teaching major or field of specialization must be constituted of course work chosen for its relevance to the public school curriculum.

In contrast to the Commissioner's charge that the college programs have lost touch with the reality of the public schools, our national accreditation standards require us to have advisory groups which include representatives of elementary and secondary schools. Follow-up studies are also required regularly.

Both surveys and meetings are conducted for the purpose of verifying that the competencies we require to be developed and evaluated in student teaching are valid as being necessary for the beginning teacher, and verifying that they have been included in the required course work prior to student teaching. Each student teacher and cooperating teacher from the public school completes a survey form following student teaching on which each competency is rated in both areas. In addition to all of this, meetings are conducted each year which include college faculty and public school teachers and administrators. The college program and field experience programs are discussed and the feedback is used to upgrade the programs.

Although Commissioner Cooperman says he doesn't know what makes a good teacher, he proposes to take over the system of training teachers. He wants to spend taxpayers' money to hire consultants from outside the State to tell him what makes a good teacher, and to create an academy to train teachers. This will create a tremendous waste of money. and it will create an unnecessary duplication of resources and facilities. The State already contains some twenty-three teacher training colleges and universities staffed with expert professionals whose lifetime careers have been devoted to the training of teachers.

The Commissioner's plan could add an enormous staff to the State Department of Education. This staff will have to monitor training programs in over 2,000 school buildings throughout the State.

With regard to the heart of Commissioner Cooperman's proposal to place bright liberal arts graduates who are untrained in the classroom, it is implied that undergraduate students who come through teacher education programs are not liberal arts graduates. To the contrary, all students who choose to teach in secondary junior and senior high schools are, and always have been liberal arts students. They major in their field of content specialty, such as math, social science, science, English or foreign language. These people then take some professional course work, usually under thirty credits, and they graduate as liberal arts majors.

In addition, the new State Minimum Standards adopted by the Departments of Education and Higher Education in 1982, require that all teacher ed students have a liberal arts major field of thirty semester hours, in addition to their professional education courses. This includes elementary and early childhood majors. Therefore, all teacher ed graduates in the future will have liberal arts majors.

Commissioner Cooperman is attempting to lower the standards by requiring that any person graduating need take only eighteen semester hours in the content field for which he or she will be certified. Our undergraduates are required to take thirty semester hours under the new 1982 standards.

Concerning alternate routes to help these unqualified geniuses to become certified, current certification regulations provide avenues for shortcuts. The Commissioner says he has letters from

people who have been teaching as many as fifteen years in private schools, who would have to leave their jobs to do student teaching to get certified. This is not true.

The current certification regulations provide that a person who has taught three years or more in public or private school does not have to do student teaching to obtain certification. I refer to an extract which I have included in the packet. This extract is a page from the State Certification Regulations; it happens to be the Elementary Ed page, which shows you that in lieu of student teaching you can have three years of teaching experience in public or private school. This provision is found in these regulations on every page for every certification and every discipline. The colleges also have a program called the "In-service Supervised Seminar," which provides for the college to supervise the applicant on the job. The applicant is required to report to the college one evening a week for seminars which help in the training process. Although some colleges no longer offer this course, it can be reinstated at all the colleges with no problem.

In fields of shortage, the alternative route of the emergency certificate has always served the State. There is no reason why this practice could not continue, with the provision that the teacher be required to take so many courses per year to develop his or her preparation. It is interesting, incidentally, to see the conflict that is going on right now. The Commissioner states there is no need for a person with an emergency certificate to take continued courses to renew the certificate. However, if you call a county superintendent's office, he will assure you that all the county superintendents follow the regulation that you must take six credits per year to renew your emergency certification. Courses could easily be taken in the evenings and, since the emergency teacher has a job teaching, he or she could be supervised there by the college by way of the "In-service Supervised Seminar Course."

Commissioner Cooperman's proposal calls for turning the responsibility of certification over to the school districts. He criticizes the varying standards of expectation by the State's twenty-three teacher training institutions; however, he will be dealing

with the varying standards of over 2,000 schools in the State. Not only will standards deviate widely, but the appointment of interns by local districts will open the doors of political patronage. The Commissioner talks about housewives who are talented and just waiting to have the opportunity to teach. What building principal will have the strength to deny certification to a school board member's wife, cousin, son or daughter, or the mayor's, or the superintendent's?

Regarding the quality of supervision for the proposed intern as compared to the student teacher's supervision and training, under the new 1982 State Minimum Standards, the college student teacher will be supervised at least eight times, once every other week. The student will also have the close supervision of the cooperating teacher almost every day of the full semester, which is approximately sixteen weeks. Student teachers usually are alone approximately only two weeks toward the end of the experience. Of course, this varies with the strength of the student.

Under the Commissioner's plan, the intern has full charge of the class from day one in the beginning, with only five days of professional training. He or she is alone, except during the one or two hours when the principal or collegial teacher comes to visit. Most of the time, the intern will be alone with the class and unsupervised.

With regard to the question of how talented a proposed intern is to teach in the classroom, despite his or her having passed an academic knowledge test, it is well to consider Robert Braun's lamentation that Albert Einstein would not have been certifiable to teach "K" to twelve in our public schools. It has been said that during Einstein's lifetime, only twelve people on earth understood his theory of relativity. Certainly, one of the prime requisites of a good teacher is to help a pupil to understand what is being taught at the child's level of understanding. Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN DORIA: Thank you very much, Mr. Stang. I hope that can get into the Star-Ledger, but I doubt it.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GARVIN: No way.

ASSEMBLYMAN DORIA: Very little is printed, except from one point of view. I would just like to point out that Mr. Stang is the Director of Professional Laboratory Experiences here at Kean College.

Mr. Stanq, just one thing. You gave us a whole packet, and one of the things in the packet I was very interested to see. One of the things we always hear, a lament from the Department of Education and from the newspapers, is how political the certification question has become, the fact that lobbyists should not be involved, and it should be a very open question with everybody getting involved and presenting their points of view. I see here something that was presented, I guess, at meetings on Wednesday, September 28, and Thursday, September 29. What it is, is an agenda to teach or to direct the various superintendents in the State, and other school administrators and county superintendents how they should lobby legislators for the Commissioner's program. Obviously, the idea is, if you get a program, even if it has something wrong with it, you should go out there and lobby for it, because you have to get it done.

So, we had criticism in the past about the Department having its own newspaper and using its own P.R. for building itself up. Now, the Department is developing its own lobbying system, and I think that is a great idea. But, I do not think then that anyone should criticize when other people lobby. I think everybody should be allowed to express their opinions at all times. I appreciate this, because I did not know this took place. I think this is something we appreciate. Mildred, would you like to comment on that?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GARVIN: Since I have been called a politician -- which I am very proud to be by the way -- by the newspapers because I had the guts to question the Commissioner-- From reading this document, I thought our Commissioner was responsible for monitoring the school districts in the State and seeing that we have the T&E law enforced. I am going to say it for the record, but I will deal with this because I invite him to run for public office. What this document tells me -- what he accuses me of, that is, being in opposition, wasn't opposition just because I questioned some of the reforms -- is that he has a real political process at work against people involvement, and I take issue with that. Joe, I hope I don't have to ask a Commissioner to resign from this great State. I hope I don't have to do that. Wow, I mean this is unbelievable.

ASSEMBLYMAN DORIA: One of the things we are trying to do at this public hearing is to get comments from the public, because there were no comments to the original proposal made by the Commissioner. I always thought that in a democratic society the idea was to have input, and to allow people with different points of view to come together to develop a proposal. This is what I was told the Commissioner wanted; that is what he said at the public hearing we had in Trenton. However, this seems to say, "Now, this is the plan. You go out there and lobby for this plan. No matter what it says, you lobby for what it is at the present time. There is no need for change."

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GARVIN: Let him run for office.

MR. STANG: Right, it establishes a network, and it proposes that you only align people within the network who are favorable to the plan.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GARVIN: People who agree with you.

ASSEMBLYMAN DORIA: The point here is, there are some good things and there are some bad things. We want to take the good things and keep them; we want to get rid of the bad things. But, we don't want anybody to say there is only one road. It is like saying there is only one road to heaven, and if you don't believe in one certain religion you are not going to get there. Well, that is what we seem to say here. There is only one road to quality education. If you don't believe in the Cooperman proposal, you don't believe in quality education -- and I disagree.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GARVIN: And, I do too. Thank you very much, Mr. Stang. I think we may really have to have broader public hearings. I think we fail if we do not let the public know what is really going on with public education, since we have a newspaper reporter -- and I wish he would be appointed to something officially -- who is really controlling the minds and the information of this State.

ASSEMBLYMAN DORIA: You know, Mildred, I would appreciate it if he even came to one public hearing.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GARVIN: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN DORIA: Because, he never listens to anyone but himself, and maybe God.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GARVIN: No way.

MR. WHITE: Dr. Donald Silberman, President of the AFT at Jersey City State College.

D R. DONALD J. SILBERMAN: I am also speaking as Vice President of the Council of New Jersey State College Locals, AFT and, in addition, as the Cochairperson of the Hudson County Coalition for Jobs, Peace and Social Justice. That Coalition has called for increased funding for education as the major solution to the problems of education. Thank you for the opportunity to convey to you the views of those I represent.

There has been a great deal of talk about the crisis in American public education. President Reagan has made education a major political issue. While Albert Shanker, President of the AFT, has welcomed the attention given education because of Reagan's speeches and appearances on the subject, I felt that, to a great extent, the President was using the issue to divert us from continuing high levels of unemployment and our controversial military involvement in Central American and the Middle East.

Do not mistake my point. I am not saying that there is no crisis in American education. I am saying, rather, that there has been a great deal of hypocrisy and self-serving posturing on the subject.

Both on national and State levels, new education reformers have proposed various remedies to cure the ills that beset the public schools. Some of the remedies proposed will only make matters worse. In fact, simply proposing them has already made matters worse.

Most of the new education reformers blame the teachers for the problems of public education. I want to talk about the real cause of the problems of public education. I do not think we should overlook the obvious. Our teachers are grossly underpaid. Over the last ten years, real wages of teachers have fallen on the average by about 20%. In addition to being underpaid, teachers are forced to teach under terrible conditions. In many schools, especially urban schools -- the urban schools of Hudson County from which I come -- textbooks are in short supply and are out of date. There are not enough books to allow students to take them home to study. Equipment and facilities are poor or nonexistent. For instance, achievement tests quiz students on lab apparatus they have never seen. Classrooms are overcrowded, so that

teachers cannot attend to the special needs of those who are skills-deficient or those who are specially gifted. Buildings have been allowed to deteriorate, and hallways and schoolyards are unsafe. These problems have been brought about by a decade and a half of budget cuts and underfunding of education. Many of the educational reformers are diverting us from this obvious cause of the crisis in public education in America by talk of such panaceas as merit pay for teachers and new alternative routes to teacher certification.

Our teachers, who are forced to teach with inadequate compensation and under the conditions just enumerated, suffer in another way as well. They are given neither the respect nor the appreciation they deserve. Those who advance merit pay or alternative routes to certification as panaceas for all that is wrong with our public schools -- these blame-the-teacher reformers -- add insult to injury. And, by further undermining the morale of our teachers, these education reformers only compound the problem.

Instead of sensible remedies for obvious problems, remedies such as adequate funding for education both on the State and national levels, higher salaries for all teachers, smaller classes, more money for textbooks and laboratories, and an end, finally an end to the cutbacks imposed on our public schools by fifteen years of fiscal conservatism, we are presented with quack remedies, such as the Kean-Cooperman Alternative Certification Plan. Allow me to submit for the record, and to read to you at this point, a resolution on this plan adopted on October 3, by the College Senate of Jersey City State College:

WHEREAS, The proposed Kean-Cooperman Alternative Certification Plan provides a route to certification with no requirements for courses in learning theory and teaching methods or supervised practicum and internship prior to a full-time teaching assignment and will lead to the certification of teacher-candidates who are not professionally competent, and

WHEREAS, This route will put teachers without professional training into the classroom and make students into the subjects of an unsound educational experiment, and

WHEREAS, The Kean-Cooperman plan essentially shifts certification to the district level with school principals and public school teachers conducting observations of teacher-interns and opens the certification process to political influence and pressure, and

WHEREAS, Reforms have recently been adopted and are currently being implemented in the teacher-training programs of the State colleges and the evaluation and strengthening where needed of these new standards, procedures and program requirements constitute the best route to reform of education in New Jersey, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED, That the Kean-Cooperman Alternative Certification Plan be withdrawn.

The Kean-Cooperman plan is an insult to the professional educators, the trainers of teachers in the colleges and universities, public and private, of this State. The plan tells them not only that their efforts are not valued by the Governor and the Commissioner of Education, but that their services can be dispensed with altogether.

"What should we do then?" you may ask. We must, first of all, reorder our national priorities, and our State priorities. Our Education Governor, through his Management Improvement Program, is sponsoring additional cuts in State aid for education. Instead, we must insist on full funding of the State aid formula. "Where will the money come from?" you may ask. From the rest of the graduated income tax on incomes above \$60,000 vetoed last December by Education Governor Kean. We must call for adequate Federal funding for education. "Where will the money come from?" you may ask. From the bloated military budget with its high cost overruns and expenditures of billions of dollars for unnecessary and dangerous new weapons, such as the MX missile, and the Euromissiles, Cruise and Pershing II, so beloved by President Reagan, the champion of education reform and of education cuts.

Finally, here in New Jersey before we decide to eliminate the schools of education in our colleges and universities -- and that would be the consequence of the adoption of the Kean-Cooperman plan, which supplies an inexpensive and easy route to certification -- we should give the reforms already adopted and currently being implemented a chance to work. Under these new provisions, teacher-candidates major

in subject matter areas in addition to taking courses in learning theory and teaching methods. They must demonstrate proficiency in basic skills. They must maintain certain grade-point averages. And, they receive increased apprenticeship training through junior and senior, and even sophomore practica and internships under the supervision of highly qualified professors of education. The quack remedy proposed by Governor Kean and Commissioner Cooperman calls for only eighteen hours in a liberal arts area, instead of the at least thirty required in the reforms currently being implemented. The Kean-Cooperman plan would place untrained teachers in front of the classroom -- would assign regular classes to apprentices, who would teach students without a cooperating teacher in the room. Would any of us want our children assigned to such teachers? Thank you very much.

ASSEMBLYMAN DORIA: Thank you, Dr. Silberman. I just want to agree with a lot of what you have said, and attest to the fine work you do at Jersey City State College and with the Coalition in Hudson County. I would like to read something to you which again points out that we are really getting a diversion here. Rather than putting our attention on what is important, and that is fully funding education, we are talking about certification and the changes that are being presented in the area of certification. Sometimes I wonder if this is not being put up as a trial balloon to take our attention away.

I have before me the recommendation of the Governor's Management Plan for recommended cuts in State education aid, in Hudson County specifically. The cuts would be, for Jersey City, a cut of \$10,140,000; for the Hudson County Vocational School, a cut of \$983,000; for the City of Bayonne -- these three being in my district -- \$3,754,000, an average percentage change running somewhere between 15% and 16% in the negative. So, while we are talking about improving the quality of education and raising the salaries of teachers, we are being cut back on money. Who is going to help to pay for this? The local taxpayers in Counties like Hudson and Essex, where they can least afford it. This is not the way we should be going.

So, the problem is not only one of certification, because, again, I think this might be the "red herring" that is being thrown

into the pot, but at the same time it is the problem of cutbacks in State aid and the recommendations for cutbacks in State aid. So, your statement is well taken. I think what we are saying here, and what we are emphasizing, is that we need to maintain quality education, and we need to maintain a quality teacher education program in the State of New Jersey. An alternative program can exist, and I have said this before, if it is a very specific program for things like science and math, in a very specific way. I think all of us could agree to something like that, but I don't think we could agree to such wholesale changes in the system that would allow people without the proper training to go into the classrooms and work with our children, and, at the same time, get less resources to work with. That's the problem.

DR. SILBERMAN: I would just like to add one comment which has to do with your Assembly Bill 3974 and with the Kean-Cooperman Alternative Certification route. It impacts very much on the people who go into the teaching profession from cities such as Jersey City, and counties such as Hudson County, and that is, the overemphasis on standardized tests. It is well known by now that standardized tests tend to discriminate against working-class and minority students. Critics of standardized tests have shown that the standardized tests more often reflect the economic background, or socioeconomic background of the test taker and the test taking skills that may be improved by going to suburban schools or upper middle-class schools in the suburbs. To use a standardized test as the main entry to teaching will disadvantage working-class and minority students, and advantage upper middle-class students.

One final note in that regard. I met, along with a group from the AFT, with Governor Kean, and he used as two examples to justify the Kean-Cooperman plan, a teacher from Lawrenceville, who has been teaching in Lawrenceville and cannot teach in the public schools, according to him, because of the lack of education courses. In addition, the Governor pointed out, and this is the only other example he used, a close personal friend of his, a woman whose children are now teen-agers and who went to an excellent college -- I'm not sure which of the seven sisters he was referring to because he did not specify -- and who was President of her PTA. She, also, is unable to get a

teaching position in the public schools, despite the fact that she is a close personal friend of his. I think it is at that level that this plan is being approached, because a lot of people have wondered why such an obviously absurd plan, and I think there are explanations for why we are being presented such an absurd plan. Thank you very much.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GARVIN: Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN DORIA: Thank you.

MR. WHITE: Elizabeth Campanile, classroom teacher from Ocean Township. (Ms. Campanile not present.) Delores Shiposh, Professor of Physical Education, Kean College.

ASSEMBLYMAN DORIA: We will call all those individuals who may not be here now, later, just to see if they do come. We will just hold them in abeyance.

D E L O R E S S H I P O S H: I would like to welcome you to Kean College. Unfortunately, I cannot take any credit for the fact that the hammering has stopped, but I'm glad it did stop. It certainly interfered with what is going on here.

I'm here this afternoon representing Marcoantonio Lacatena, President of the Council of New Jersey State College Locals. He regrets that he wasn't able to attend himself, but I assured him I would come and would limit myself to five minutes or less, as I am sure he would.

First of all, with regard to Assembly Bill 3851, I appreciate the fact that Assemblywoman Garvin has agreed to increase the size from thirty-five members to thirty-six, thereby providing some valuable input and participation from the American Federation of Teachers. So, thank you very much. We all wish you much success with that.

I have a statement which I would like to read. The statement has been prepared by Marco, and it comes from the Council of New Jersey State College Locals. This is with regard to Assembly Bill 3974.

Dear Members of the Committee: The Council of New Jersey State College Locals, which represents the faculty and professional staff at the nine State colleges, supports the purpose of this bill, to ensure that teacher preparation programs in New Jersey colleges meet the highest standards, and that individuals entering the teaching profession are of the highest quality.

However, the Council is concerned that those students already enrolled in teacher education may be affected by the standards set forth in the bill. The Council would suggest that the Committee act to make the changes necessary to meet their needs.

The Council opposes elements of the Cooperman proposal which would put in our State's classrooms persons who are not trained to teach young children and adolescents. Like other professionals, teachers need training in their profession. Like doctors and lawyers, they must not enter their profession without thorough training in that profession. The Plan erroneously assumes that subject matter competence is enough to ensure quality teaching. Effective classroom performance does not follow from subject matter competence alone. Effective classroom performance presumes a knowledge of how to teach, how children learn, and a broad knowledge of sociology, psychology and history as they relate to the education of our youth. Professional education programs offered at the State colleges have provided this training in effective teaching over the years.

The Council commends the new teacher certification standards which were enacted by the State Board of Education in June of 1982. The new standards, proposed by the Commissioner of Education and endorsed by Chancellor of Higher Education, T. Edward Hollander, represented a prudent and well-thought-out proposal for improving the quality of elementary and secondary education. Therefore, the Council is surprised that Commissioner Cooperman would undertake to overturn the new certification standards before they could have any effect on the quality of teaching in the State of New Jersey.

We are glad to see that the Governor recognizes the need to raise teachers' salaries as an important ingredient in improving the quality of teaching in the schools. Increased salaries, in addition to the new certification standards put in place only last year, should be given a chance before any unproven tampering is done with the State's educational system, which could do serious harm to the children in our schools.

The AFT stands ready to work constructively with the Governor, the Commissioner, and the Legislature to improve the quality of teaching in the State's schools. Sincerely, Marcoantonio Lacatena, President, Council of New Jersey State College Locals.

ASSEMBLYMAN DORIA: Thank you very much, Delores. I just want to make a comment. Obviously, the bill will be amended to take into consideration problems of students who are presently in programs. It is not intended to change the programs they are presently involved in. The bill, obviously, was drawn as a response to something that came up from the Commissioner and, obviously, there are problems with our bill. We are of the opinion that the bill can be changed any way possible to make it more effective. That is where we differ with the Commissioner, who seemingly is presenting a plan that he doesn't want changed. We are very willing to change it, to try to meet the needs of the students and the various criticisms which exist. So, thank you.

MS. SHIPOS: Very good. The Council does support your bill; I don't know if I said that.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GARVIN: Yes, I am aware of that; I have talked to your leader. I think it was just an omission, but, it will be amended to include--

MS. SHIPOS: Very good.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GARVIN: I have put it on record.

MS. SHIPOS: I know.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GARVIN: I will be calling for that bill immediately when we reconvene and have our meeting. I would just like to make a request here while I have an audience. After reacting to a political memo the Commissioner had sent out, I think it is about time that the education community begins to write letters to both Cooperman and the Governor. I have never made that request before, because I really do not consider this a political football. But, since I am an excellent politician, if it is a political football, then I will play that game. So, perhaps we should begin a letter-writing campaign, maybe not in opposition, but for an in-depth review. I think we are going to have to do something, those of us who care about education. Since I have just been informed of a process today, and you have no idea now subdued I was, I think we need to deal with it.

MS. SHIPOS: Yes, on the level at which, perhaps, they are almost dealing with it, but in a more ethical way.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GARVIN: Yes, because I think, as we've heard, there are problems. We are not against reform, but I think perhaps we

need to let both the Governor and the Commissioner know that there are people out here who respectfully have concerns, and it is in no way disrespect. It is just that there are some valid concerns. I guess, Joe, you and I are going to have to get busy to put the word out that we want letters of support. If this is the kind of game we are going to play, I guarantee we're better at it than he is.

MS. SHIPOS: We can disseminate that, you know, the need for that also.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GARVIN: Thank you, Dear.

ASSEMBLYMAN DORIA: I have to say that lobbying hasn't been working well, because my mail has been two to one against the plan. I think we have to try to get more people aware of the fact that it is necessary to write and to present the fact that, "Look, I think all of us are open to the need for changes, but we want to have some input in the change process." And that is why I think everyone is concerned here, no one had any input, especially the teachers and the people involved in teacher education programs, and two of the people who are directly affected, the legislators -- as Mildred points out, I always leave us until last. I leave us until last because, obviously, we have a direct responsibility. Thank you.

MS. SHIPOS: Thank you very much. Good luck.

MR. WHITE: Barbara Pollack, a teacher from Union County. (Ms. Pollack not present.) Michael Knight from Kean College. (Dr. Knight not present.) Giovanna Musto.

G I O V A N N A M U S T O: Hello, my name is Giovanna Musto. I am an elementary classroom teacher from Middlesex County, as well as a local association president. I am very pleased to be able to be here this evening to testify before you.

My leadership responsibilities have enabled me to test and to touch base with a variety of teachers throughout the State of New Jersey. I would like to assure you that the majority of the teachers in this State applaud this Joint Committee's efforts to maintain high standards and strict standards for the teaching profession. We are very proud of our profession, and we certainly do not want those standards to in anyway be weakened.

There seems to be an attitude among some circles of people that just anyone can teach. I strongly, strongly disagree with that notion. Although it is true that a liberal arts graduate receives a very intensive training in his or her specialized subject area, I believe most strongly that it takes much more than that to be able to work with children successfully. Subject area knowledge is certainly necessary, but it is not the only ingredient that makes a successful teacher. We have proven throughout the years that it takes special training, subject area knowledge and an ability to work with children. That is an art, I believe, and something we can deal with through proper teacher training courses. Liberal arts graduates, I do not believe, have the opportunity to get that specialized training that is very necessary.

Two years ago, discussions were carried on regarding the preparation of those teaching in New Jersey public schools. As a local leader I participated in those requirements debated by the Board of Education and the Board of Higher Education about course work necessary to properly teach children. Both Boards, at that time, decided upon strict standards that dictated what these colleges would offer to teacher candidates, and what the Department of Education would require for those persons requesting their transcripts to be evaluated for New Jersey teacher certification. As a teacher at that time, I was proud of the standards that were put forth by both of these Departments. To the best of my knowledge, these standards were to be put into place this September. Now I read from newspaper accounts, that the regulations are not yet in place. In fact, I believe the Chancellor will not even know what the colleges are offering until sometime after the new training session has begun, maybe in the middle of November.

The real question I have to ask is, "Why wasn't all this done prior to this date?" Colleges do not appear to be at fault at this time. If the Department of Higher Education had given staff members at colleges their marching orders to submit the information, I believe it would have been done. The way in which both the Department of Education and the Department of Higher Education handled implementation of the newly adopted regulations does not seem to be atypical. It frightens me that the certification process could be taken out of the

hands of those professors in the classroom and placed in the hands of the bureaucracy. The new regulations should have been given a chance to work. A-3974 points this out so vividly to me. If the two Departments were not serious about the efforts put forth in drawing up the regulations, a real disservice was done to those of us, or those who participated and provided valuable input in trying to make the changes possible.

Assemblywoman Garvin's bill enables those organizations most affected by the changes in certification, teacher salaries and other working provisions to fully examine the ramifications of the Study Commission's reports. I believe such a move is critical. Too often, experts use our public school children as guinea pigs, to try out ideas that have not been validated anywhere else. I urge this Committee to release both bills; I think they are both crucial. Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN DORIA: Thank you very much. It is good to see a teacher coming out to speak, and we are very happy you were able to make it today.

MR. WHITE: Dr. Carole Willis, Associate Professor, Kean College. (Dr. Willis not present.) Dr. Sean Healy, Kean College.

D R. S E A N H E A L Y: One of the problems, I think, in the sea of paper I brought with me, is the relatively short notice we had of your coming. We are delighted to see you, as numerous people have said already, but I'm afraid it has left a few of us a little short of time to make the necessary preparations. If I stumble a few times -- and I was a little late coming -- I trust you will bear with me. Also, I have a very bad case of bronchitis, so I will go a little slowly.

I would really like to address myself directly to the Cooperman proposals, but out of deference to the fact that you have come officially for us to talk about the two bills, I will stick to that. Also, I take it from what I have heard already, that much of what I might have to say about the Cooperman proposals, none of which would be particularly laudatory, is not unknown to you already, and there will be other times to talk about that. So, I will be fairly brief in what I have to say. It is not my nature, but I will do it.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GARVIN: We're used to that, Doctor.

ASSEMBLYMAN DORIA: We all suffer from that.

DR. HEALY: I know; I guess that is why we are in teaching or education or, perhaps, in politics, and the two are really branches of each other. In fact, the real problem, I think, in much of what is being proposed is that people are quite overlooking the fact that education is a highly political affair. They are treating it as if it is a purely technical matter of administering curriculum of a neutral kind, through procedures of a neutral kind, in a setting of a neutral kind, and it is none of those neutral kinds of things. However, I said I would not wander abroad.

I was personally glad to see, and this is in relation to the Doria bill, if I may call it that, A-3974, that the Legislature is concerned with all these matters. But, I must say, I felt it is really rather like the case of buying a dog, and barking yourself. After all, we have a State Department, which is concerned with regulations, and I am quite content, by and large, that the processes through which those regulations come about should continue to be. I think it is unnecessary and unwise for the Legislative Branch to get involved in what are essentially administrative matters.

I understand your concern to, as it were, preempt the field to prevent the Cooperman proposals from going through without any kind of opposition, but it seems to me that all the things you have in your bill are already substantively seen to and much more besides in N.J.A.C. 6:11-7.1 and following, and that all you really need to do at this stage, as a legislator, is to urge implementation of the regulations, urge it very heavily, very categorically. And, if this is your pleasure -- it is certainly my pleasure -- to register dissent from the new and largely unwarranted Cooperman proposals. I do not, myself, see that legislation is necessary, but, of course, I am not a politician and I would defer to your wisdom in that respect.

I do not see anything new apart from the change from a 2.5 to a 2.8 average in Clause 1(a) here that differs from the regulations, so I take it that this is largely a political -- what shall I say -- maneuver, to outmaneuver. My question here is, and I think I would just like to raise it, why is an alternative being sought at this particular time to the regulations and the minimum standards which have been set up? I was very interested to hear that it may very well be

because relatives are pressing and it is much easier to get them into a school through this process, than through the minimum standards one.

I must say, I am still naive enough, and perhaps ingenuous enough, to hope that that kind of justification isn't the real explanation for this mountain of paper Klagholz has thrown at us, but I don't know. As you hear, I am not native to this State, and perhaps I come from a situation which makes this, frankly, incredulous -- which makes me incredulous, but still you may be right.

It is alleged as a reason, and I notice this in the documents, it is mentioned twice that there is a vast reservoir of potential talent in the community waiting to crowd into the teaching profession. It is said elsewhere that there is a vast reservoir -- it is a phrase, obviously, that Leo likes -- of talented persons, who are, as it were, lurking in the wings ready to rush on stage, if only they get the right signals. And, they are merely deterred from becoming teachers because of a purported banality and irrelevance of educational programs.

Well, first of all, I must admit I am not aware of the evidence for this crowd of witnesses being mentioned. There is Aunt Flo who mentioned it to Uncle Schmo that such and such a person might like to come in, but apart from that I see no evidence at all. Secondly, if there is such a crowd of would-be teachers -- and I'm glad to hear of it, though dubious -- why haven't they made use of the existing alternative routes, of which we heard quite a few mentioned this evening? If you want to get into teaching, there are all sorts of back doors already, which I think should be shut up, but they do exist.

So, I am driven to suppose it may be that the reason why these people are not dashing on stage is the same reason for so many from the lower ranges of ability crowding into our undergraduate programs, and it is for this reason, or for these five reasons-- Why don't these people come into the teaching profession? Is it because our "Mickey Mouse" courses, as they like to call them, are so horrifying? No. I think it is for these five reasons. Teaching is badly paid. It is badly paid, it is not just poorly paid, it is badly paid. (applause) I think there are some teachers out there, right? Secondly, teachers are poorly regarded. They are regarded, as you can

see in the newspapers, and every conceivable report, every Gallop poll, as doing a poor job and being poor sorts of people.

Thirdly, I think it is quite obvious to the meanest intelligence, and there are some of those kinds around, that the conditions in many schools are discouraging, if not downright depressing. Right? That might defer a few. Besides that, the management of schools, and I have occasion to see it from time to time, strikes me as being extraordinarily authoritarian, and extraordinarily picayune very often. There are many notable exceptions, probably all the schools that people here are presently in, but I have noticed it. I don't know where this authoritarian strain in American management comes from. Back in 1776, we tried it, and it didn't work. It seems to have taken over since.

Surely, the most imaginative and the highly motivated teachers are not going to put up with that kind of garbage. And, it is notable, incidentally, that of all the teachers who go into the teaching profession, 50% are left by the end of the fifth year. In other words, there are many people who go through all these horrors, get into the schools and, by the end of the fifth year, they're out. Amongst those are the most highly motivated, originally, the most idealistic, if you would like to put it that, the most able, which does not mean, fortunately, that many of those are not left -- and I'm sure the audience comprises many of them.

Fifthly, and not least notably, jobs are hard to find. Why, in fact, would people go through four years of training in order to get a job which just isn't there? So, it seems to me that this whole process is a diversionary one. The regulations, the new minimum standards, as people have eloquently said already, will do a great deal to secure that teachers who leave our colleges are better trained, better prepared, more aware of what goes on in the field, than they were, and that we don't need Cooperman to come along with a lot of half-baked proposals, which will, in fact, release a lot of so-called "bright" liberal arts graduates into the classroom, without any training whatsoever.

Just to finish off this little exercise, A-3851, this is the one which deals with the setting up of a commission. I am all in favor

of commissions to study things. I guess it is the way things get brought out into the open. But, I would just like to look at Clause 4, which is on Page 2, and if I could just read it in case people don't have it in front of them, it says the following: "The commission shall conduct a comprehensive study and examination of the concerns and recommendations of the several national commissions and task forces on education, giving special attention to the preparation, training and retention of quality teachers and other recommendations." It seems to me that this is really beside the point, though in itself not a bad idea, because the real problem is not preparing and training and retaining quality teachers. The real problem is getting them in the first place. How the hell can you prepare good people if they won't come forward? And, who is their right mind, other than missionaries, who we heard talked about, or us here, would come forward into a badly paid, poorly regarded, miserably treated, largely unemployed profession?

I think if the Legislature would address itself to the one notable exception that is being made in all this-- Tom Kean said, "Let us give starting teachers \$18,500," and I thought to myself, "My God, there is one good suggestion out there." It is not enough, but it is a start. It seems to me that the one thing the Legislature has to do is to find out how it is going to get the money; that is the real problem. That is all I have to say, and thank you for listening so patiently.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GARVIN: Doctor, excuse me, I have a question.

DR. HEALY: Oh, I'm sorry.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GARVIN: May I ask what you teach?

DR. HEALY: I am a member of a Department mysteriously called Educational Policy Sciences. Does that satisfy you?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GARVIN: Yes, it does.

ASSEMBLYMAN DORIA: Dr. Healy, I would just like to make one or two comments I think would be worthwhile. I agree with you that we should direct ourselves to the increasing of teachers' salaries, and I think all of us are awaiting with bated breath the bill the Governor is going to submit to us to do this. Unfortunately, nobody seems to know what the plan is. The proposal was made but, unfortunately, the

proposal was made without having a plan ready to introduce. I think we are all waiting for that plan, and we are waiting to see the recommendations on how it can be financed. We have our own ideas, but I think we're waiting for the Governor, since he is the leader of the State.

When it comes to the question of the bill, I agree with you. It really should not have to be necessary to make regulations law. Unfortunately, if we had just had the Legislature pass a resolution which would be an expression of the will of the Legislature, it would have had no effect in law. All it is, is an expression of our will, and we cannot force that on the Executive Branch. Unfortunately, there was the question of legislative oversight, where the Legislature would have control over the regulations and could veto the regulations of an Executive department. In a case that was noted for its bipartisan enforcement, if you will, where Governor Byrne represented Governor Kean before the State Supreme Court to defend the right of the Executive to promulgate regulations without any legislative control -- the end result was that the Legislature does not have control, and we are forced to resort to these types of machinations that are not necessary, but are the only way we can enforce our will. So, that explains a little bit of the political problems we have to deal with.

DR. HEALY: One question, if I might. Does that mean that the regulations which are currently, at least I understand are currently enforced and which will govern our activities from September of next year, could be altered?

ASSEMBLYMAN DORIA: Sure they could.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GARVIN: Sure.

ASSEMBLYMAN DORIA: Again, since the State Board of Education has the authority by itself, without any legislative approval, if you will, or oversight, to change those regulations, put in the entire Cooperman plan, without any changes, and even scrap the plan as they presently have developed it -- the one they are going to implement the beginning of this year -- without any approval from anybody.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GARVIN: Right.

DR. HEALY: And yet, in your legislation if it were, in fact, to become law, they could not do that?

ASSEMBLYMAN DORIA: No, that's right.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GARVIN: Right.

DR. HEALY: That's very curious.

ASSEMBLYMAN DORIA: That is the reason why we had to do it this way.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GARVIN: Right.

ASSEMBLYMAN DORIA: Now you know a little about our maneuvering.

DR. HEALY: No, that's good. I honestly admit it.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GARVIN: I think in your comment about our legislative role, I think you are looking at two of the finest legislators in Trenton.

ASSEMBLYMAN DORIA: Well, thank you. I agree with Mildred 100%.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GARVIN: No, I mean dealing with education. Joe and I have talked, and we don't think we should have had to do this, by the way. For your information, we have met with the Governor and with the Commissioner, but when one doesn't get open dialogue, then one has to do what he or she is responsible for. I think we have always been against too much mandating, you know, from those hallowed halls.

DR. HEALY: I guess you mean personal mandating?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GARVIN: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN DORIA: Very good.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GARVIN: He is delightful.

MR. WHITE: Dr. Douglas Osheroff, Physicist, AT&T Bell Labs.

DR. OSHEROFF: I'm here. but may I give my spot to Barbara Wilson, who is also here to testify, but who has a meeting?

ASSEMBLYMAN DORIA: Certainly.

DR. OSHEROFF: I will speak in her place later.

ASSEMBLYMAN DORIA: Is there anyone else out there who has a pressing time problem? (no response)

D R. B A R B A R A A. W I L S O N: My name is Barbara Wilson; I am a Research Physicist employed by AT&T Bell Laboratories. I had three years of college teaching experience while I was a graduate student. I am happy to be here to express, what I believe is the first point of view from the other side. Although I personally considered high school

teaching at one point in my career, and included education courses as part of the minor for my Ph.D. in physics, my main interest today at this hearing is more general, a more general concern for the state of precollege education in our nation and in our State.

Precollege education in this country is suffering a decline which is accelerating daily. This is particularly true in the areas of math and science where the situation has reached crisis proportions, as recognized by most of the major associations related to science and math teaching. We must act quickly and decisively to reverse this trend before it is too late. What is needed are more intelligent, knowledgeable and effective teachers in our schools. Those three aspects are each important. As some other people I know will be stating shortly, statistics showing that, in fact, our current population of teachers, statistically, is lacking at least in two of those categories, as far as ranking in any testing of the pool of teachers of intelligence and in competence of knowledgeable material. We need to find ways to stimulate many more intelligent and knowledgeable people to choose teaching as a profession, and to assist them with the training necessary to mold them into effective teachers.

Governor Kean has introduced a new program built on a proposal by Commissioner of Education, Saul Cooperman, which offers the potential of significant progress toward this goal. At its core is an alternative teacher certification procedure based on the successful completion of a bachelor's degree, tested knowledge in the subject matter, and an intensive one-year internship in the schools.

Assembly Bills 3851 and 3974 I find counterproductive to this first step of real progress. The study of the education system proposed in A-3851 could, in fact, provide useful information, but I feel it must not be allowed to hold up the reforms proposed by Cooperman. We cannot afford to waste any more time before starting active measures to reverse the accelerating decline of our school system.

A-3974 more directly counters Cooperman's proposal by demanding that teachers complete a traditional teacher education program and be tested in the theoretical aspects of teaching, as well as in the subject matter to be taught. While the motivation behind

this bill is clearly to upgrade the knowledge and effectiveness of certified teachers, and is, therefore, certainly praiseworthy, I feel that the Commissioner's alternative criteria not only assures equally high standards of knowledge and effectiveness, but also have the potential to attract a much larger number of intelligent individuals into the profession, individuals who are desperately needed. A-3974 in no way addresses the problem of the lack of teachers qualified to teach, in particular, science and math, in our schools.

Studies, in fact, have shown no clear correlation between knowledge of the theoretical aspects of teaching and teaching effectiveness. In fact, there is not even a consensus concerning which theoretical material is relevant or important for teachers. The one aspect of current teacher preparation about which there is no question regarding usefulness is the learning of the more practical knowledge, the how to knowledge, which frequently, or usually, is acquired during the practice-teaching experience for teachers prepared under the traditional programs. The internship program proposed by Cooperman includes a number of improvements over existing practice-teaching programs, and thereby offers, I feel, an even better opportunity for prospective teachers to acquire the necessary practical knowledge. By delegating more authority and responsibility directly to the local schools in which the teachers are doing their internships, the program promises to provide more contact-hours of supervision, more immediate and consistent feedback for the teachers as they are learning, and closer Mentor relationships with practicing teachers. In addition, it offers more accurate evaluation of individual teaching effectiveness because of this more intensive observation by the people during this internship program. Thus, in many ways I feel the internship program could better serve the needs of the school systems in the training and evaluation of new teachers than the existing teacher education programs.

In summary, the Commissioner's proposal not only meets the needs of assuring higher quality teachers, but also has the crucial advantage of opening the doors to a large pool of intelligent and knowledgeable individuals who otherwise would not consider precollege teaching as a profession. The passage of bills 3851 and 3974 would,

therefore, I feel, be a grave mistake in putting up blocks or delays to this proposal, and I urge you instead to reconsider and to, in fact, support Commissioner Cooperman's proposal of an alternative certification procedure. Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN DORIA: Thank you, Barbara. We appreciate your coming, and it was good to hear another point of view. I would like to ask you a question now. Obviously, as a physicist, you feel well prepared to go into a high school classroom to teach math and science, I would think. Right?

DR. WILSON: I taught for three years at the college freshman level. As far as the high school level--

ASSEMBLYMAN DORIA: (interrupting) Do you feel well prepared to go into the first grade to teach reading?

DR. WILSON: No, I have not interned in any way for first grade.

ASSEMBLYMAN DORIA: What about teaching special education?

DR. WILSON: No.

ASSEMBLYMAN DORIA: Under the present Cooperman proposal, if you had a desire to go into the first grade to teach reading, or if you had a desire to teach special education, and you could pass the test -- I'm just saying, if you had that desire, you could go into the classroom and do that. Do you think you would be prepared enough to be able to handle that?

DR. WILSON: I think all your remarks are totally ignoring the internship program part of Cooperman's proposal.

ASSEMBLYMAN DORIA: But, the internship part of the proposal calls for, Barbara, and I just want to point this out, an individual going into a classroom with three days' orientation, walking into a classroom of twenty-five students, and having no one in that classroom with them during that internship, except for someone coming in to observe them on a very irregular basis.

DR. WILSON: In my experience, that would not be different from practice teachers going in who only have under their belts theoretical knowledge for which there is no evidence of its usefulness.

ASSEMBLYMAN DORIA: In practice teaching, doesn't the cooperating teacher stay in the classroom?

DR. WILSON: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN DORIA: Yes, always does?

DR. WILSON: Always?

ASSEMBLYMAN DORIA: Always, until the last two weeks, so they have. you know. another person in the field who has expertise working with them. I am not disagreeing with you. What I am saying is, I think you are right to a degree. In science and math, as you are presenting it, there is a need, and the need could be met by the Cooperman proposal. What I am saying is, the Cooperman proposal is too broad and, because it is too broad, it is creating the type of conflict that is not necessary. If it is going to work, run a pilot program in science and math in the high schools, and I think everybody will say, "It's a good idea, run it, and let's see what is going to happen," and have individuals such as yourself, who have been out in the field for five or ten years, come and handle a classroom. I don't think anyone questions that. I think they are worried about, and the concern is, having people come back one year after graduation from college. not with a Ph.D. or a master's degree, one year after graduating from college, going back and trying to become a teacher in a classroom, in any classroom. That is the problem. But, I appreciate your comments, and I think you are correct to a degree. However, I think the proposal Cooperman made is too broad. Thank you.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GARVIN: I have a couple of questions, if you don't mind. You spoke of a pool of teachers who are available. Do you think those teachers would be willing to teach in Newark at Central High School?

DR. WILSON: I don't have any idea: they have not been asked.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GARVIN: No, no, no, I mean-- In other words, in your presentation it is as if we have a lot of intelligent, knowledgeable people-- I would like the record to show that we have a lot of intelligent, knowledgeable teachers in our system.

DR. WILSON: I agree; I agree that we absolutely do. However, statistically, that is not true.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GARVIN: All right. My point--

DR. WILSON: (interrupting) As an overall statement that all of the teachers are intelligent and knowledgeable, that is certainly not a true statement.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GARVIN: Okay. Well, I'll tell you before I ask my question that I don't deal this way, but were you at the meetings on September 28 and September 29, and I don't know whether I should shut up or keep asking questions?

DR. WILSON: No, I was not.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GARVIN: Okay, thank you. My question has to do with the urban schools here in the State, and with your experience at AT&T as a physicist. Do you think the engineers and the people who are waiting for this new proposal would come to the urban schools of this State? Teachers are needed in the urban schools because there has been an increase in enrollment; there has been a decrease in enrollment in the suburban schools. Do you really think they would?

DR. WILSON: I don't think they would any more or any less than any other group of people, so I do not really see the relevance of the question.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GARVIN: Thank you, Dr. Wilson.

MR. WHITE: Rorrie Bernard, classroom teacher. (Witness not present.) Dennis Testa. (Witness not present.) Maria LaSalvia. (Witness not present.) Sue Miksza, please.

SUE MIKSZA: Good evening. I believe I'm listed on your sheet as a teacher. I am a teacher first and foremost; however, at the present time I am the principal of an elementary school.

ASSEMBLYMAN DORIA: Where?

MS. MIKSZA: In Elizabeth, an urban area. I am also presently a member of Dr. Healy's class in Critical Issues in New Jersey Education.

Even though there may be some positive aspects to the education reform proposals, and I agree that we need reform in many areas of education, I have several reservations as to the way they have been presented. The new certification standards for teachers' preparation which were adopted for New Jersey teacher training programs two years ago, have not even had a chance to be field tested as yet. Up until this point, they have been little more than paper regulations. I feel it is unfair to bring in a totally new program before our new regulations are even given a chance to be proven. Even though liberal arts majors would have to prove their strengths and

knowledge in their specific subject areas, there is a definite need for them to have some background in the methodology of teaching various subjects, educational theory and child psychology.

As was alluded to before, where is the correlation between knowledge of subject matter and the ability to teach children? When we are working in the classrooms, we are working with the fragile minds of young people, and in order to teach these young people we cannot allow others to go in as teachers and work with our children, without adequate training and supervision. By adequate supervision I mean the constant supervision of a cooperating teacher, such as one receives during student teaching. I am proud to say I am a graduate of Kean College with a B.A. in General Elementary Education. One of the most valuable experiences I had during my four years of college was my sixteen weeks of student teaching. I was a true intern. During my internship, I was supervised daily by my cooperating teacher and by my college supervisor. My college supervisor, by the way, was on site every day, and so was readily available to answer any questions or to help resolve any problems which may have arisen.

I used much of the knowledge that I garnered from my sixteen weeks of student teaching through my eleven years of teaching in an urban school, in grades one through five, and I still use it today as an administrator. By the way, I would also like to add, we had to pass the internship the first time around in order to become teachers. My understanding is that the present plan would allow an intern to fail, so to speak, the first year, yet if the district chose to renew that internship, they could do so.

The present plan also does not allow for in-depth supervision. As an administrator, I know I would have to spread myself extremely thin in order to give a liberal arts intern the type of supervision I feel would be necessary, and at the expense of the rest of my school, both teachers and students. When Dean Esposito spoke earlier, he alluded to a program of field experiences. For the second year, my school is currently involved in a project in conjunction with Kean College of sophomore field experiences. The program is for college sophomores who are considering entering the field of education. At the present time, I have twelve students who are coming

to my school, working for a full day in the classrooms one day a week, for a period of twelve weeks. Not all of them, by the way, are education majors as yet. But, this type of experience is giving them the opportunity to be a living part of a classroom, so they can decide if teaching is for them, and to give we, out in the field, and the college the chance to decide if education is for them.

I also agree with Dean Esposito that we are making a comparison of a vigorous road for those who are in a four-year program versus the comprehensive exam. Any alternative to a four-year program should be made just as vigorous and demanding as the standards that are put forth for education majors. In my mind what is happening now is the imposition of a double standard. As it is, those of us who enter education are often made to feel inferior, and we are often put down in public and in the press. The easy way which is being offered to non-education majors only serves to increase that feeling of inferiority. I would also like to add that where Governor Kean is proposing a starting salary of \$18,500 for the people coming in under this program, it took me eleven years to attain that goal, and I feel I was a very hard-working and good teacher in the classroom.

In closing, I would like to stress the feeling that we need more input and representation from all of those in the field, from preschool all the way to the college level. Thank you. (applause)

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GARVIN: Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN DURIA: Thank you very much.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GARVIN: We just have a comment. We have discussed the role of middle management, and we feel it has been left out of this whole reform movement. That is all I wanted to say.

MS. MIKSZA: It is interesting that you bring that up. I have said many times during the past two years since I became an administrator, I really know now what middle management means.

ASSEMBLYMAN DURIA: You get a chance to do all the dirty work.

MS. MIKSZA: Yes.

MR. WHITE: Is Dr. Carole Willis here? (no response) Barbara Pollack? (no response) Joan Cioban? (no response) Rorrie Bernard? (no response) Dr. Walter Eliason?

D R. W A L T E R E L I A S O N: My name is Walter Eliason, and I am Associate Professor of Education at Rider College. I come representing the State Coordinators' Committee of Bilingual Education and ESL Education -- higher education. For many years, we have been cooperating with the State Department of Education to develop standards and criteria for certifying bilingual and ESL teachers. We have been leaders in the country in doing that, since our neighboring states, New York, Pennsylvania and Delaware do not have such standards. We feel we have contributed to improving the quality of classroom instruction because of such standards. Last year, we were also active, as everyone else was, in revising our curricula to accommodate for the recommendations made in the Newman Report. We also feel that those changes will improve the quality of teacher preparation and the quality of instruction in New Jersey classrooms.

We support A-3974 and the efforts of the Committee to assure that teachers will be prepared in the way the Newman Report suggests and the way that programs set up in colleges and universities throughout the State have been designed. I cannot say categorically that all members of our association, of our group, would support A-3974 as a bill. They support everything in it, however. We are still a little reluctant to make a commitment to legislated programs. However, as an alternative to the alternate route recommended by the Commissioner, most of us would find it a great help.

We have reservations along certain lines of the alternate route. First of all, we, of course, agree that a degree is necessary to enter the profession. We consider ourselves a profession of trained, qualified people, not a stopover place for people coming out of liberal arts programs who have a great deal of subject matter knowledge, and wishing, perhaps, to spend a while in a school seeing what is going on there, or helping out. We do not feel those people are necessarily dedicated professionals.

In the area of discipline of knowledge, or knowledge of subject matter, we find that for bilingual teachers and for ESL teachers there is going to be a difficulty deciding what subject matter is appropriate. We view that a teacher is someone working in an applied field, who of necessity has skills of communication and

cross-cultural understanding and, not only a knowledge of English, but a knowledge of how English is composed. So, we find it is going to be difficult for someone to decide on what subject knowledge tests should be applied for ESL and bilingual teachers. For example, it was recently stated at one of our meetings that an effective teacher of English as a second language, or of bilingual teaching, should really have a love and respect for language. We are not sure where you get that kind of thing. We know that it has a knowledge base, probably in linguistics and in grammar, but we are not sure how you acquire it. We feel that having had courses in linguistics will probably promote it. We also feel that it is developed over a period of time, as a teacher trainee acquires experience in the field.

In the area of linguistics, we look for twelve credit hours of work for an ESL teacher, only three for a bilingual teacher, but we want an ESL teacher to have skills in recognizing how language works, which is different from simply using the English language. We are very fearful of the notion of someone going to the State Department and passing a test in spoken English and having a degree and, therefore, being qualified to go out and train students of limited English proficiency. They would simply not know where to begin, whether they were in the second or third grade level, the junior high school level, the high school level, or in adult education. We hope that a knowledge of linguistics would help them to acquire such skills.

We also want them to be sensitive in terms of cross-cultural understanding, so the standards which we helped to develop, which are in content areas, not necessarily in education or method courses, also include requirements in areas such as anthropology, social psychology, sociology, urban sociology -- courses that are designed to help foster a knowledge base wherein a person can develop a sensitivity to people in other cultures. We think those two things are essential, and we know from research in language learning that they are essential. That can be demonstrated. We do not feel that someone going simply with a knowledge of English will have sufficient knowledge to do teaching in either bilingual or ESL classrooms.

Also, we wonder about the tests being prepared. First of all, there is no promise that there will be any professional

involvement in identifying what subject matter ought to be tested of teachers. We would not like to see the task assigned to a linguist or to a cultural anthropologist. These are very distinct fields which serve to furnish a knowledge base for teachers, but which do not necessarily help them acquire the applied skills they need to have. So, we hope you will insist on there being professional practitioners included in any task force that again examines teacher competencies to project for us some kind of tests wherein teachers can qualify with the subject matter knowledge they need.

We feel, also, that the internship, as it is described in the proposal, is an affront to teachers. After only a few days introduction, there is nowhere a definition of what the collegial teacher contact will be, whether it will be a coffee klatsch discussion, whether it will be a full-fledged classroom observation -- exactly what that will be is not defined, at least not to my satisfaction, and the principal's observations appear to us to be unworkable, since we know for a fact that principals are rarely able to get out of their offices nowadays. Perhaps they should get out of their offices more often, but most often they are caught behind their desks. We think it is unreasonable to expect them to do the number of observations suggested by the proposal. We feel that a good training program which engenders a professional skill begins early. In my own institution, sophomore courses frequently include field experiences, and junior students studying the teaching of reading, for example, take what they learn in the classroom and go out and observe it, and practice it in elementary schools, middle schools and high schools.

We have classes running as clinics. We have reading clinics, ESL clinics, in which students come to us from the schools and are taught and tutored under the direct supervision of methods teachers. All of our methods teachers are certified teachers in every field they are teaching. They not only have advanced degrees in the field of education, but they are certified teachers as well, and those same teachers do observations of the student teachers when they finally get into the last level of the student-teaching phase. So, they have had a theoretical and practical classroom orientation which culminates in a student-teaching internship which is supervised by the college teacher

and the cooperating teacher. The cooperating teacher, of course, as you know, and you have probably heard this a dozen times, plays a terribly important role. The collegial teacher and the cooperating teacher may be teaching even different kinds of classes. They may have different requirements, different time schedules. The cooperating teacher's schedule is designed so that it dovetails with the student teacher's work. They have common interests, common objectives. The common objective is to better instruct the children in their particular classroom. The collegial teacher will have a classroom of her own or his own, whereas the intern will also have a classroom of his own or her own. There is no reason to believe there will be a good connection there. We think it is very weak.

Finally, we feel that placing untried and untrained teachers in the classroom will really be harmful to kids. We feel it is much too experimental. Some kids will suffer because of an attempt to place unprepared, untried persons in the classroom. Some few kids may benefit, because some of those people may be find, well-intentioned, intelligent people with a lot of common sense who may be able to pick things up quickly, but basically it is a regressive act to do away with training programs. We see this not as an alternative, but as an alternative which will very quickly submerge training programs, and we would like to be more progressive about the thing and continue to improve education along the lines of the Newman Report and along the lines of A-3974 which you are proposing. Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN DORIA: Thank you. We will include your position paper in the record. Thank you very much.

MR. WHITE: Dennis Testa. (no response) Dr. Michael Knight from Kean College.

D R. M I C H A E L K N I G H T: This has been a very enlightening experience over the last five months. I think we entered 1984 about five months early. The intensive internship is neither intensive nor an internship. We somehow use words and we make up what we want them to mean. I have been at the college now for fourteen and a half years, and one thing that this whole experience has done is clarify a problem I have had. I have been angry with Trenton for fourteen years. It took me one semester to get angry. I now realize I have been angry at

the wrong people. I should not be angry at Trenton; I should focus my anger on those people who cause the greatest problem. I see Commissioner Cooperman creating a tremendous problem. I think what he has done is cast himself in the role almost of a fanatic, and I recall when I was taking an undergraduate philosophy course, fanatic was defined as someone who having forgotten his goal, redoubles his effort. I am afraid that when I look at his proposal, the first paragraph speaks to the quality of students who are entering education, but the rest of the proposal does not address that. The rest of the proposal addresses other concerns, what would be the best alternative route, rather than addressing the question, "What is the best way to attract the best and brightest of our young people into education?" Even Dr. Wilson from Bell Labs, I agree with a number of things she says. I certainly do believe there should be alternative routes to education, but I am tired of the perjorative statements I recognize, that even among teachers there are some intelligent people. I know she did not mean that, but I am angry at that, as well as a number of other things.

Who is the target of the criticism that manifests itself in the Cooperman report? The issue seems to be the quality of the students who are entering teacher education. After about the third paragraph, it becomes very clear to me that it is an attack on the schools of education. I have no idea why Commissioner Cooperman feels so negatively about schools of education. I think it is interesting that when people first began challenging him and asking him questions, he did not defend his position, but he attacked the questioners, and I think that is a very interesting approach. I think he would have a very hard time defending his proposal, and the best thing to do is not to defend, but to attack someone else. More supervision and greater involvement will not take place in any school that I have been in in the last ten years, and I spend probably two days a week visiting schools in various capacities of my job.

I am personally offended, as I think every graduate of a teacher education program should be. I am offended by a number of things. One of the things, and Assemblyman Doria mentioned this in the very beginning -- I was totally unaware that it was part of the

Commissioner's job to lobby for particular acts. I also happen to be a taxpayer and a citizen of New Jersey, and I find that extremely offensive.

Commissioner Cooperman, throughout his document, indicates that he is looking for consistency. He is saying we cannot agree that this is important, or that is important. No matter what he says, no matter what anyone says about a consensus regarding what is an effective teacher, every education program must go through NCATE and NASDTEC, so there are standards we are held up to. We have no problems addressing those standards. We frequently wish they would not change as rapidly as they do, but we have no problem addressing those standards. We are happy to; we wish to be known as a quality institution.

Some of the analogies I have read about, and heard about, saying, "Well, we have a bar exam. People can take a bar exam, what will be an entrance exam for teachers." I believe you have to do something else before you can take the bar exam. I believe before you take your internship as a medical doctor, you have to do something else. If you don't, I would be happy to buy my own scalpel and start working. I think the principal question asked has been, "Why is teaching in such poor repute?" I think the answers have been given, low pay, little respect, little involvement in decision making within the schools and within the system and, in some cases, poor supervision. I would like to know, who taught the students who went on to work in Bell Labs, ten or twelve or fifteen years ago? Evidently, those students did quite well. Now, I would guess -- not guess, I should not say guess -- it is my opinion, again visiting many schools, that most of the teachers who taught those students who went on to Bell Labs ten or twelve years ago are still teaching. If they did a good job ten or twelve years ago, why are they not doing a good job now? If they did a good job ten or twelve years ago, it would indicate to me that their training program was fine. We should not change their training program.

I would just like to close by once again saying, I think Commissioner Cooperman has offended us -- when I say us, it is rather universal -- by not asking us to participate, and I can think of only

two reasons why he would not ask us to participate. One is he does not trust us, and we are so self-serving that we would do anything we could to maintain the status quo, and the other is that he does not think we can make a valuable contribution. I hope that is not the case. If there is a commission established, I would hope there would be ample representation from various schools of education in this State. Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN DORIA: Thank you very much.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GARVIN: Dr. Knight, I think the only thing I want to add is that with all of this we have heard, we seem to forget that there are parents out there who must begin to play a greater role, no matter what kind of teacher we put in front of that classroom.

When I go over this record -- and I have to apologize as a legislator -- there are some things you think of that you want to put on the record because you will pursue it in-depth. I thought this was a perfect time to make that comment.

DR. KNIGHT: I certainly agree. I think that is part of the problem, and the problem is that Commissioner Cooperman has not identified what the problem is. He has identified one minuscule part, and sees that as the entire solution.

MR. WHITE: Maria LaSalvia. (no response) Fay Palomore. (no response) Lorraine Mayifsky. (no response) Dr. Stanley Geschwind.

D R. S T A N L E Y G E S C H W I N D: I would like to thank the members of the Committee for giving me this opportunity to testify on the two bills in question before the Assembly. I do have a prepared statement, but if the Committee will allow me, I would like to depart from my statement just for a moment or two, to answer the question posed by the preceding gentleman as to who were my teachers.

I am also from Bell Laboratories. Of course, I emphasize that I speak for myself only. Whatever I may be today professionally, I lay at the doorstep of my teachers in grade school and in high school. I do not refer only to math and science teachers, but to history, English and art teachers, all the way down the line. It is because of those teachers that I was able to go on and get whatever education I did get, to be wherever I am today.

I believe we have an outstanding, very fine group of teachers in our high schools today, in science and math as well, but there are glaring deficiencies, especially at the entry level. I believe as I read Cooperman's proposal and Governor Kean's speech to the Legislature, they attempt to address these deficiencies. I would also add that I regard the starting salary of \$18,500 as perhaps just minimal. Most teachers today are grossly underpaid.

Having made those remarks, I would like to proceed to my prepared statement, which you may all have a copy of. I am a member of the Panel on Public Affairs (PUPA) of the American Physical Society (APS), and serve as its liaison to the Education Committee of the American Physical Society. I appear before this Committee at my own initiative, representing only myself, and I am solely responsible for my remarks.

I have taught at New York University and Rutgers University, and have served on the American Physical Society Visiting Scientists Committee to Schools, which is throughout the country. The membership of the American Physical Society has been deeply concerned about the declining quality of high school mathematics and science education in the country. They believe that a strong pre-college educational program in science and mathematics for all students is crucial to our national well-being. This concern is evidenced in the September, 1983, issue of the journal Physics Today, published by the American Institute of Physics. I will leave a copy of this journal with the Committee. This journal normally is devoted to scientific matters, yet the entire issue of this journal is devoted to the crisis in high school science and math education. Detailed documentation is provided in this journal of the critical shortage of qualified physics teachers throughout the nation. More generally, in testimony before the United States Senate on April 15, 1982, the president of the National Science Teachers Association cited statistical data that half of the newly employed teachers in science and mathematics were unqualified. In some states, 65% of those teaching physics did not have a major or even a minor in physics. Even more worrisome is the fact that there are no prospective teachers in the pipeline. What are the reasons for this critical shortage of science and mathematics teachers? In partial answer to

this question, I quote from a copy of a letter from Dr. Jack M. Wilson, Executive Officer of the American Association of Physics Teachers, commending Governor Kean for his report to the Legislature on September 6, 1983, entitled, "Education in New Jersey - a Blueprint for Reform." Dr. Wilson writes to the Governor:

"Your proposal is bold but realistic and addresses the two major items cited by science students as obstacles to a career in teaching: low salaries and the need to take many education courses that they feel are not significantly helpful."

The bar that traditional certification through education training programs presents to the bright student seeking to teach is referred to in several of the articles appearing in the issue of Physics Today cited above. To quote from an article by B. F. Porter and W. H. Kelly:

"Faculty members, counselors and friends frequently advise the brighter male students," this would no longer apply, because they are currently advising the brighter female students along the same lines, "that teaching is not a desirable profession. The professional education programs that prospective teachers must take to be certified tend to buttress this advice; they are too often among the weakest programs offered. Bright students are both embarrassed and insufficiently challenged by the low quality of many of these course offerings."

Surely there is something amiss when the education majors in our State score as low as they do on verbal and math SAT scores, ranking among the lowest of all the majors given in our colleges. I would like to quote from an article by Albert Shanker, President of the UFT and the American Federation of Teachers, which appeared about a year ago in the New York Times. He quotes from a study made by the Carnegie Fund, by Dr. Ernest Boyer, and I quote:

"From 1972 to 1980, SAT verbal scores for education majors dropped from 4.18 to 3.39, a loss of seventy-nine points, while the SAT math scores dropped thirty-one points, going from 4.49 to 4.18. This is a much steeper decline than the national averages for all students in the same time period, which dropped twenty-one points on the verbal and fifteen points on the math."

I do not mean to imply that we do not have outstanding teachers in our schools who have come from schools of education. However, there is a growing perception that there is no proven relationship between the performance of these fine teachers and their teacher training programs. No, I am not suggesting that competency in subject matter is a sufficient condition to be a good teacher, but I unequivocally state that it is an absolutely necessary condition. The Governor's and Commissioner Cooperman's proposal for a statewide examination will at least guarantee this crucial element of competency in subject matter. The proposed one-year internship under the guidance of an outstanding teacher is the best vehicle for honing one's skills, other than natural inborn qualities, associated with teaching methodology and techniques. I feel the proposed bills, A-3974 and A-3851, will have the effect of blocking the Governor's proposal for urgently needed reform in the certification procedure. I cannot help but feel that the overwhelming majority of taxpayers are in favor of quality education in our State, and will be in opposition to these bills. Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN DORIA: Thank you very much, Dr. Geschwind. I would like to ask just one question. Do you know how the statistics were gleaned, at least in the State of New Jersey, on the SAT scores for students involved in education? Do you know where those statistics were gleaned from?

DR. GESCHWIND: No, I was just referring to the statistics here for the national scores.

ASSEMBLYMAN DORIA: Right, which is similar to what they have been saying in New Jersey. I just wanted to point this out because, again, what I find here is a little subterfuge. I agree with a lot of what you're saying, and I think, now again, in math and science I can see needs. I think all of us can see needs.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GARVIN: That's right; all of us can see needs.

ASSEMBLYMAN DORIA: I think the question I have, is that what has happened in the State of New Jersey, is that information is being used to try to present a specific point of view. For example, we were told that the students going into education as a major in the State of New Jersey, have the lowest SAT scores. When we asked where these

statistics came from -- and at this point I would ask your opinion on this -- we were told these statistics actually came from the SAT's taken during junior and senior years of high school, by approximately 50,000 students in the State of New Jersey, and there was no way of knowing, actually, which of these students who checked off that they were going to college, and that they were going to be education majors, actually, number one, went to college and, actually, number two, were education majors. So, what I am concerned about is that some of the statistics which are presently being used to feed a certain point of view, are being gerrymandered to try to prove that point of view. I would say it is an excellent first affirmative debate case. You know, you always try in the first affirmative to present your point of view, take all the statistics, and twist them around to prove your point.

What I'm saying is, unfortunately, we have had too much of that happening. What you're saying, as I said, I agree with to a degree, but I think we have to look at the broader picture and, unfortunately, the broader picture does not allow us to say that the system that is being presented as an alternative will work.

I have one question. Do you think -- I would like your own personal opinion -- that in this type of program presented by Commissioner Cooperman, that a student who has only been out of school one or two years with a bachelor's degree should be allowed to take this internship program and teach physics in college?

DR. GESCHWIND: Absolutely. As a matter of fact, to answer Chairperson Garvin's question to Dr. Wilson, I would say that it is inconceivable that a first grade teacher would just be taken off the street and drawn from this pool because of performance on an examination. If I were a member of a school board, I would certainly want to see a lot more than that in terms of experience with children, and perhaps some feeling for what it is to work with children, and some background of that sort.

Regarding people going into schools in Newark, and so on, again I would answer in the affirmative to Assemblywoman Garvin, especially if those who come forward to do so are committed. Those who come forward volunteering to teach today in the face of the competitive salaries offered by industry-- I believe the starting salary for a

high school teacher in New Jersey today is something in the vicinity of \$13,000. This is for a fresh bachelor's degree. The starting salary for someone in mathematics, chemistry or physics is approximately \$24,000. These figures were compiled by the American Institute of Physics Manpower Commission, and they are available. I believe anyone who chooses to teach is committed. He or she is extremely committed. Now this in itself, of course, is not sufficient to guarantee that he or she will exceed in the tough environment of teaching, but presumably the intern program is designed, or you should help to see that it is designed, in such a way that it picks out from among these individuals who are committed, who have the competency in the subject matter, those who can also teach. In no way is competency a guarantee of teaching ability. But, I repeat, it is an absolutely necessary condition, and I believe a failure of the schools currently. What is happening now is, because of the critical shortage, we are finding people who are unqualified in subject matter being thrown into teaching, and this is a far more risky thing than to take people who have not had a background in education courses.

Thank you very much for your time.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GARVIN: I have one question regarding math and science. You know, we have studied what other school districts across the country have done: certain states have instituted scholarship monies and a differential in the pay scale. So, I think when it comes to math and science, I agree with you that we need to do something in those subject matters of high technology. But, that was not the proposal, sir, that was presented to us. It cuts across all lines. If it were related to math and science, I would not be here tonight speaking with you, but when you deal with all the categories that the proposal would impact on, it just leaves a lot of questions in your mind. I want you to know that anything we do, and I think we are planning to do proposals for math and science -- I would like to share that with you -- whether it be scholarships to teachers or pay, which are what other states have done-- You know, we sit here listening, but we travel extensively nationally: we are both a part of a national leadership coalition, and we get information from all over this country. So, we do not come here just to evaluate Dr. Cooperman's

proposal in a vacuum. It is because we have heard some proposals in other states by other commissioners that really met the need in math and science. We're here to tell you that we would support any effort like that, but we will not support across the board reform that is so extensive that I don't know if even Dr. Cooperman realizes what he has proposed.

ASSEMBLYMAN DORIA: Thank you.

MR. WHITE: Elaine Jewell from Essex County, classroom teacher.

E L A I N E J E W E L L: Thank you for giving me the opportunity to address you this afternoon. My name is Elaine Jewell. As a teacher in the public schools of Irvington, New Jersey, I support Assembly Bill 3974 because it protects high standards for students wishing to enter the teaching profession.

All students deserve a teacher who is fully educated and trained the first day he or she stands before a class. Experience is part of the training necessary to give students the best possible chance of success. Recently, I had occasion to observe a student teacher in my building, and I was delighted to see how she had developed. This experience was also made clear to me in my own switch in grade levels this year from sixth to third. The organization of reading groups, math groups and the gathering of materials was facilitated because of experience. The experience helped me to judge the attention span of the class, as well as their individual needs.

Strict statewide standards for teacher trainees must include subject area competency, as well as supervised classroom experience. Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN DORIA: Thank you very much for taking the time to come here. We appreciate your comments.

MR. WHITE: Dr. Phyllis F. Kavett, Department of Educational Arts and Systems, Advisor to the Secondary Education Program, Kean College.

D R. P H Y L L I S F. K A V E T T: Good evening, I am Dr. Phyllis Kavett. As I sat there waiting for my turn, I realized how you felt, because it is getting late and I know we would all like to be home. However, I do have a presentation of a very brief statement, which was

arrived at by the persons at Kean who teach secondary education, which I would like to read concerning your bills, and then I would like to speak extemporaneously on mathematics education, which is my field.

On A-3974, the faculty of Kean College who teach courses in secondary education wish to thank the members of the Education Committees for assembling here today to take public testimony on proposed legislation, and for their concern regarding the Cooperman proposal.

While these faculty members applaud the efforts and intent of the proposers of this bill, they wish to make known their general concern that the State Legislature is attempting to enact rules about matters which might better be decided at a lower level, e.g., grade point average, and which are essentially administrative in character.

However, such legislation, if passed, would lend strength to the new regulations dealing with minimum standards which, of course, you explained earlier. While this might prove an advantage, it could also become disadvantageous if the new minimum standards themselves prove in the future to require revision or upgrading.

The faculty members were pleased about the improvement in emergency certification which may result from the passage of this bill, and they would like to see further legislation to refine and limit the emergency certification process.

Some faculty members questioned the imposition of a specific grade of 3.0 in student teaching, equivalent to a "B," a course which at Kean College has received grades of "satisfactory" or "unsatisfactory," accompanied by anecdotal reports, in recent years.

The faculty members were pleased to see the distinction made between elementary and secondary education undergraduates. This was not the case in the Cooperman proposal documents.

On A-3851, secondary education faculty members at Kean College feel it would be very worthwhile for a commission to study national reports on education and make recommendations concerning the public school system.

On the Cooperman proposal, the secondary education faculty members intend to present their position on this matter during hearings for this purpose, so they have not made an extensive report.

Meanwhile, representatives assembled here should be assured that close attention is being given to all developments in New Jersey education.

Now, the reason I felt you might wish to hear some other input from me, is that I have been in the State system of public education in the colleges since 1960. I have taught in public schools and in private schools. I am a liberal arts graduate, who came in on a kind of emergency certification in New York City as my first teaching experience, and I realized that there might be some justification in emergency situations. But, at the time, New York City required that anyone on an emergency certificate complete all requirements within two years. In my case, it was merely the student teaching experience, which I subsequently had waived because of the experience of teaching I had been doing, but I had already had a lot of education course work behind that, so I did not feel as though it was quite equivalent to what Cooperman is proposing.

As far as the proposal itself is concerned, there are a few points I would like to bring to your attention. In a recent report called "The Governor's Task Force Report on Technology Trained Manpower," issued in July, 1983, one of the points made -- a very strong point, and this applies to all colleges -- was that students are electing to leave New Jersey because of the generally poor reputations of New Jersey colleges. That applies to everybody. We are maybe the largest State to send people out of state to colleges, which means that some of the brighter, perhaps, or at least possible candidates, have left the State and have gone to other states for training. Teacher training, of course, would just be a very small part of this.

At Kean we have had the experience, which I have documented in my own research, that with math majors through 1975 to 1982, we have had a very small number at Kean. We had a much larger number going into computer science in that period, from that same potential pool of people. It is obvious that the lure of salaries was making a large change here. We went from zero computer science majors to over two hundred, and we went from probably over two hundred math majors to about sixty, at most. Well, of the sixty people that came through as math majors, fully 35% elected education, which was not a bad number, but we had very little to draw from to begin with, you see, in the

mathematics major. As was pointed out earlier, secondary people are liberal arts candidates here at our college. They merely come in later to take their education collateral. So they, in fact, would not even have identified as education majors on any of the statistics that have been cited from the SAT high school polls, because a person in high school who was interested in mathematics or science would probably have said mathematics, or biology, or chemistry, or whatever, and would not have indicated education in the first place.

I have found in my experience that there has been no diminution at all in the quality of teacher trainees. Perhaps we seem to get more dedicated persons coming into teaching because, I would like to make the statement that, in fact, these people who go into teaching have to learn both the subject area, take a full major in that, and then, on top of that, add to that the various aspects of the education collateral, which also includes mathematics education and science education, and so on.

One other concern I have if, indeed, the Cooperman proposal were ever to become a fact, is that I have read research which stated that the student teacher and the first-year teacher coming into a school learn a great deal that is different from what they learn at the college. One of the biggest factors they learn is conformity in the schools themselves. They do not learn the kinds of things we try to teach here, such as, variety, developing one's own style, teaching in an individual manner. I have a fear that if an internship is established whereby a teacher is placed in a school for a year under anyone's guidance, that that would mean a kind of learning of conformity of the practices already in the schools which, according to the Cooperman report, are admittedly quite bad. So, I don't understand how this would really help the situation at all.

That is really all I have to say about the math education. If there are any particular questions, I will be happy to answer them.

ASSEMBLYMAN DORIA: Thank you very much.

MR. WHITE: Barbara Tanis from Passaic County, a classroom teacher.

B A R B A R A T A N I S: I would like to thank you for this opportunity to express a teacher's point of view on the certification

issue. My name is Barbara Tanis of Passaic County. I am a classroom teacher and Chairperson of the NJEA Government Relations Committee.

Let me say right up front, I endorse passage of A-3851 and A-3974. This Legislature has been more than responsive in maintaining strict standards in the teaching profession.

I would imagine that these bills have been sparked by actions coming out of the Department of Education regarding the proposed certification changes, as well as the national recommendations in the "Nation at Risk Report." This Legislature is wise in not being too hasty to accept every whim and fancy, because an agency says it's good.

As a practitioner in the classroom, I have grave concerns about the Commissioner's program, particularly the provisions of the internship program.

One of the concepts to make the internship effective will create a need for more teaching substitutes. We, in Passaic County, already have difficulty in employing substitutes. I ask, how will an internship program be conducted in my school without totally interrupting the educational process?

It appears to me that since both the Board of Education and the Board of Higher Education adopted strict standards for teachers preparation, we should let the colleges handle teacher training.

Also, before any efforts to turn the new certification process upside down, perhaps the newly adopted system should be given a chance to work.

Another aspect of the Cooperman plan that bothers me is the fact that there is no track record of its effectiveness. Certainly, I mean no offense to the State Department of Education; however, it has not maintained a glowing record of implementation in the field. How, I ask, does the Commissioner feel that 614 school districts can certify teachers in a consistent and adequate manner?

And, finally, should the Commissioner's plan move forward, it will create havoc in urban districts. I teach in the Paterson School District. Commissioner Cooperman's proposal will be a disaster in our system.

I urge you to release both of these bills for a full vote of the Assembly. Those employed in the teaching profession deserve it.

Students attending our public schools deserve the passage of both of these bills.

I also gave you a copy of NJEA's Legislative Bulletin. It states that the Governor's Management Improvement Panel has recommended cuts in State aid to education of up to \$700 million a year. The Governor calls for excellence in our schools, yet the report recommends cuts. How are the districts going to fund Kean's proposal if the Panel's recommendations are also implemented? Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN DORIA: Thank you very much. I think the points you make are well taken, especially concerning the Governor's Management Task Force, as well as the problems which presently exist, where a number of districts would each be setting up their own system to try to set up certified teachers. That is one of the questions we've asked. How can you set up a better system when you have 614 different entities coming up with their own criteria, or implementing established criteria because, obviously, the elimination process would be different in every instance. So, we thank you.

MR. WHITE: Is Michael Johnson here, from Camden County?

M I C H A E L J O H N S O N: How do you do? My name is Michael Johnson; I am a third grade teacher from Voorhees Township in Camden County, New Jersey. I would like to take this opportunity to thank you very much for allowing me to come here this evening to speak to you on behalf of A-3974 and A-3851.

I have been a teacher for fourteen years. I am very proud to say I am an elementary school teacher, something that a lot of us very frequently tend to avoid. When we are dealing with a social situation, we kind of mutter what we do for a living. I initially began my higher education career, not on a career choice of my own, but on a career choice of my parents. They decided that I was going to become a veterinarian, and for two years I attended a private institution where I dealt with fellow peers who were quite adept at regurgitating any information thrown at them. I then left that particular area and went into, at my own choice, the realm of teaching.

I went through a four-year teacher education program at a New Jersey State college. I was very fortunate in terms of being able to have pupil contact time from my sophomore year on. I had a practical

experience in my junior year that was very similar to a student teaching experience in terms of its length, and in terms of the amount of pupil contact time that was requested of us.

I am very much concerned with the Commissioner's proposal at this particular point. I am concerned because it has a tendency to look at children, very young, very pliable minds, as a mere commodity, a machine into which information can be plugged by anyone. I find that totally reprehensible. It is impossible.

I also have a concern for the quality of the profession, and I am not referring to those members of the profession who may come into us via this program. I am concerned about those of us who are now in the profession ourselves. I would put to you, if I become one of the collegial teachers, the intern persons's partner, am I then a master teacher, or, am I the teacher who gets the ax when my intern partner does not have a successful experience? Am I, ultimately, the one to blame, so to speak?

Along with being a third grade teacher, I am one of the elected members of the New Jersey Education Association to the National Education Association as a State Board member. I find it very interesting to listen to a number of the comments that have been made here this evening, the most interesting of which is the concept of statistics. I have taught for fourteen years. I have headed up an Educational Resource Center out of southern New Jersey based upon Federal funds. I was the Chairperson of a Teacher Center that covered the six-county southern New Jersey region for four years, on Federal funds. I question the statistics that Assemblyman Doria brought up; I question them because not once in my fourteen years of experience within this State has anyone ever asked me to take a test to prove my intelligence or my competence and, quite frankly, I know of no other teacher in my experience in dealing with people all over the State, who has ever been asked the same.

I applaud the Joint Committee for having had the foresight and the concern to propose two bills I feel will greatly enhance and reenforce educational quality within our State. Thank you, again, very much.

ASSEMBLYMAN DORIA: Thank you very much, and thank you for coming all the way up from Camden County.

MR. WHITE: Dr. Douglas Osheroff from Bell Labs.

D R. D O U G L A S D. O S H E R O F F: I wish to thank the Committee for giving me the opportunity to present my views on this matter here today. I am a professional scientist, the head of the Solid State and Low Temperature Physics Research Department at Bell Laboratories; however, I am here of my own accord, and the views which I express are simply my own. I am very interested in education. I have spent a considerable amount of time going around to various K-12 institutions here and giving demonstration lectures on physics to students all the way from grade six through high school. In addition to my recruiting activities, I have kept in touch with the undergraduate and graduate physics students in various colleges and universities throughout this country.

It is my observation, and certainly one that has been made rather succinctly today, that there is a considerable need to improve the education and training of our scientists in the United States today. I think a statistic which I found very recently which points this out quite well is the fact that in 1982, in the entering graduate class in physics in this country -- 40% of the entering graduate students were from foreign countries, that is, roughly half of the graduate students in physics in this country today do not receive their secondary education in the United States. I think this number has been rising and, at the same time, the number of students who have been taking physics and mathematics in the high schools has been dropping in rather consistent accord.

I think the reason for this is twofold. One reason is that the students, for one reason or another, are not bothering to get the necessary training they need so they can compete with the foreign students who are coming in and taking their places in the universities today. The second reason is that frequently the teachers simply do not have the information to give them. The training they are receiving is inadequate. I would submit that, at least in the science and mathematics fields, the prime prerequisite for an educator is that he must know his subject matter. Not only is this important because without knowing the subject matter he cannot transmit it to the students, but when students ask questions, deep and thoughtful

questions, and they do not receive adequate answers for those questions. I think the students' interest in the course is diminished and the population of students who enroll in that course drops, and I think this has happened rather consistently throughout our schools.

The answer to the current shortage of science educators in this country must come, and to a large extent is coming, from people outside the teaching profession. As we have seen today, there are simply not enough teachers in the pipeline to fill positions which are available today. There is a backlog, because there is a considerable number of teachers who are teaching physics, science and mathematics courses who really do not have the background, or who are not qualified to teach these courses. So, if we were to try at this time to remedy the situation, we would simply not have the people, the manpower available. I think it is certainly true in my experience, and I believe in the experience of other people here, that a large number of the people who end up teaching science and mathematics in high schools receive their training outside the normal teacher education curricula.

I recall that the best science teacher I had in high school was one who had started out as a graduate student in chemistry, but who decided eventually, because he was married and ran out of money and things, that he would teach high school. He was a very animated, very dedicated teacher. I don't know at what point he learned how to teach, but I will submit that virtually every person who graduates in physics, with a B.S. degree in physics in this country, the very next year after he is graduated he starts teaching as a teaching assistant, rather unsupervised, in our colleges and universities, teaching undergraduates who themselves have just graduated from high school. I would submit that some of them are very excellent teachers, and some of them are not very excellent teachers.

But, the point is, I think there is a large number of people who are potentially good teachers, who are out there, and who would like to have the opportunity to teach. If the Cooperman proposal were to be enacted, I think at least a significant number of these people who are reluctant to join the teaching profession because of the difficulties they would have obtaining the teaching credentials, would do so. I also submit that this type of funneling of people from

outside the teaching profession into the teaching profession in the sciences and mathematics is going on anyway, as is quite clearly pointed out in the Cooperman proposal, and that what the Cooperman proposal tends to do, is to formalize the process whereby these people are accepted and given accreditation as teachers in this State.

I think, given the fact that the hour is getting late, if anyone has any questions I would be happy to answer them, but that is basically what I had to state today. Thank you.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GARVIN: I just have one positive thing to say. I had the opportunity to review and visit the science program you have in Plainfield. I commend you and your company for it. I wish Dr. Cooperman would look at that program, what it is doing in math and science, and perhaps recommend funding for pilot programs like that on a statewide basis. It is a marvelous program. I think it is those kinds of experiences in the science area that are very positive. I wonder why they were not looked at and expanded on, because they are good. Again, I want to commend you and your company for that program.

DR. OSHEROFF: Thank you very much. If the State wants to give us money to carry on our work-- (laughter) I should point out that this is, I believe, a very complex problem. There is no single answer to it. I believe, particularly in the math and science areas, that the Cooperman proposal is one rather important step.

ASSEMBLYMAN DORIA: I do not think there is much disagreement in the math and science areas, maybe only about how it would be put together. I think that is an area where experimentation can occur, because of the problems that do exist. I do not think we should experiment with other programs that are doing well.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GARVIN: That's right.

ASSEMBLYMAN DORIA: I think that is where the difference is -- where there is a need, and where there isn't a need. I think a lot of people are concerned that we are trying to "bite off more than we can chew" at the present time.

DR. OSHEROFF: I would submit that the Cooperman proposal doesn't necessarily mandate that teachers have to be drawn from outside the teaching profession ranks. I very much doubt that a large segment of the teachers, particularly for the grade schools, would be drawn from outside the professional ranks.

ASSEMBLYMAN DORIA: But, he doesn't say that; see, this is the problem.

DR. OSHEROFF: I have listened to speaker after speaker, speaking today about problems they foresee might occur if the Cooperman proposal were to be implemented. However, I submit that this is, in fact, a program which has not been completely formulated yet, and I do not see any reason why the Legislature couldn't go back next year, or the year after, and look back at this program and say it has either worked or it hasn't worked. But, at this point, to not give it a chance, I think, is in a real sense actually doing another experiment, that is, you're saying, "Well, we don't want to change the system. We don't really know what is out there. We don't know how well the Cooperman proposal will work, but we really do not want to try it."

ASSEMBLYMAN DORIA: Let me just say, the problem is that the Legislature could not go back after two or three years and change the teacher certification system in existence at that time, unless we, by law, made new regulations to change what existed. We do not have control over the State Board of Education, or over the regulations for certification. We can only get it by doing exactly what we have done here, and that is by making regulations law. That is one of the problems.

The second problem is that, as you say, the Cooperman proposal is one that is not completely developed. I think what we have asked for is for it to be completely developed, and for some specifics of the proposal to be given to us, so we can determine how successful it can be. I don't think anyone would have objected to a pilot program in one or two areas like math or science, which would allow for the kinks to be -- which would allow us to determine what kinks existed in the system, and try to straighten them out. However, what has happened is, we are going in and we are going to do everything at one time, and I don't think you as a scientist, or we as politicians, believe that you can change everything immediately and not completely destroy the system. You have to maintain some of the past, take what is good from the past, and develop something good in the future, and then tie it together through some trial and error.

DR. OSHEROFF: Well, I would simply like to end by saying, I really do not see that this program would have an enormous immediate impact on the teaching profession in the State. The reason is that the number of new teachers who are hired every year is not a great number, and I think the number of people who would come into the profession based on the Cooperman proposal that would not be coming in otherwise, would, in fact, be quite small.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GARVIN: Are you saying that non-education majors are by some magic more-- What are you saying? Undoubtedly, you support--

DR. OSHEROFF: (interrupting) I think there are some good teachers out there who maybe do not even know it. I think there are good teachers, and there are bad teachers, and I think a lot of it has to do with your personality, how you relate to people, commitment, and things like that. Some of these people, I think, would--

ASSEMBLYMAN DORIA: You mean, it is just like scientists; there are some good scientists, and some bad scientists, or good lawyers and bad lawyers. Is that what you're saying?

DR. OSHEROFF: I think there is a lot of truth to that.

ASSEMBLYMAN DORIA: That's human nature, unfortunately.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GARVIN: You know, I think it is unfortunate that this had to come, the Cooperman proposal. I just don't think the proposal took in all the variables that exist in the entire system we call "learning." I think it was developed in a vacuum, it is being supported in a vacuum and, with due respect to your intelligence, and to the intelligence of a lot of the people that have come before this Committee, I'm sorry to say that many of you have not been into school systems to understand all the variables that exist in our schools today, sir. Believe me, if you deal with the total picture, you too will question a proposal as extensive as this. And, you know, it's interesting, maybe some of the AT&T -- I respect your company because of what you are doing in Plainfield, and maybe we should invite them to spend a day in a few schools. I'm serious. I mean, I think a lot of the people who have come before us supporting the proposal have not been in the school systems for a period of time, and maybe that is the omission. Maybe we should arrange that, because we are not against

reform; we are not against excellence in education. You would have to know our history to understand that, but this Cooperman proposal is like a piece of cement, and nothing, honey, is made of cement in Trenton. (laughter)

DR. OSHEROFF: I now appreciate the rather irrevocable nature of this proposal once it is implemented. However, I would like to submit that, in fact, I did spend twelve long years going through public education, and I think I really know quite well. I do not believe things have really changed substantially from the way they were and, as I indicated, the best teachers I had when I was growing up going through high school, were people who had actually come rather separately into the teaching profession.

ASSEMBLYMAN DORIA: Thank you.

DR. OSHEROFF: Thank you very much.

MR. WHITE: Gertrude Clarke, teacher.

G E R T R U D E C L A R K E: It seems to me there was a song one time about the numbers dwindling down, or whatever. Well, I thank you for allowing me the opportunity to speak with you this evening. I come as a teacher, with thirty years of teaching experience in the State of New Jersey. My field is physics, but I think I can speak -- and I am speaking for myself -- in an across-the-board fashion, which is clearly what would better serve your interests.

Although I have been a very active member of the New Jersey Science Teachers' Association in a variety of ways, have been the Vice President and the President for a couple of years of the American Association of Physics Teachers in New Jersey, now represent all the physics professors and high school physics teachers from the State of New Jersey in the national organization, and have also, myself, produced and directed, and still direct that is, a New Jersey Business Industry Science Education Consortium that is involved in across-the-board "K" through 12 changes for the betterment of education, I speak not for any of those groups, but rather for myself. I will make one other point, and I do this not in a laudatory tone, but to clarify the air, for whatever reason, Princeton University, a few years ago, selected me as the recipient of the Princeton University's prize for distinguished teaching in the State of New Jersey. I say

that only because out of all the education courses I had, both as a bachelor student and as a master's degree in science education, and now finishing up a Ph.D. in radiation physics, in all of those education courses, I think I can count probably two that had any real direct bearing on the quality of my teaching.

Furthermore, I have asked many colleagues with whom I deal daily, and at professional meetings all over the country, how valid, how valuable were your education courses? I surmise that probably well over 90% of them remarked without hesitation, "Almost no good." Now, I say this with some care, because I realize there are schools of education in this State that have members who work assiduously toward trying to train teachers in a much more effective and efficient way, and I think perhaps too, some of the things they try to teach are well worth learning. But, if you look at some of the people who are teaching these courses, if you evaluate those teachers, you say to yourself, "You cannot give what you do not have," and many of them do not have what they should be giving to other people. The same is true, of course, of teaching at any level. You cannot give what you do not have.

So, if you don't go to the teaching profession at any level with a very strong background of the material you are about to teach, you might as well go someplace else and do something else, because otherwise you are jeopardizing the life framework of our State and, of course, also our nation.

So, I start first of all by saying that in my own view, and in the view of the few people I have polled, the caliber of the content of the courses that are now being offered in the State of New Jersey, in the education courses, is not worth the paper that those courses are printed on. As I say, I sort of apologize to the people in the audience who may devote many long hours to that particular thing, but that's a personal opinion, as I mentioned before.

In terms of these particular bills, which I looked at, and I must say I confess to having heard of this hearing late Friday afternoon and was working myself in a laboratory most of the weekend, so I haven't had a chance to prepare this as I would normally have prepared it when I have been asked, for instance, by the National

Executor of the National Science Teachers' Association to give talks in New York and various other places in the country about the quality of education. So, I do not have at my fingertips, or at my lips, the figures that I might like to have. But, most of them are clearly available from many sources, and I notice a gentleman this evening gave you a copy of some of the latest statistics with regard to math and science. So, I don't think I need to go through that. But, as I look at the bills themselves, and in particular I will start with A-3851, I do not see the need to spend \$75,000 and a long time, by another group, to try to evaluate all that has already been said and printed. I think that any intelligent person, and all of those of you in the Legislature among them, can digest that within two or three weeks, or a month tops, and not at a cost of \$75,000. I guess you probably heard at one point that ideomatic expression, "A camel is a horse put together by committee." Well, it seems to me this is a case where if you have too many committees, and you look over another committee's work, there is a time factor that is a waste, and a financial factor that is a waste as well.

I also noted in that particular bill that out of the thirty-five, and now I hear this evening thirty-six, proposed members to constitute that group, there are really only five teachers, classroom teachers from "K" to twelve. That is one-seventh of the entire group. That reminds me of a comment made earlier this evening about the poor regard for teachers. If there is only one-seventh of the whole group to be teachers, and you are dealing with the topic of trying to assess how good or bad education is, then I think perhaps my advice would be that there should be a greater percentage in that.

ASSEMBLYMAN DORIA: I would just like to comment that under the Commissioner's plan, there wasn't one teacher involved.

MS. CLARKE: I realize that, and I think that was a direct fault, absolutely. This is an improvement, but my suggestion is that it still needs expansion -- that particular thing.

With respect to the other bill, which is the one that most people have been concerned with this evening, there are many things about this bill that I think are very good. Actually, if, as someone mentioned earlier -- if those changes that were brought about by the

August, 1982 law had been implemented, we would be in much better shape now, and I'm sure you agree. However, I don't think that this bill itself goes that much further, makes a much more significant step, than what Cooperman's proposal does. I mean, there are a few variations, but in the main it doesn't seem to me that there are large enough significant differences. Sure, there is a little difference in the average that a teacher should earn, but there are some other things in here that to me also are vagaries, if you will. You see, as I said before, you can't teach what you don't have. My thought was that first of all you need a firm foundation in the subject material.

When we go to physicians, we pick, you know, if we have a heart problem, we go to a cardiologist, and if we have a liver problem, we go to someone who is an internist, or something of that sort. Why don't we have specialists "K" through twelve? If you want a child to learn how to read, why don't you have that child go to a reading specialist, not some person who in an elementary school is expected to know reading, writing and arithmetic, mathematics, social studies, and even driver education practically these days? My point being, it would seem to me that within the framework of that last 1982 proposal, there could be much that could be done, you know, that would not necessitate going to the step of having this extra bill.

In general though what I'm saying, and I'm sorry to say this is not my usual form of presentation, since I would probably have at my disposal some facts and figures to substantiate what I'm saying, but my overall feeling on these two bills is that they are not necessary, that two things can be accomplished that will cause considerable improvement in the drastic situation of education in this State, as well as in the nation. Here in this State, the two things that can be done have already been outlined. One is the bill that has already been passed in 1982, which needs implementation, and the other I think are many -- not all, but many -- of the proposals that Commissioner Cooperman has espoused.

ASSEMBLYMAN DORIA: I just want to clarify. There was not a bill passed in 1982; those were regulations passed by the State Board of Education.

MS. CLARKE: Oh, regulations, I'm sorry. Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN DORIA: And, my bill, A-3974, basically are those regulations put into law. Cooperman's proposals are very different than either the bill or the regulations that were passed.

MS. CLARKE: Well, yes, I think there are a lot of differences, but I think fundamentally what Cooperman has in his report -- it seems that would adequately cover what needs to be done, with some massaging. I mean, I do not agree with every single point he makes.

ASSEMBLYMAN DORIA: I think he is going to have to go to a massage parlor to massage it enough. (laughter)

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GARVIN: Is there anything worth teaching future physics teachers? Do you see physics teachers needing any other courses or skills to teach physics?

MS. CLARKE: Than just a physics major?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GARVIN: Yes.

MS. CLARKE: Yes, I do. I don't think that just being a physics major or just being a mathematics major makes you a good teacher, by no means. As a matter of fact, on the contrary, if you had very little substitutive background knowledge, and you had a host of excellent skills, that will not do the trick either. You have to interdigitate in a blend, which is very, very hard to achieve, and add a mixture of a sound, thorough understanding of your subject matter and, also, a knowledge of children. Now, that knowledge of children can come to you in a variety of ways, and in different kinds of time scales, and for different people it does. I just don't think that one needs to wade through an awful lot of courses, if you can get the same material in much less time.

ASSEMBLYMAN DORIA: Thank you.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GARVIN: Thank you.

MS. CLARKE: You're welcome.

MR. WHITE: Ken Lyons.

K E N L Y O N S: I also have a prepared statement which I intend to read tonight, which I believe you all have copies of over there. First of all, I would like to thank you all for this opportunity to discuss this proposed legislation.

As a research scientist active in industry for over ten years, I have a long-standing interest in our public school system. I have done curriculum development work in the "K" through eight levels, and I belong to a group of more than fifty industrial scientists and engineers who have been organized a year now, for the purpose of assisting science programs in the local schools. Our group has spent considerable effort, in cooperation with a number of excellent science teachers, in identifying the needs of the local science programs. The result of these discussions may be summarized as follows, and I would like to emphasize here that these remarks relate to all areas, not only to math and science.

The most fundamental need in our schools is to attract the most competent people possible to the teaching profession. It is clear that this requires three things:

1. A substantial increase in salary, both for starting teachers and for established ones who meet reasonable requirements of competence;

2. Opportunities for continued professional growth of teachers in their selective subject areas, along with development of a feeling of professional pride by rewarding excellence; and,

3. An immediate change in certification requirements to allow the tapping of the large reservoir of qualified people who at present cannot teach in our public schools due to the inflexibility of the present requirements.

The first two of these three are necessary components of any reform program if the last is to be effective. When a person with equivalent training can command almost twice the salary in industry as he or she can in teaching, it will clearly not be possible to hold consistently the best people in the educational profession. This is not to say that competent teachers are not present in our system. They are. However, the dedicated and committed teachers are there in spite of the salary problems and certification requirements not because of them.

I would like to depart at this point from what is in my text to respond to a comment that was made earlier this evening. It is true that the teachers of fifteen years ago are, in many cases, still in the

schools, and it is a good thing because we have not produced too many in recent years. Therein lies the problem.

The shortage of qualified teachers in crucial areas is well-known. For example, when the teacher of an advanced physics class recently resigned from Scotch Plains, no replacement could be found at all. When one member of our group, a professional scientist, offered her time during the day to teach that class, there was no mechanism for her to do so, even acting as an assistant to another teacher, which she also offered to do. I would like to comment that that is not a gerrymandered statistic; that is an actual experience.

This experience highlights the need for a change in the certification procedure. Even if salary incentives are increased, there would be a lag time of several years before the effect would be felt in the college graduating classes. However, the current shortage could easily be eliminated by opening certification to qualified people with appropriate safeguards built in to ensure that these people receive training in educational methods as well.

Governor Kean and our State Department of Education have recently taken the initiative to cure these obvious problems, by actions along the exact lines outlined above, namely increasing salaries, rewarding excellence in teaching, and liberalizing certification procedures. The two bills under consideration here would block or delay these much needed reforms. One of them explicitly forbids the proposed change in certification procedures so sorely needed to alleviate the present shortage, while the other would institute a delay, as yet another "study group" is formed to examine the conclusions of other study groups and committees. In other words, a committee charged with putting together a camel, to draw upon the analogy which Gert Clarke used in the last talk. Heaven help us.

I submit to you that either of these proposals is detrimental to the interest of our public schools and the children who attend them. I urge that these bills be defeated in order that we may make New Jersey schools an example of excellence for the rest of the nation to follow. Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN DORIA: Thank you.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GARVIN: Thank you.

MR. WHITE: Is there anyone else in the audience who has not been called on this evening?

FROM AUDIENCE: I would like to testify, but I haven't registered.

MR. WHITE: Fine.

J E A N I N E L a R U E: Good evening. When we first came here, I said good afternoon, and now it is almost good night. I want to first thank the Committee for having the hearing scheduled at a time at which teachers could make it. As you will note on the list, we had several teachers scheduled to speak, but some of them were called away to meetings and could not make it.

I heard Assemblyman Doria mention the letters that are coming in against the bill, and we need people to write. I would just like to alert Assemblywoman Garvin and Assemblyman Doria that about three weeks ago, the NJEA did call a meeting of about fifty local leaders, teachers from throughout the State, to come into Trenton to discuss A-3974, A-3851 and the Cooperman plan.

What the teachers did that day was give up an entire afternoon to discuss the bills and to discuss the Cooperman plan. They were very, very dissatisfied with many of the provisions with the internship, and very excited about what is being proposed in the legislation. The thing they were concerned about most was that the strict standards that were put in place two years ago, finally adopted last year to start this year -- that we would see some kind of implementation. The areas, for the record, that the fifty educators who came into Trenton were most concerned about were requirements for child and adolescent development, individual differences, testing and measurements and the very relevant question of urban education. That was a major, major concern among our educators, especially with the bilingual programs.

The teachers also felt it takes much, much more than having an Einstein intellectual to deal with children in the public schools. One of the things I haven't heard mentioned a lot about today, and I just want to make the point, is that we are talking about certification of people who are going into public school systems. There is a very, very big difference when you are dealing with the public schools. The

public schools cannot select their clientele; they must deal with every single person who wants to get an education, if they cannot afford to go to a private school.

We have talked to the Commissioner about the internship. We feel it is just much, much too broad based to start out "K" to twelve, to start out on every single subject level. We have proposed an internship to the Commissioner, but we haven't heard anything from him yet on this area. We proposed that perhaps he could bring the interns into the schools, or into the districts the entire month of July, the entire month of August, and train them how to teach, just train them in the art of teaching, and then in September, the five-day orientation would help them learn where the bathrooms are, it would help them find out where the faculty room is, but they would not learn how to deal with children. We have not heard anything from him yet.

Finally, I should hope, and NJEA has voiced this and the teachers have voiced this -- that during this open debate, and we have heard the Board of Higher Education say, "Yes, we endorse an open debate on certification." We are hearing the Commissioner say that, and the Board of Education say it, and we heard it here today with this Committee. During this debate, we hope that parents, Board members and local officials will find out what the Cooperman proposal really, really is, because we have heard many liberal arts graduates come here today and discuss how you can do it in the school system. We're finding out, and many of our educators will stand up and tell you, that it takes a lot more than the subject matter. The real world is there in the classrooms, and a lot of people just won't be able to cut the mustard. Thank you very much.

ASSEMBLYMAN DORIA: Thank you.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GARVIN: Dean Esposito, would you have any wrap-up comments? (no response) If not, we would like to go home. We would just like to thank you and the members of your staff here who made this all possible. Hopefully, at some point there will be a meeting of the minds. I think that is what we are all about.

I would just like to make this comment. Our Commissioner presently has the powers that he exercised when he put in the new rules. They have not been monitored yet, even though they were

supposed to be in effect September 1. I think if we are talking about a curriculum for teaching schools, the Commissioner has the power presently to recommend curriculum, but I see the Commissioner not using the power he has, to do, perhaps, what he really wants to do. When I read the report of the Management Improvement Plan that the Governor presented to him, I just became more confused because we are talking about less money, we're talking about a very confused reform possibility, and I really do not fully understand. I think that with all the studies they have done in other states, how unfortunate that we have had a study for this State done in a closet without anyone's involvement. That is what my study commission is about, hopefully, to involve the people who are going to be affected, who are going to be responsible for implementing any proposal that comes from the Commissioner's office.

Again, I would like to thank you very much for the use of your facilities.

ASSEMBLYMAN DORIA: Thank you very much, Mildred. I would just like to close by saying that many people define politics as the art of the impossible, and define it as an art that requires a great deal of compromise. What we are saying here this evening, I think, is that there is a need to look at the proposals presented by the Commissioner of Education which did not provide for any input from the various constituencies that were directly impacted by these proposals. There is a need to look at these proposals and determine how effective they can be to improve the quality of education in the State.

There is an underlying presumption, as I see it, under these proposals that anyone with a liberal arts major has a better knowledge and has better skill at teaching than anyone who has an education degree. I do not think that presumption or hypothesis is necessarily a valid one. I think, rather, that there is some valid presentation of the fact that individuals who have liberal arts degrees can become teachers in specific areas, and there might be needs for them, such as math and science, but I do not think our changing of the entire system at this point, for the sake of change, is necessary. This is an alternative proposal we are told, but yet it is never clearly stated that this is meant to only serve a small group, that it is there to

serve the needs of maybe a few people. It is said to be for people with experience, but yet the proposal doesn't say you have to wait five or ten years to take advantage of the proposal.

There are a lot of problems which have come up such as these, which I think have to be answered. These hearings are meant to present this information to the public, and to have the public present information to us, and then to take all the information given and give it to the Commissioner and the State Board of Education, and say, "Here, this is what the people think. There are people who are very much for it; there are people very much against it, and there are those people who are trying to deal with it in a very practical sense, who say, 'What are the best parts of the proposal? How can it help the State of New Jersey, and how can we effectively develop the proposal to allow it to meet some needs such as math and science, while at the same time, not gutting the entire present teacher education system, and really undercutting all the teachers who are presently in the classrooms?'"

We cannot allow that to take place. I'm very happy we had the opportunity to be here tonight. I want to thank Mildred for her suggestion to have this hearing, because I think it was an excellent suggestion. I want to thank our Committee Aides, Kathy Fazzari and John White, and the ladies who recorded the hearing. I want to thank Fred, who represents the minority here. We are going to have at least one other hearing in the southern part of the State, to get the viewpoints of the teachers and the people there. It will be in the evening, and hopefully then we will have all of this to present to the Commissioner. We are not here as adversaries of the Commissioner. We are not here as opponents. We are not here as Republicans or Democrats. We are here as people who are interested in education. What we are saying is, we have to come up with the best solution for the State of New Jersey. But, don't degrade teaching, don't degrade teachers, don't go to the newspapers and use every ploy possible to make it look as if the present system is bad, and the new system is going to be a panacea for all problems, and that once that new system is put in, we will have the best of all possible worlds. No, that's not it. But, we are trying to find a system that is going to benefit all the children in the State of New Jersey.

I want to thank you all, and thank Dean Esposito for his cooperation, and all the staff here at Kean College. Hopefully, we will be able to come up with a solution that will benefit everybody. Thank you.

(HEARING CONCLUDED)

COMMENTS OF DR. FRANK J. ESPOSITO
DEAN OF THE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
KEAN COLLEGE, UNION, N.J.
TO THE
ASSEMBLY EDUCATION AND HIGHER EDUCATION COMMITTEES
PUBLIC HEARING OF OCTOBER 17, 1983

On behalf of the faculty of the Kean College School of Education I want to welcome you to our campus. We are pleased that you have chosen our college as a site for your hearings on Assembly Bills 3974 and 3851.

The Kean College faculty is very supportive of the active role taken by the members of these committees in raising questions about the poorly conceived proposal of Commissioner Cooperman for an alternative route to certification. The fear always exists in the education community that the State Department of Education is not interested in soliciting the opinions of those educators who have spent their professional careers training teachers.

Unfortunately, the Department of Education did not seek professional and community input before submitting the proposal. No state college or university deans were consulted prior to the announcement of the plan. Since the announcement, the Department has devalued as self-serving the views of the deans or college faculty members. It also appears that no classroom teachers were consulted in the development of the plan. By deliberately taking an "I know best" role, the Department made two assumptions:

1. That the deans would oppose the change because of their vested interest.
2. That the best route for certification reform is through the creation of conflict between districts and colleges over control of teacher education.

Both assumptions are inaccurate. Deans have expressed dis-satisfaction with the course counting transcript evaluations approach to certification for years. Complaints about this system usually fell on deaf ears in the Department of Education. The transcript evaluation approach allows students to accumulate credits from several institutions, thereby avoiding the usually much more rigorous route of completion of a State and NASDTEC approved college program.

I believe that you will find that the Deans and faculty of the Schools of Education will support - and initiate - proposals for reform. The Commissioner has badly underestimated this group.

Of course, Deans and faculty are opposed to this particular proposal. It is replete with exaggerations, illogical assumptions and inaccurately presented information. On the second assumption - that certification reform is best achieved through creation of conflict between concerned parties, the Commissioner is again mistaken. The colleges look forward to reform proposals which will call for new ways of joint college-district training and supervision of prospective teachers. We will not retaliate to his incessant criticisms of Schools of Education by attacking the capabilities of local districts. I believe that we can create joint college-district training programs and, at Kean College we will make some initiatives in this area. I also want to point out that Kean College is now preparing an institutional response to the Cooperman plan.

I would like to comment on the two bills now under consideration by these committees.

Assembly Bill 3851 would create a commission to study education in New Jersey. I heartily endorse this bill and I hope the Commissioner will reconsider his apparent opposition. The proposed commission will be able to illuminate many of the problems of image, funding, and bureaucracy which now handicap educational programs.

Assembly Bill 3974 reaffirms the intent of the Minimum Standards. While I have misgivings about legislating curricular and academic standards I can understand the reasoning of the proposers of this bill. The Commissioner is proposing an alternate plan which will, if adopted as suggested, undermine the enrollments of undergraduate teacher education programs before we have time to see the impact of the new standards.

I believe that few students will opt for the far more rigorous programs offered by colleges under the just implemented new Minimum Standards when given the option of employment after only taking a subject matter test. Although the Cooperman alternate route has been trumpeted as a means of bringing great talent into the classroom the sad fact remains that it will lower standards for entry into the profession. One might even argue that it will eliminate the career of teaching as a profession. For these reasons, I commend the legislature for their vigilance and for their concern that the vast curriculum overhaul of the past two years not be undermined and destroyed.

Let me close by saying that the problems besetting teachers today are complex. They cannot be blamed solely - or primarily - on the courses prospective teachers are asked to take. Bear in mind that the new Minimum Standards allow for a professional education major of only 30 s.h. and more than half of the 30 s.h. will be taken up by field experiences. The so-called "weak and frivolous" educational curriculum and methods courses will only amount to no more than four three-credit courses.

As we responded favorably in the past to the call for higher standards, we are also willing to rethink our present programs. However, that process should be cooperative and based on sound information and judgment. It should not be a process of conflict, innuendo and hostile disregard for the opinions of college faculty and public school teachers. We are not the enemy as conceived by the Commissioner. But neither will we stand idly by as he criticizes Schools of Education for the past failures of his own department.

We do, in fact, look forward to the further improvements in the training of teachers, and in the raising of their pay and status in society. We will work closely with you in promoting gains in these areas. By building professional coalitions for providing other alternative plans to the state board legislature and governor, we hope to place the emphasis on constructive change and well thought out alternatives to the present system of certification. The students in our schools and colleges require no less than the best we can provide.

Wednesday, September 28, 1983
and
Thursday, September 29, 1983

SUBMITTED BY:
George Stang

Meeting of Citizen Support Network

Issue: Certification

Welcome and Certification
Proposal Presentation - Commissioner Cooperman

Related Political Climate - Robert Swissler

Network Process - Jeanne Oswald

Questions and Discussion - Gus Run, Leo Klagholz

Packet Materials

- Agenda
 - Charge to network members
 - Special charge to district administrators (blue)
 - 2 bills/bill summary/list of committee members (yellow)
 - Legislative roster
 - State Board of Education list
 - Publicity piece
 - Support arguments (green)
- *included in administrator packets only

...I am calling upon you to be a key member of a special, statewide network formed to support the teacher certification proposal. Your influence and support as a local leader will play a major role in insuring that the proposal is accurately communicated and understood.

The charge to you, as a member of this group of key contact people is as follows:

1. Identify at least five individuals within your area whom you feel have an interest in improving public education. These individuals may be school administrators, teachers, local leaders, business representatives, parents, non-parent taxpayers, etc. However, they should be identified based on your feeling that they would be supportive of the certification proposal as one step to improving public education in New Jersey.
2. Contact each of these people, explain the details of the certification proposal to them, and determine if each person is interested in supporting the proposal as a member of a statewide citizen's network.
3. Explain to the supportive contacts you have established that specific action by network members will be communicated to them through you, their key contact person, during the next several months as the proposal is debated and considered for adoption.
4. Beginning immediately, the network members you have identified should be urged to:
 - A. Contact their state legislative representative for the purpose of expressing support for the Commissioner's proposal on certification.
 - B. Write or phone members of the Assembly Education Committees in opposition to A-3974 and A-3851 (see yellow sheet for names, addresses and brief description of bills).
 - C. Share the details of the proposal with friends, organizations, civic groups, and associations they belong to, and encourage others to contact their legislators or express support to members of the State Board of Education.
 - D. When legislators and other public officials in their area express support for the proposal, contact them and express agreement.

1. When legislators and other public officials in their area express opposition to the proposal, contact them and express reasons for support.
2. Write letters to the editor for daily local newspapers (see press information included).
3. Write letters to the editor for local weekly newspapers.
4. Encourage supportive editorials in local papers.
5. Remind your network people that you will be contacting them as needed with additional action to take.
6. At 10:30 a.m. on October 3, 1983, a special joint public hearing will be held in the Assembly Chambers by the Assembly Education Committees. The hearing was scheduled to provide public input on two bills recently introduced to block the Commissioner's certification proposal (see attached bills and yellow sheet).

You are encouraged to attend these hearings and speak individually with legislators in support of the Commissioner's certification initiative and against these two bills. Those of you who wish to testify before the committee should phone the General Assembly at (609) 292-1646 to be scheduled for testimony.

Your contribution, and that of the network people you identify, will play a critical role in the improvement of public education in New Jersey.

CERTIFICATE: Instructional

ENDORSEMENT: Teacher of Elementary Education

AUTHORIZATION:

This endorsement authorizes the holder to serve as elementary school teacher in grades kindergarten through eight in all public schools. Teachers with elementary endorsements are not permitted to devote more than one half time to teaching art, music, health, home economics, industrial arts, or physical education in the elementary grades. Teachers with elementary endorsements are authorized to teach the common branch subjects such as reading, writing, arithmetic, and spelling in the secondary school, grades seven through twelve.

REQUIREMENTS:

- I. A bachelor's degree from an accredited or approved institution
- II. Successful completion of one of the following:
 - A. An approved program-- a college curriculum approved by the New Jersey State Department of Education as the basis for issuing this endorsement. (See listing of New Jersey colleges and universities offering approved programs.)

OR

- B. A program of college studies including:
 1. General Education
 - a. 45 semester-hour credits in the following areas. Starred (*) areas are required.

| | | |
|-------------------------|--------------|-----------------|
| *English | *Mathematics | Psychology |
| Fine and practical arts | Music | *Science |
| Foreign language | Philosophy | *Social studies |
 2. Specialization
 - a. 24 semester-hour credits in education including study in at least four of the following areas. Starred (*) areas are required.
 - 1.) *Methods of teaching each of the following:
 - a.) Creative arts
 - b.) Health and physical education
 - c.) Language arts
 - d.) Mathematics
 - e.) Reading
 - f.) Science
 - g.) Social studies
 - 2.) *Educational psychology or equivalent
 - 3.) *Human and intercultural relations
 - 4.) Curriculum, foundations of education, student personnel services, field experiences
 - 5.) Electives
 3. Student Teaching
 - a. An approved student teaching program in addition to the specialization requirement.

or

Elementary Education (Cont.)

b. One of the following:

- 1.) Three years of acceptable teaching experience in a recognized school, *or*
- 2.) A regular, valid out-of-state certificate and official evidence of one year of successful teaching experience, *or*
- 3.) College-supervised classroom teaching under a substandard certificate approved by the New Jersey State Department of Education.

4. Reading

- a. 6 credits or 2 courses

NOTE: Endorsement on instructional certificate

- a. A teacher holding a regular New Jersey instructional certificate in another field, who presents methods of teaching in each of the following areas, will be eligible for an elementary endorsement:

- 1.) Creative arts
- 2.) Health and physical education
- 3.) Language arts
- 4.) Mathematics
- 5.) Reading
- 6.) Science
- 7.) Social studies

APPROVED PROGRAMS:

The following New Jersey colleges and universities offer approved teacher education programs for this endorsement:

Caldwell College: U
Centenary College for Women: U
College of St. Elizabeth: U
Fairleigh Dickinson University: U & ND
Felician College: U & ND
Georgian Court College: U & ND
Glassboro State College: U & G & ND
Jersey City State College: U & G & ND
Kean College of New Jersey: U & G & ND
Monmouth College: U & G
Northeastern Bible College: U
Rider College: U & ND
Rutgers - Camden College of Arts and Sciences: U & G
Rutgers College: U
Rutgers Graduate School of Education: G
Rutgers - Livingston College: U
Rutgers - Newark Campus: U
St. Peter's College: U & ND
Seton Hall University: U & G
Trenton State College: U & G
Upsala College: U & ND
William Paterson College of New Jersey: U & G & ND

U - Undergraduate G - Graduate ND - Non-degree

*required areas

KEAN COLLEGE TEACHING PERFORMANCE CENTER

Student Teaching Competency Evaluation
Instructions

I. TIMELINESS AND METHOD OF DISTRIBUTION

COOPERATING TEACHER

- A. Midway through the student teaching experience, the cooperating teacher should complete a Student Teaching Competency Evaluation Form. The content of the report should be discussed with the student teacher. A copy should be given to the student teacher, and the college supervisor should be given the remaining copies.
- B. During the penultimate week of student teaching, the Final Student Teaching Competency Evaluation Forms should be completed, discussed with the student teacher and college supervisor, and copies should be distributed in the same manner as described above.

COLLEGE SUPERVISOR

- A. Midway through the student teaching experience, the college supervisor should complete an evaluation form. A copy should be given to the student and cooperating teacher. Copies of the cooperating teacher's report should be collected and read, then delivered with the copy of the supervisor's report to the Teaching Performance Center.
- B. During the penultimate week of student teaching, the Final Evaluation Report should be completed, discussed with the cooperating teacher and student teacher, and distributed in the same manner as above.

II. RATING SCALE

- A. Scale – Utilizing the scale below, please circle the appropriate numerical value next to each competency:

5 Outstanding; 4 Above Average; 3 Competent; 2 Below Average;
1 Unsatisfactory; N No Evidence

- B. Scale Standards – A student teacher must receive a minimum achievement level of “competent” on all behaviors to pass student teaching and be recommended for certification.

The term “competent” for the purpose of this report means acceptable work performed by an average student teacher. The term should not be equated to a measure of in-service professional performance.

The use of the symbol “N” means that no evidence of a particular competency has been observed by the cooperating teacher or the college supervisor. The supervisor should confer with the cooperating teacher to determine whether competencies in question were met at times when the supervisor was not present. Should an “N” appear on the supervisor's final report, the student teacher may not pass student teaching.

KEAN COLLEGE TEACHING PERFORMANCE CENTER

Student Teaching Competency Evaluation

FOR NEW JERSEY TEACHER CERTIFICATION

COLLEGE SUPERVISOR'S

PLEASE WRITE HEAVILY TO RECORD THROUGH ALL COPIES

MID-EXPERIENCE REPORT _____ FINAL REPORT _____

Name of College Supervisor _____

Student _____ Curriculum Major _____

Building/School _____ School System/Agency _____ Subject/Grade _____

Name of Cooperating Teacher _____ Date _____

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Demonstrates a working knowledge of the basic content areas of his/her major field. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N |
| 2. Demonstrates ability in the basic skills of written and spoken English. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N |
| 3. Demonstrates knowledge of human development including the social, physical, emotional, intellectual, and aesthetic aspects. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N |
| 4. Demonstrates knowledge of learning theory. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N |
| 5. Demonstrates the ability to identify and prescribe solutions for specific teaching-learning problems. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N |
| 6. Demonstrates the ability to plan for instructional activities and write suitable lesson plans in advance of the lesson. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N |
| 7. Demonstrates a working knowledge of the tools of teaching such as instructional materials, audio-visual hard and soft ware, and print and non-print media. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N |
| 8. Demonstrates the ability to effectively manage a classroom. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N |
| 9. Demonstrates competence with a variety of teaching strategies and styles. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N |
| 10. Demonstrates the ability to communicate effectively with students. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N |
| 11. Demonstrates the ability to motivate learners. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N |
| 12. Demonstrates the ability to cooperate and develop rapport with others. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N |
| 13. Demonstrates a commitment to all assigned responsibilities and professional expectations. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N |
| 14. Demonstrates the ability to be self-analytic and to accept constructive criticism. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N |
| 15. Demonstrates a sensitivity to human and intercultural relations. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N |
| 16. Demonstrates the ability to assess learning outcomes. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N |

COMMENTS:

(CIRCLE ONE ON FINAL REPORT ONLY)

MARK: **SATISFACTORY** **UNSATISFACTORY**

11x

Signature _____
COLLEGE SUPERVISOR

Testimony on Assembly Bills A3974 and A3851

Dr. D. D. Osheroff, AT&T Bell Laboratories

I am head of the Solid State and Low Temperature Physics Research Department at AT&T Bell Laboratories. As a professional research physicist I am deeply interested in science education in this country, and am active as a member in the Bell Laboratories Science Education Club as well as the Plainfield Science Center. I have given numerous lectures for local K12 student populations, and through professional recruiting activities have kept in close contact with undergraduate and graduate physics populations throughout this country as well.

I am addressing this committee today not as a representative of AT&T Bell Laboratories, but as a citizen who is concerned with the status of public education in this state. I will restrict my comments to the needs in math and science education in our schools because this is my area of expertise; however I do not wish you to infer that I do not perceive similar needs in other subject areas as well.

Enrollments in physics courses at the high school level have been on a steady decline in this country. This decline has been paralleled by an increase in the percentage of professional physicists we are training who come to study physics in this country from abroad. In 1982 40% or nearly one half of all entering graduate students seeking an advanced degree in physics in this country received their secondary education abroad. That American educated students are failing to compete with foreign trained students for positions in American universities is indicative of two failings: 1) Our students are not bothering to obtain the necessary course training they need in math and science, and 2) those who are taking the courses are not being taught what they need to learn. I believe both these failings are related to the critical shortage of qualified math and science teachers in our schools today. Moreover, one cannot replace a knowledgeable science or math teacher with a history or english teacher. When a poorly prepared teacher attempts to instruct a high school science class his ignorance in the subject matter and his inability to properly answer thoughtful student questions is painfully evident. Students lose respect for such teachers and course enrollments drop: No number of education credits nor the best pedagogic techniques can save a classroom in which the teacher knows less than his students. Yet our teaching colleges are not producing nearly enough trained science teachers to eliminate the current shortage, irrespective of their subject matter training.

The answer to the current shortage of science educators in this country must come and to a large extent is coming from outside the teaching profession. It is a frequent observation that truly great science teachers often start with a love for science and for one reason or another discover a love and a talent for teaching. This is not to say that excellent science teachers cannot come from teaching colleges, but that potentially important numbers of them will always acquire their science training as university science majors or through informal reading and self instruction.

My view of the Cooperman proposal, "An Analysis of Initial Certification," is very positive. I consider this thoughtful analysis to be timely and impressively thorough. It recognizes many needs in our current educational

system and attacks these needs decisively. The recognized need to assure competency in subject matter, and at the same time the realization that we are and must continue to draw on as broad a basis as possible to obtain adequate teaching candidates is a paramount feature of the commissioner's proposal. Yet at the same time the proposal acts to insure that these candidates are uniformly given a thorough and effective internship, supervised by a group of professional educators who have a vested interest in the successful training of the intern: his teaching colleagues and administrative associates.

Given the enormous needs and deteriorating condition of public K12 education in this nation I do not feel we can afford to forestall or block implementation of this program, as assembly bills A3974 and A3851 would effect. I therefore urge that these bills be defeated and that full legislative support be given to the commissioner's program.

COUNCIL OF NEW JERSEY STATE COLLEGE LOCALS



NJSFT-AFT/AFL-CIO
420 CHESTNUT STREET
UNION, NEW JERSEY 07083
201-964-8476

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

October 17, 1983

Honorable Members
Assembly Higher Education Committee/Assembly Education Committee
CN-042
State House
Trenton, New Jersey 08625

RE: Assembly Bill 3851

Dear Members of the Committee:

The Council of New Jersey State College Locals endorses the goals of Assembly Bill 3851. But it must be amended to include a representative of the American Federation of Teachers as a member of the commission.

The Council of New Jersey State College Locals represents, as the members of the committee are aware, the faculty and professional staff at the nine state colleges. Thus the Council represents the majority of the organized teacher educators in this state. Those teacher educators are intimately involved in the creation and implementation of quality programs in teacher education in this state.

Not to include on the commission the representative of teacher education faculty at the State Colleges would have meant that the proposed commission would not be the benefit of the expertise of those most involved with the training of the state's future teachers and the American Federation of Teachers.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads 'Marcoantonio Lacatena'. The signature is written in black ink and is positioned above the typed name.

Marcoantonio Lacatena
President