

1000 0000 7672

have and it is the one that brings us here together in Nashville, Tennessee is the question of will the reform movement serve adequately all children or just the most advantaged.

It is my own opinion and it is a stomach cramp, I can not prove what I am about to say but I have a hunch that it is right. The reforms have been working fairly well for the schools that are already well stabilized and have certain advantages themselves. That is, they have tightened structures and sharpened purposes within institutions that are already working rather well.

Where would I draw that line? Perhaps 55-60% of the schools I think are responding to various degrees of positiveness to the reform movement. What I worry about, I guess that is why we are here today, is that it is my own opinion, reform movement is pretty largely bypassed. The urban schools as well as some of the schools that serve the rural poor is where the pressures are most acute. So we have a reform movement that serves schools that need reform and renewal the least. If we do not find a way to develop what I would consider a radical new agenda, for the renewal of the urban schools, I believe this reform movement will have failed at its most essential task. And history will not look kindly on our efforts where we have simply directed them for the benefit the most advantaged. I think the nation will be, in turn, imperiled.

During the last 8 months we at the Carnegie Foundation have been in six urban cities across the country looking at the schools. This has not been an exhaustive study, it has been more descriptive investigative in its nature. question that I just raised. Is the reform movement working in the cities or is it simple focused on those who seem most able to respond. My conclusion is even more deeply rooted now than it was 8 months ago.

The urban schools are deeply imperiled and, as far as I can see, the strategies that we have introduced are not adequate to the problem. There are no easy answers. If there were, we would have found them long ago. I do have 6 priorities to suggest as a framework for our discussion. None of these are novel. I am sure in the past 24 hours you have examined them with great care. But nonetheless, I repeat them to give you some sense of the priorities that I think we share. The overriding conviction that I have is first that there is no way to talk about urban education without confronting the problems of the poor. Poverty and education are inextricably tied together and this nation could never hope to talk about these schools if we do not confront the really tragic almost obscene problems among our little children.

Understand that one out of every six in this country defined as poor are children under six. I think it is a national disgrace that we have seen that number increase by one-third in

creative. We have focused more on the institution, bureaucracy, and funding than on people. That is not surprising, since the reform movement has been driven more by governors and legislators than by educators. This is not a reform movement that has been led by the professionals in education. It has been a reform movement led by governors, and by corporate leaders.

I do not say that with hostility, in fact, I say it with commendation. I think we should indeed express enormous gratitude that some of the most vibrant and creative thinking that has been going on has been at the governors' level in this nation, certainly not in Washington. But governors' level is another matter. I think that is where the most interesting political activity is going on. So it is understandable that most of the responses have been, in my judgement, more regulatory because that is what legislators do. They know how to regulate. It is not their job to talk about professional renewal, that is the educators' job.

I would hope that when we get to Phase 2 we would move beyond the regulations, that we would return to what I consider to be the most fundamental questions: What should we be teaching? We had more Carnegie units but we have not inquired into the content of the curriculum to be studied. How can we not just regulate but renew the teacher and focus on the losers but not just the winners? Finally, how can we evaluate the results? I think perhaps the most important, and I would say in some respects the most disturbing aspect of the reform movement, is the almost mischievous way we have avoided the simple question of evaluation. And I fear that we drift into a formula to evaluate schools and teachers and students which will measure that which matters least and derail the reform movement by defining the purposes of school within the narrow confines of rigidity of testing.

And if we do not become more creative in methods of assessment that recognize the full potential of each child, I feel we will have perhaps lost. We will have perhaps won the battles but lost the war. Because in the end, alas, we educate in terms of what we measure. The assessment perhaps more than any other criterion determines priorities of education.

I will not get into the mischief being done about the abuse of the SATs or the forcing of early learning into very narrow categories of classified assessment. The point that worries me the most is whether we are going to evaluate children broadly or narrowly and whether the reform movement will be smart enough to confront the hard and essential issue of evaluation. I am sure that some of you may know the work of Harold Gardner at Harvard who reminds us that children not only have verbal intelligence but also have intuitive intelligence, facial intelligence, and a social intelligence. Yet our measuring instruments are horse and buggy, which do not in any way begin to tap the broad potential of our learners. The last word that I

the past decade. I consider it shocking almost unspeakable neglect that for the past decade we have not had at the national level as the highest priority, the confronting of poverty among our children. Related to that is the tragic fact that the lack of nutrition among teenage mothers who are pregnant and their little children, I am convinced there is an absolute connection to school performance later on.

The Task Force report of the Harvard School of Public Health two years ago documented, it seems to me, the issue. Mothers and children who are nutritionally deprived will in later years be intellectually and academic deficient. We do not understand the linkage then between feeding the minds of little children in anticipation of good schooling we have failed to make a linkage which I believe is absolutely crucial. My wife is a midwife, delivers babies including five of our own grandchildren. She has been working in urban areas with teenage mothers and endlessly tells the story of instructing adolescent pregnant girls about their bodies and even during childbirth between labor pains explaining to them what is going on in their own bodies.

PRIORITY ONE

Lack of understanding of mothering, feeding little children soda pop and potatoe chips and expecting they will have developed adequately the physical and intellectual strength they need for schooling is, to me, the crises we face. We can not talk about urban schools without going back to priorities. If I had one recommendation of reform, I would say, start talking about nutrition. The top priority is full funding of the child nutrition programs in Washington, D.C. Winston Churchill said on one occasion that there is no finer investment for any society then putting milk into the mouths of little babies. I say this not casually, I believe there's a far higher priority than putting weapon systems into space. If we do not understand that priority we do not understand the future of this nation.

So, I do not feel embarrassed coming to a conference on education and talking about nutrition and talking about poverty. I'm sure we're talking about long term solutions.

PRIORITY TWO

Clearly we are going to have to give priority to pre-school and early education.

I am convinced that the early years are profoundly more important because it is there that the foundation will be layed. Not that we cannot compensate later on, but I do not know that we can fully compensate for it. Surely the job is far more difficult in the later years. I think the time is not far off when pre-kindergarden programs will be available for three and four year olds, as the governors themselves recommended. Did you ever think you would live to see the day when governors would urge

schools to enroll students who are three years old? Incidentally, may I say, this part of the explanation for this I think, of the report from the governors was perhaps the most enlightened. I might even add the most important statement in education that has been released in the past 10 years. It spoke in imaginative and creative ways about pre-school programs that seem to me to be absolutely crucial. One of the reasons has to do with nutrition and early learning. The other has to do with the change in calendar. The point I am making now is that I think we must give top priority to pre-school and early education, that also involves the parents.

There is a national movement now that involves parents as teachers at a very early age, that is for the children at an early age. The state of Missouri has now launched what I think is a model program, they are enrolling parents in these programs when their children are first born. I think it should be a national policy that would give time off from work for parents so they could in turn participate in the education of their children. If we give time off to vote and to serve jury duty and on occasion days off to go to school. I think also, we need to reorganize the first years of school. I would like to see us reorganize kindergarden thru grade four into a non-graded unit in which children would not be moved along chronologically but would be moved primarily on the basis of their linguistic proficiency. The focus would be on language and language development in the early years. In the basic school it would be non-graded.

The focus would be on saturation and the reading of stories, the telling of stories, the writing of stories. The arts as well. Certainly there would be no more than 15 children for every one teacher. Here again, that is what they recommended in the governors' report and I think it is absolutely necessary. You cannot have urban grades of 20 or 30 children and expect a teacher to give anything close to personal attention. So, if I had my way as secretary of reform, I would reorganize the early years and have a basic school non-graded. I would insist that there would be no more than 15 students for every teacher and that there will be great priority to proficiency and language.

PRIORITY THREE

The day is not far off when we will have to reorganize both the school day and the school year in order to reflect the changing work and family patterns in the nation. The truth is that when the current school calendar was organized a hundred years ago almost all families were living on a farm. The children had the summer off in order to help tend the crops. We are living with an obsolete school model that does not fit the reality of family or work life. Today, almost all families have parents who are working and many are single parents. Keep in mind that the school carries not just an educational but a custodial function. It seems to be absolutely clear that between now and the year

1000 0000 7672

2020 we will have a radically reorganized school calendar that will reflect the reality of both the changing work and custodial obligations of the school rather than nine months off and summer hiatus or the school day arranged from eight to two.

I see the urgent need to have afternoon enrichment programs in every school optionally available for any family where the child is not cared for afternoons to avoid this terrible latch-key problem or stated more directly, street drift problem in the urban school and in the urban community.

I also think we need an enrichment program in the summer for children whose parents are not able to buy such help. The reason I argue strongly for these afternoon and summer enrichment programs is if we do not provide these as public policy we're going to once again see a great division between the haves and the have nots in this nation. It is off to summer camp, it is babysitters, it is all the rest. It is the poor children who are deprived.

I would argue strongly for a new chapter in the elementary secondary education act that would provide federal vouchers for every parent, every poor parent, so that they could, in fact, secure afternoon enrichment services and summer services for their children if they are not cared for otherwise.

For the middle and upper income families vouchers should pay for these services and not load them on the current complicated school budget. If we don't find ways to educate the children instead of having them drift I think we will have simply extended the growing gap between the haves and the have nots in the nation.

To show you this difference between school and work calendars in family circumstances I did visit, six months ago, a school in the lower East Side Manhattan where they get the children every morning about seven o'clock and return them back to their hotel homes at six thirty in the evening. They have three meals at the school. The school is literally a surrogate family for these children. Now I'm not describing any of this with joy, but it's too late for us to be naive about the simplicity of the American Family, especially when we're talking about the urban schools and it's high time we start adjusting our public policies to accommodate the changing school and family pattern of the nation.

My own dream would be that on the school calendar, instead of nine months and then three months off, to tend the crops, we might have shorter terms of three months and then a week to ten days of interruption and then another term and during that week to ten days of interterm. That would be a great time for teacher renewal and teacher development.

1000 0000 7672

PRIORITY FOUR

This priority has been talked about so often that it is certainly a center piece in the recent report from the council of corporate leaders which I thought was a bold and dramatic statement overall. I think we must find ways to break up structurally the large school units into smaller centers. It has gotten to the point where I can hardly walk into some of these warehouses we call schools. They are frighteningly crowded impersonal places. If I were to choose one illustration of the breakdown of the urban school, it is the fact that as these students move into junior and senior high school they become faceless and nameless at the very moment they need their identity established. Again if I were secretary of reform, I would insist that the one test to be met is that every student must, thru all of his or her education, be known and supported by at least one adult as a human being. So I would break up these large schools and would call them small academic villages. I would be willing to rent quarters in any place in town. I would padlock most of the old buildings which should have been blown up many years ago.

When we talk about urban renewal, you know what we have renewed? We have renewed the banks and the shopping centers and the restaurants and we have left these dumps we call schools stand there as relics of the past. We have had children in schools that no bank would run for two days. We close up the hotels as obsolete and yet that is where we expect our children to go and then we wonder why they judge us in terms of the lack of priority we give the school.

PRIORITY FIVE

The fifth priority then, is to create transition schools to combine service, work and learning. I think we need more flexibility in the relationship between schooling and work outside. It is really shocking to me young people seventeen and eighteen years old are still being housed in schools from eight to three just as they were when they were four years old and five years old.

I would like to see the schedule in the upper grades, by that I mean the last two years of high school, converted into a transition school in which they can spend part time in school, part time in service, perhaps part time in work, or as it's been done so successfully, part time in taking college courses.

Also that flexibility should provide for reentry, easy reentry. What we have now is an arrangement, once you leave you become an unknown, no way to get back into the system. Young people should be able to react to this. Especially young mothers who have perhaps dropped out because of childbirth.

1000 0000 7472

PRIORITY SIX

Again this priority has been stated so often, the Carnegie Forum Report spoke of it so splendidly, and that is we are not going to have better schools in the urban areas until we give more autonomy and more accountability to the local schools. They go together.

What we have now is an attempt to impose more regulatory obligations but less autonomy, and it will not work. It will simply defeat the most gifted and enterprising teachers and drive principals to despair. What we have done, you see, is try to impose regulations on the input. What I am suggesting is we give full freedom or great freedom to the school but hold them accountable on the basis of outcomes, and define those outcomes very clearly.

I would add one other point. We need a take-over arrangement if in five years that school has not found an answer. We need to have an intervention arrangement that would, in fact, dismiss the principal and provide for supervisory oversight. The endless neglect of children over 5 and 10 years is socially unacceptable. It is a national disgrace, and if a school, year after year after year is not able to educate the children, it cannot be allowed drift. It calls for intervention, carefully guided to be sure, based on criteria that have been well established.

Well, those are a few thoughts, weighty notions on a Saturday morning in Nashville, Tennessee. There is nothing new or novel in what I've just been saying. Is there any good news? I think there's great good news because, as far as I can tell, we are all agreed that the problem is very urgent. And as far as I can tell we all rather agree on the strategies to be accomplished. Now that's terrific. Is it possible that we would have an unwillingness to act? It's unthinkable that this nation would not make every effort possible with the same urgency as a moon shot to say that by the year 2000, which will be the year that those children entering kindergarten will graduate, that by the year 2000 every child in this nation will have quality education.

And I think to do anything less will imperil the future of our democracy.

I understand that we are to have a few minutes of questions or comments. I will be happy to respond to anything you have to say.