THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION

THE FUTURE OF CHILDREN

A BROOKINGS INSTITUTION-WOODROW WILSON SCHOOL PARTNERSHIP

EXCELLENCE IN THE CLASSROOM:

IMPROVING THE QUALITY OF TEACHING IN AMERICA'S SCHOOLS

Washington, D.C.

Wednesday, March 28, 2007

INTRODUCTION:

RON HASKINS
Senor Fellow, Economic Studies;
Co-Director, Center on Children and Families
The Brookings Institution

OVERVIEW:

BRIAN JACOB
Assistant Professor of Public Policy, Harvard University;
Visiting Professor of Public Policy, University of Michigan

PANEL ONE

MODERATOR:

RON HASKINS
Senor Fellow, Economic Studies;
Co-Director, Center on Children and Families
The Brookings Institution

PANELISTS:

THE HONORABLE GEORGE MILLER
Congressman, Democrat - California
U.S. House of Representatives

THE HONORABLE MICHAEL CASTLE
Congressman, Republican - Delaware
U.S. House of Representatives

PANEL TWO

MODERATOR:

JENS LUDWIG
Assistant Professor of Public Policy, Georgetown University;
Non-Resident Senior Fellow, The Brookings Institution

PANELISTS:

DEBORAH JEWELL-SHERMAN
Superintendent of Schools
Richmond, Virginia Public Schools

THOMAS KANE
Professor, Graduate School of Education
Harvard University

KATE WALSH
President
National Council on Teacher Quality

RANDI WEINGARTEN
President
United Federation of Teachers

* * * * *

P R O C E E D I N G S

PANEL ONE:

MR. HASKINS: Good morning. My name is Ron Haskins, and I am Senior Fellow here at Brookings. I would like to welcome you to our event this morning.

This is to celebrate the release of the fifth volume we have published in the journal, The Future of Children. There are copies available on the web, and this is a totally new experience for old guys like me that 90 percent of our circulation is through the web and not through actual volumes that people in the old day used to carry around and drop on their toe.

This is our fifth volume. It is on teacher quality. Of course, as has happened in the past, we are very fortunate in the timing of this event because we landed right in the middle of No Child Left Behind in which teacher quality is one of the major issues. So we are very pleased about that.

Let me also mention that tomorrow morning in this very room at 9:30, the Hamilton Project is going to sponsor another event on education, and in particular they are going to examine the role of education promoting opportunity and economic growth, an extremely timely topic. They are going to look at early education, K through 12 and higher education, and that is tomorrow morning at 9:30 in this room.

In addition to the volume, we also have published a policy brief that is

available in the back room in the shelves back there. This brief presents a specific plan that we think would be useful for producing increased teacher quality. It is very similar to another brief that also is available back there that was published by the Hamilton Project, and one of the authors of that brief is here this morning and will be on the second panel, Tom Kane, who may leave the panel because he has got to get a plane and go back to Harvard and then come back here. So we are going to be active here.

Between the two panels, we will not have a break. The first panel will leave, and the second panel will come up and take their seats, and we will start right away. Please do not, unless you are under emergency circumstances, leave the room because we are going to start right away.

My role is to moderate this first panel and to introduce the people on the panel. Let me just say I am not going to give elaborate introductions because you have extensive biographical material on all the people participating in the event, and Brookings has a tradition of specializing in short introductions. So I am going to follow that tradition.

The first speaker will be Brian Jacob who wrote one of the key chapters in the volume about how to get better teachers in inner city schools and big city schools which, of course, is a huge problem at this point. He is Assistant Professor of Public Policy at Harvard. He is visiting this year at the University of Michigan.

Then we are fortunate to have two senior and very influential members of Congress, people who have been at Brookings before, people I had great privilege to work with when I was on the staff of the Ways and Means Committee.

Chairman George Miller who is the head of the House Education and Labor Committee, Mr. Miller's influence in Washington has increased somewhat in recent months. Some of you may notice that. But actually even when he was in the minority, he was extremely influential, and I had the opportunity to work with him on many things because he was very close with Tom Downey who was on the Ways and Means Committee, and he and Tom did many things that were under the jurisdiction of the Ways and Means Committee, including crucial 1980 legislation on child protection which is still the key legislation in the nation on child protection. He also was one of the original co-sponsors of No Child Left Behind. He has been influential in the minimum wage debate. He has had a number of legislative provisions on environmental law.

Then Mr. Mike Castle from Delaware, I think you should think of Mr. Castle this way. Delaware has two Senators and one Representative. So we are fortunate today to have a man who is more important than two Senators. I had the great fortune of working closely with Mr. Castle on a number of occasions, but especially in 1990 when we passed major childcare legislation and then in 1996 when we passed welfare reform legislation. He is the Ranking Member on the Subcommittee of Early Childhood, Elementary and Secondary Education.

We are blessed to have two of the finest, most active and even intellectual plain-speaking members of Congress. Any of you who have heard them here before know how plain-speaking they are. Mr. Miller still has the all time notorious line for summarizing a policy debate here which I will not mention because I understand he got a lot of constituent mail, but I will tell you later if you want to know.

Brian?

MR. JACOB: Well, first, I would like to thank Ron and Brookings for putting on this event and to thank the Princeton-Brookings team who put together the volume including editors Susan Loeb, Cece Rouse and Tony Shorris.

The volume covers a variety of issues relating to teacher effectiveness including certification, professional development, pay for performance. I think the main contribution of the volume is it collects in one place an objective and non-technical overview of key policy issues and existing research. As authors, we are academics. The editors had a task getting us to speak clearly and in plain English and limit the amount of figures and tables. I think they did a very good job.

So rather than summarize the entire volume here, I am just going to highlight several of the key points and then a few of the policy recommendations starting with some key points about teacher quality or teacher effectiveness, some basic findings from the research.

There is an extremely wide range of teacher effectiveness, and by that, I often refer to value-added. This is defined as a teacher's ability to improve the student achievement of his or her students. This is something that all of us who have been involved with education have obviously known for years; some teachers are quite good, and others are not as good. But the recent availability of lots of micro data on teachers and students has made these analyses even clearer and starker.

At the same time, there is remarkably little correlation or little association between many of the commonly used measures of teacher effectiveness and value-added. For example, there is considerable evidence that more experienced teachers are more effective although this seems limited to the first few years. There is no doubt that third-year teachers are more effective than first-year teachers, but it doesn't seem like 10 or 15-year teachers are much more effective than third-year teachers.

Another point to note is that the differences in even this experience premium are relatively small relative to the overall differences in teacher quality among the large group of teachers. There is some evidence that teachers with higher cognitive ability are more effective. There is no evidence that teachers with advanced degrees are more effective than those without advanced degrees, and there is no evidence that traditionally certified teachers are substantially more effective than teachers with alternative certification or who are uncertified.

And so, it is no accident that the language used throughout the volume refers to teacher effectiveness as opposed to teacher quality or qualifications. I think that is an important distinction. Effective teachers are not always and certainly not only those that have the highest qualifications or commonly used measures of quality.

Another main finding is that there are shortages, teacher shortages, but only in certain circumstances. There is no doubt that in secondary math, science and special education, there are real teacher shortages in many areas. On the other hand, as I was actually surprised to find myself in the course of doing some work with the Chicago Public Schools and the Office of Retention and Recruitment there, I was surprised to find that the Chicago Public Schools have over 10 certified applicants for every one position. For example, the New York City Teaching Fellows Program, an alternative certification route in New York City, a few years ago received almost 18,000 applicants for 2000 positions, and these are for the hardest to staff areas.

What does this tell us? Well, this tells us that teacher supply is certainly important. We need to focus policies on getting teachers to hard-to-staff schools in hard-to-staff areas. But I think it also highlights the fact that teacher demand, what an economist would call demand, how schools and districts choose among their pool of applicants or candidate is also a very important issue as well.

The volume highlights a number of structural difficulties in hiring teachers

from late state budgets to restrictive collective bargaining agreements to just outdated HR systems. There is also, I think, a deeper underlying difficulty in that even today, we really -- we meaning researchers and practitioners -- have difficulty identifying who will be the most effective teacher based on short prescreening type interviews and activities that we would usually do in hiring teachers.

What are the specific recommendations coming from this volume? One is that we need to reduce the barriers to entry in the teaching profession. This, I think, largely means expanding alternative certification opportunities. The existing evidence suggests that teachers with alternative certification perform at least as well, if not better in some cases, than those with traditional certification, and these pathways certainly bring new people into the teaching profession, especially in the hardest to staff subjects in schools.

The second key recommendation is to reform salary structure. One of the most important features to that recommendation is targeting large pay incentives for highly effective teachers in hard to staff either subjects or schools, so essentially paying differentially the math teacher. The secondary school math teacher might be paid more than the third grade general education teacher. A teacher in a very disadvantaged urban school that perennially has trouble staffing would be paid more than the teacher in a more advantaged, easier to staff school.

It has been done in some districts in the U.S., but it is certainly not the

norm, although it has been tried in other countries as one of the chapters in the volume highlights. Sweden, a country with traditionally very strong teacher unions, started this tradition of differential pay in 1995. London, for example, pays teachers 12 percent more as a standard than teachers in other parts of England because of the more challenging requirements and the more disadvantaged student population in London.

I think, though, as I know Tom will highlight, it is critical that these targeted pay incentives be tied to some measure of effectiveness. This need not be, as highlighted in the volume, a purely value-added measure. I think the volume is quite objective in highlighting some of the dangers and some of the disadvantages of student achievement value-added measure, but I think one of the conclusions of the volume is some measure, tangible measure of student outcomes and effectiveness measured by student outcomes needs to be a key component of staffing.

One more recommendation is to reexamine professional development. This was an area in which the chapter concluded that there is remarkably little research that seems like it should be tremendously important and anecdotally is tremendously important, but the current structure of professional development in U.S. K-12 education is one of the most disorganized, incoherent and seemingly ineffective parts of the teacher education and schooling experience. The chapter points to several characteristics of effective professional development and cites

evidence, very rigorous controlled experimental evidence, that certain types of professional development can be effective.

So the recommendation here is not so specific but a more general one that we, as policymakers and researchers, need to focus a lot more attention on professional development than we have in the past.

Finally, one of the recommendations certainly that is probably one of the more controversial recommendations is the need to remove staffing restraints. That means making it easier to dismiss ineffective teachers, making it harder to promote the least effective teachers to tenure positions and then providing principals more flexibility in staffing when it comes to transfer provisions and other issues that have typically been decided through collective bargaining. The difficulty here, I should note, is certainly not in the broad concept. I think everyone across the political and education spectrum would agree that incompetent teachers should not be teaching. The trick, though, is how to measure this and how to balance the competing demands of fairness to individual teachers and fairness to the children that they are serving or not serving.

I think this is an issue as much as I, as an academic who would like to stay out of politics, would love to avoid. I think this political issue of staffing restraints that is clearly tied to collective bargaining agreements is an issue that just simply needs to be addressed to some extent or another in order to make progress on developing an effective teaching force.

Some closing thoughts: I think, as the volume states, there really is no one silver bullet and the effort to improve teacher effectiveness is not simply going to be a one-time initiative. It must be an ongoing initiative, both at the state and district level but also at the individual school level, and continuing research is important as we implement any of these recommendations.

I think there is unusual -- I am hard pressed to think of any policy that is so clear cut and there is such overwhelming evidence. I would advocate the entire country switching to it tomorrow with no pretense of evaluation or further work. Professional development, as we develop strategies for professional development, should be evaluated in a rigorous manner. Certainly, different methods of evaluating teachers and handling tenure decisions are fraught with a lot of complexities and should be piloted and should be rigorously evaluated, but this work needs to be done.

So this is an overview of the volume.

Have I managed to stay within my 10 minutes?

MR. HASKINS: Yes, you have, very nicely done.

MR. JACOB: Okay. I must say without PowerPoints, it was a great sacrifice on my point and took great restraint. I have actually given a presentation now without tables or figures.

MR. HASKINS: I would like the audience to know that the main confrontation we have with our speakers is always PowerPoint. They always

want to use PowerPoint, and it is not conducive to the kind of program where we are trying to have informal atmosphere.

I was very pleased near the end there when you just about got away without recommending more research, and that, of course, would have made the walls fall down here at Brookings. So I was relieved to hear that.

Now, we will hear what these two gentlemen have to say. We have asked them to speak about the volume or about the policy brief, about teacher quality in general or especially about the role of teacher quality in the debate that is ongoing now and will hopefully resolved this year on No Child Left Behind.

We have told both of them something that strikes fear in the heart of anybody who knows about procedures on the Hill, and that is that they may consume such time as they may need. So let us begin with Chairman Miller.

MR. MILLER: Well, thank you and thank you very much for this volume on teacher quality. It is the epicenter, I think, of the reauthorization of No Child Left Behind, the question of how we match the best resources we have with those students who need them the most, and it is a problem that has plagued the American education system for a long time for a whole host of reasons, some of which are referred to in this study. That is between work rules, human resource policies in districts, traditions, collective bargaining agreements, all of those things mitigate against that happening.

We are looking at, as this volume suggests, how you provide incentives for

people to make these decisions. It is an interesting idea, one which I strongly support, but I think you also have to understand that bad teachers can accept incentives too. So you have to be careful here and decide who you are going to offer these incentives to, based upon what record, what knowledge of their abilities and talents and how does that fit. If you simply ask senior teachers to go to difficult schools, a lot of people might just decide to go, and you end up with the same mix you have now. You hope that is not the case, but that is at the end of the process here.

I think, again, trying to identify those individuals who really want to teach and that are willing to pursue subject matter competency in terms of their college education, and then at the end of that process getting them to decide to teach again which is the number of steps here. A lot of people grow up with the romantic idea that they want to teach, and it sounds great. Then at the end of their college, they have graduated in biology or mathematics or whatever it is. Then they decide maybe they don't want to teach.

I think we have to think about how we identify those individuals early on. I would think as early as the beginning of college or even in high school, talking to people and then stay with them. If they are promising, if they are talented students, if they are good students, we may want to provide them some up-front assistance with their college education. The more they decide they want to teach, maybe the more assistance that we can provide them in terms of help with tuition

or forgiveness if they then decide they want to teach for four or more years. That is laid out in the Teach Act that Senator Kennedy and I have introduced and many organizations have supported to really try to increase the pool of talent and to stick with people through the process.

Obviously, if they go into teaching, we want to cure some of those problems that we see in the forms filled out by teachers when they leave the field. That is the week after Thanksgiving of their second year when they decide this just doesn't make any sense, and they are gone. What we see there is the lack of really good professional development, the isolation of teachers. They say that what teachers hate in their first three years or four years is isolation. What they love most after their fifteenth year is isolation.

We have got to figure out how to break that down so that teachers really have the ability and the opportunity to learn from good teachers in their school, from good teachers in their school district, from their principals. That is time, and time is what most teachers have. We have got to think about how we encourage districts to redesign the school day for a whole lot of reasons, whether it is an extended day concept or whether it is the ability to increase time on task for particular reasons even if it is just remedial or corrective but also to allow teachers to do their preparation, their professional development, their communications across classrooms. We can no longer continue a system where the door is closed at 8:30 and is opened at 2:30 in the afternoon.

There has got to be much greater communication so that teachers can learn and share from one another. The professional development has to be, I think, on site, certainly in district, using ongoing talents and resources in the district with outside assistance, but it really can't be a series of Saturday morning motivational speakers who take depressed teachers, get them all rapt up. They feel great on Monday morning. By Tuesday, they are back into the groove. That is just a big waste of money. It is very expensive, and I don't think there is any evidence that it works.

I would hope that we would be able to tilt No Child Left Behind toward the idea of systematic real-time professional development ongoing all the time, and I would like to see people rewarded for participating in it. I think those teachers who choose not to participate are also telling us something, and I think the districts will have to make that kind of decision.

I think that we have got to then also consider the rewarding of teachers beyond just coming to the profession, going to a difficult school but clearly teachers who are getting results. I think we have got to consider differential pay for those students. I know that people say you can't do this subjectively. It becomes political and all the rest of that. I know millions and millions of Americans go to work every day, and they are in places where they are judged. Sometimes they are given bonuses, and sometimes they are given pay increases. Sometimes they are given incentives. I am sure not all those systems are

objective and wonderful, but the fact of the matter is we do try to recognize and reward talent.

I think we owe it to teachers to do that in this profession. We all know that there are teachers who put in a lot of energy, a lot of extra time, a lot of effort into this profession. I think that we have got to consider rewarding that effort.

I also think when we talk about teachers and the reauthorization, we have to talk about teachers and principals. Again, if you go out on the ground and you talk to teachers, the principal is a very, very important person in this entire system. I think we have got to try to figure a way to encourage districts to really develop teaching teams at the school site. You can't just plug in and out of a school site without regard to whether or not you are building a team, whether they have the capacity or they have talents that are needed at that school. I think it is very important that teachers and principals make those decisions.

Again, I don't think that collective bargaining rules should allow people to automatically go to a school because of seniority either way, either to go to a school that may be easier or better or whatever it is to teach or just because that is what you want to do at that point or necessarily let you bid into a school that is in serious trouble and you are simply going to hide out there because of seniority, not an unusual circumstance in some cases.

I think that principals have got to be able to select their teams, and I think they have got to take responsibility for it, be held accountable for it. I think in

this case we have really got to ask the question: If you are a school in need of improvement under No Child Left Behind, should you have to accept a teacher that you don't think will fit in your efforts to rebuild this school and to rebuild the capacity? I question whether principals should have to accept these teachers. In some districts, that is now taking place where principals have the right to do this.

This also requires a major commitment to the professional development of principals. Too often, a principal is a bit of a lottery system, and also it is becoming a more and more difficult position to fill because of the nature of many of these schools.

I think much of what is in this report is really at the center of the kinds of changes that we have got to do. There is a very, very strong demand for a growth model within AYP so that we can reward growth. We can measure growth. We can learn from it. We can respond to it in real time in a diagnostic way to help those students and help those teachers that may be falling behind where they should be at that point in the school year, much less intrusive. I think hopefully more effective.

But if we are going to have this growth model, we have got to have someone who is going to help bring about the growth and that goes to the question of a highly effective teacher. Those two things are going to have to go together. Otherwise, we are not going to get the growth that we need for those students and certainly for those students who are not on grade level where we are

going to have to make up the deficit over a period of time to get to AYP, if you will. If growth is going to happen, it is going to have to be growth to proficiency. That, in a number of cases, is going to require making up deficits that exist, and that is going to require, again, a highly effective teacher.

I don't think we can change one part of the law without examining the other part of the law to make sure that we have a match of resources and talents to do what everybody says they want to do and what they are trying to say they think they are perfectly capable of doing. A lot of people look at a growth model as that silver bullet that will release all of the political pressure on the school districts. So far, there is not a lot of evidence that that is the case, but I do think it is a fairer way to treat schools and teachers who are, in fact, improving the lot of these students with growth during the year.

If you don't get the right amount of growth or year's growth or grade level, however you want to measure it, then you are deemed a failure. I think you can't do that to people and expect them to stay in the field.

Later on at another point, we are obviously going to have to back this whole process up into the schools of education which I think are just dismal in terms of the preparation of individuals to go into this field and to equip them and to prepare them for what they are going to encounter in these school districts.

I will stop there, and again thank you because I think that this bolsters the case for the kinds of changes that we need to consider in No Child Left Behind

reauthorization.

MR. HASKINS: Thank you.

Mr. Castle?

MR. CASTLE: Thank you, Ron. I am also very pleased to be here with you, Ron, and with Brian and with George.

I would remind George that the last time I was here for an education seminar such as this, you and I were here with Margaret Spellings and at that point, I was sort of an important person. I was the head of a subcommittee that dealt with education. I am a Republican, and George was a ranking member. We all know, those of us in the minority, ranking members don't do that much. Margaret Spellings was an aide at the White House.

Two have advanced, and one has gone backwards. Margaret is now the Secretary, and George, of course, is the Chairman of the Committee. I don't know what I am, but I am still on a couple of committees.

MR. MILLER: We are honoring the growth model, so you will be all right.

MR. CASTLE: I will be lucky to be in the audience next time the way I am going at this rate.

I am delighted to be here to share a few thoughts with all of you.

First of all, I am in agreement with practically everything that has been said today with the study that we have here. These things are all of vital importance.

Just one comment from the study, it says, a compelling body of research

showing good teachers can boost student achievement. I would doubt if there is anybody here -- I won't ask you to put up your hands -- who would doubt that. I believe that we all feel very strongly that the best examples in our lives in many cases are teachers and others who are in the mentoring circumstance, who gave us our opportunities in life. We think that is of vital importance to everybody. I think that is at the premise of what we are trying to do with respect to education.

You, unfortunately, can't deal with these things in a vacuum. You are going to have family circumstances which are going to be controlled by education of parents, by income, by a whole variety of things that are a little beyond any reach of government or a particular teacher or whatever, and we understand how difficult that can be. But I think there are many tings we can do, and we have heard them outlined well this morning.

One of the areas is teacher incentive. I am going to talk a little bit about the difficulty of doing these things in a moment, but the whole teacher incentive business is important. We have a fund that we have been actually funding in Congress called the Teacher Incentive Fund which helps with performance-based compensation systems. It is not authorized yet, but it is something we probably should be paying more attention to, I think, in terms of trying to move this forward.

I am a total believer in principals and in leadership. I have been in every public school in Delaware at one time or another, and I have always said that

when you walk into a school, you can tell almost within a minute how well that school is doing. You just get the instant feeling in the hall or the first class you go into or whatever it may be. A lot of it, in my judgment, is the principals, and I believe the principals make a huge difference in providing the leadership for the entire school. Without a good principal, it is very hard for a really good teacher to be as effective as they might be otherwise. The significance of that is something I think we have to constantly pay attention to in terms of dealing with our teachers.

Another area I just want to touch on that we are not talking about too much today is the early preparation, Head Start, for example, or early education. Most states are getting into this now. We are dealing with Head Start in Congress. I have been dealing with Head Start for some time now. We can't quite get the bill through the House and the Senate. Hopefully, under George's leadership, we will get that done. I know he considers this to be vitally important.

Those individual kids who need perhaps more help then others to get up to the starting line are something we need to focus on more in this country. Early Head Start and Head Start can do that and what the states are doing in some instances can do that as well. We really, really do need to focus on it.

The studies show that the kids who go through Head Start generally do much better than their age peers who did not go through Head Start, but they also show that after a few years, they return to the norm, and that is not good. We need to give them the extra start. We need to get them all involved, and then we

need to keep them all at a high level. That is very significant if we are going to make education as productive as we possibly can in this country.

I would like to talk about No Child Left Behind for just a moment. It is a difficult law. There are some people who just say I am against No Child Left Behind, and there are states that say we are not going to cooperate with this or whatever it may be. The truth of the matter is that most of the implementation of No Child Left Behind is at the state level, and I think the states which have met it head on and have done well and the school districts which have met it head on and done well and the principals and teachers who have done the same thing have all come out literally ahead.

I think standards and accountability are difficult. Having said that, I am not sure the standards are quite where they should be. I think if you look at NAEP testing versus where some of the testing is as far as the states are concerned, you will see that the standards are lower. The accountability methodologies are not quite what they should be. I think they need to be up to speed. I think we need some comparable circumstance there if we possibly can.

The growth models, as George has indicated, I think will be helpful. I think, as he said, the growth to proficiency is very important to understand. Growth is okay for a while, but at some point you need to get everybody to a proficient level. So it is very important that we take that step as well.

Funding is going to be a major issue. The Democrats have long argued we

have not funded No Child Left Behind to the full authorization. Maybe the authorization is not sufficient, and that is correct. Republicans will argue that that may be correct, but if you look at IDA and Title I and a variety of other federal programs, you will find the Republicans have actually funded it more than the Democrats. That is also correct. So we go back and forth, but the bottom line is funding is necessary in order to help in education, and we need to make sure we are paying attention to that as well.

The other big concern with No Child Left Behind is all students being able to be successful by 2014. That is not a goal that I would easily give up. I think the key to this is no child, and that means that we do have to reach in-- disaggregation has helped with this-- and help those kids who start further behind, who come from more difficult circumstances. We need to make sure that we keep a good goal in there in order to try to meet it as best as possibly can. We just need to figure out how to get there. Obviously, good teacher preparation, good teacher professional opportunities are very significant in terms of making sure that we do get there.

You know it is very easy for us to sit here at Brookings up here or out there and to say here is what we can do. Here is what we should do. We have got a wonderful study, and we have got a bunch of speakers who are going to say it.

It is a lot harder to implement changes in education than just saying it. I have experience as a governor, as a state legislator and as a member of Congress,

and I tried to make some of these changes, particularly as governor. I tried to extend the school year. I tried to extend the school day. I tried to have differentiated pay. I did all these things, and I had some real problems with that.

Believe me, it wasn't just teachers or teachers' unions. Often, it was the administrators. It was other people in education. There was just a lot of resistance to change. If anyone thinks this is clinically easy, let me just shake you of that. It may sound good. It may even be good, but getting it done is extremely difficult.

Dealing with the unions -- and you are going to have a speaker later who will present that direct point of view -- is very important. I believe that the unions are extremely well intended. In my case, the Delaware State Education Association, the AFT, the NEA, I think they have good people and they are very well intended in terms of what they are trying to do, but they a union. They are protective of their people. Dismissal of a teacher is not something that they are that interested in. Giving that discretion to a principal or to some body is not something that they are really all that interested in doing. There are other things that they need to do to protect maybe in a proper sense in terms of what their responsibility is, but that may contrast sometimes with what is needed as far as good teaching is concerned.

So we have to deal with that, and I think frankly we have to learn how to deal with it in the political sense of making everybody at least relatively content,

not happy, not too unhappy, not too very happy but some place in the middle where we are getting the job done, but we are not offending anyone. That is a very difficult challenge, and I think you need to bring everybody into the room to do that, not just sort of mandate it from above.

I would just like to say finally about the desire to teach. We have a changing economy out there. I don't know how many of you follow that. But if you are working for a large corporation, there is a very good chance that they have said you are not going to have a defined benefit pension type plan when it is all said and done. Instead, we are going to give you an extra couple thousand dollars a year, and you can set money aside. You can have your 401K. You can have an IRA, whatever it may be. You have got to provide for your own retirement. You may have to provide for your own health care as well.

As far as I know, almost all teachers in this country benefit from a retirement plan that will allow them to retire with some sort of a defined payment made to them and probably some sort of health care.

I am going to say something else that ends up being controversial, and that is that teachers do have time off that other people don't have. Now most teachers will tell you, fine, we have time off. We have got to hold other jobs because we don't earn enough money.

I understand those arguments as well. We have all had a lot of jobs. I was a camp counselor in Maine, and it is hard for me to determine what the best job I

ever had was. It wasn't being in Congress. It was either being governor or being a camp counselor in Maine. If I was a teacher, I could still do that, but obviously I can't at this point. These are things you can do when you are a teacher.

You can argue that, well, gee, I have got to take courses or whatever it may be, but the bottom line is you do have time perhaps to do something else which could be interesting. So that is an inducement to teach. You have a set payment and benefit situation. You may have time at least to be able to work in things that other people cannot do which is important.

Look at Teach for America which has I forget how many students now, but it is amazing to see the number of applicants from the best schools in America who want to join Teach for America. At Yale and Harvard, you are talking about 10 and 20 percent of the kids are applying for this, not to go to work for Goldman Sachs or somebody like that but to go to work for Teach for America. The whole concept of that is they will teach for a couple of years and then go off and become very wealthy but still be interested in education. The surprising thing is that some of them are staying in education which is fine too, but the bottom line is you are inducing a whole group of students who might not otherwise have conventionally gone into education to get involved in education in America.

I just think there is a backlog of people who, if we can deal with interesting forms of alternative certification, can become good teachers as well.

So those are some of my thoughts about this.

We are going to be dealing with No Child Left Behind. We are obviously interested in any ideas you may have with respect to that. George is a stalwart on that. He wants to get it done as much as I do. We may have slightly different ideas about how to get it done. I think Senator Kennedy is in that same camp. I know Representative McKeon is. We need to work on that, and that is a very significant factor in terms of where education is going to go in America, although I think we would all agree that education basically is still going to be at the state and district and school level when it is all said and done.

This is a good opportunity this morning to have this discussion, to develop some of these ideas that were put forward in the study which we have before us, and I look forward to that discussion.

MR. HASKINS: Let me ask you a question about testing. Thank you.

Testing is already somewhat controversial, and I think No Child Left Behind has made it even more so. One of the key proposals in many of the plans now for improving teacher quality is to do more testing, in this case of teachers and students and how they advance. I think you referred to it several times as a growth model. Some scholars call it a value-added model. It really is quite innovative compared to when I was in education 30 years ago. We didn't have anything like this. There have been some really quite astounding results and advances in student achievement if they have good teachers several years in a row.

The question is can you imagine that with all the controversy on testing, that either you would recommend or give some incentives for schools to use these growth models, as you call them, to make decisions about who should be retained as teachers or who should be dismissed or who should be promoted as a role in merit pay as well?

The whole issue of testing and using testing and student improvement to evaluate teachers, is that going to be a part of the federal debate and can you imagine encouraging the states to take that step?

MR. MILLER: If you are going to endorse a growth model, and it is pretty clear that almost everybody on the outside of the Beltway is seeking a growth model, and we have been running this program through the Secretary's office that seems to be showing that it can work and that schools have good data systems. That is problem, and we are going to have to help school districts and states develop that data system. Today, they say there are about 27 states that have sufficient data systems to embrace a growth model.

The problem with testing today is that tests probably don't tell you what you want to know. If they do, they tell it to you very late. It is a one time assessment and a snapshot of what you are doing on that day. I think most educators believe that may not tell you everything you want to know about that student or how that student is, in fact, really doing.

What we are starting to see emerge is the use of longitudinal data on

students. The publishing companies are coming up with more and more diagnostic, formative, adaptive testing that now is used. What I think the end result would be is you would like to be able to know in real time how these students are doing this week, this month, this day. It is just a small assessment that can be embedded. If you have the technology, it can be embedded. It can tell the teacher immediately how they are doing, how the class is doing. Again, if teachers had time, then they could share that across the three third grade teachers in the school and make some decisions about those students.

That kind of testing and that kind of diagnostic capability would then start to also, if the principal would sit down and look at this data on a weekly basis, might help that individual intervene with a teacher or two or suggest that two teachers talk about how that lesson was presented this week or this day. All of a sudden, testing becomes something the teacher is interested in because it provides information. It becomes a tool for change, a tool for success, if you will.

Today, the testing just delivers a lot of bad news, but it really doesn't tell you what to do about it. Well, if you are just going to have more tests like that, I would say we will let the states do that. You know we took the states as we found them, and they really didn't design these tests with the idea that they would be disaggregating the data and they would be held responsible for it. These tests were sort of designed when governors were going to use them to say we have a world class system here. Then some kids would pass the test; they would beat

their chest about the kids that passed the test; and they wouldn't talk about the kids that don't pass the test.

I think most people now would like to get rid of that system, and they would like to move to a longitudinal, diagnostic growth model which will give you a lot of information about a school, about teachers, about principals, about whether they are working together and in real time so that you are not trying to make some massive intervention at the last minute in the last year to see if you can get this kid to grade level before the summer vacation or trying to figure out in November who you have inherited in this classroom because you don't have the information because of the lousy data systems.

Education probably is the last major American institution to engage the internet and data. Hospitals have probably moved ahead a little bit on this. Everybody else has. This is a tool that is used now all across American society to try to see how you can best deploy your assets and to understand what is taking place.

Initially in No Child Left Behind, the President said he wanted diagnostic testing. We said we wanted diagnostic testing. All we got was high stakes testing. So I think there is a world of difference in terms of how teachers, principals, administrators, others would look at this kind of testing in terms of the information and how they could really use it. We see that happening now in a number of states, very few, but more in the number of districts that really have

decided this is a positive development.

MR. HASKINS: Mr. Castle, would you support the kind of testing? I don't know. I think it would be high stakes if it is measuring teacher effectiveness. It wouldn't be one test. It would be longitudinal data over a period of two or three years to evaluate new teachers or for merit pay or for other uses. Can you imagine any federal role in helping states develop systems like that?

MR. CASTLE: Well, let me just say a couple things about all of this, Ron. First, I think George articulated all this far better than I can, and I tend to agree with him.

As a student, as a rather lackadaisical student, the one thing that motivated me was my father really motivated me, but it was tests and knowing that those results were going to get reported to home that really got me going. If it wasn't for tests, I would probably still be in first grade right now as a matter of fact. That was the one thing that kept me going. So I have never been anti-testing, not that I liked them much, but I have never been anti-testing because I know that is what I needed to inspire me.

I would be very reluctant to make testing the sole source of judgment of a teacher or a principal. I think they are important. I think when you get to the whole school level as we do in No Child Left Behind or categories and disaggregation, your numbers are sufficient that it is perfectly okay. But I think that by the luck of the draw, you may have a teacher who will have students like

me, who may be really concerned about their advancement and would be looking for something more. I think that just basic using the test to judge everything might be going a little bit too far,

For those who are dismissive of testing, I think George gave a very good answer. I think if you use testing in a broad sense, making them perhaps somewhat more subjective than they are today, I would tell you that testing really needs to be looked at. It needs a degree of expertise that has not been there. I think if that takes place, some of the judgment can be passed on in terms of how the school is doing, how the particular teacher is doing. I think it can be partially used in terms of judgment of things just beyond the student himself or herself, but I wouldn't want it to be a sole source of judgment of how a particular teacher may be actually doing.

MR. HASKINS: I think the plans presented both in our policy brief and in the one from Hamilton see testing as an important part of the teacher evaluation but not the only part.

MR. MILLER: I hope I didn't leave the impression that this would be used then to flip over and decide whether a teacher comes or goes.

I think again it gives you a level of information over a period of time, and it may be multiple years where you then decide we really have got to put this teacher into additional professional development or we have got to rearrange what we are doing here. I think that kind of information mitigates against the idea that

we are going to have one event where we are going to decide the future of this teacher which I don't think is workable. I don't think it makes sense, and you certainly can't do it from Washington, D.C. That would be the height of folly to suggest that that is what we are going to do.

MR. HASKINS: Okay, the audience, there is a question in the back. Please give us your name and remember we are all here to hear from the members of the panel. Please have short questions.

QUESTIONER: Hi, I am Tom Toch. I am the Co-Director of Education Sector, a think tank here in town.

The logic of performance-based pay, of rewarding teachers on the basis of the quality of their work is compelling. As Representative Miller suggested, that concept is used throughout the workplace in our country. But is there any evidence that it has worked to students' advantage in education?

We seem to be moving quickly towards embracing that concept, but it is not clear to me that there is a lot of research to support it. Thank you.

MR. HASKINS: Let me ask you a question, Tom. Is there any evidence that we really have a performance-based pay system any place in the country today that you can make that judgment about? I mean it is hard to judge something that is not really been tried very much at least.

QUESTIONER: Fair enough. There are a few examples around the country. There aren't a whole lot would be my quick answer.

MR. MILLER: I don't think there really is much out there to look at. When I talk to individual teachers, they don't think this is such a terrible, irrational idea. California, they had a system. When California thought it was rich for about 10 minutes, if you boosted school scores, everybody got $25,000. Well, that didn't tell you anything. You know. I mean it was nice that everybody, staff, everybody got the money. Of course, they were broke the next year.

That is not the system, but I do think that people are entitled to be rewarded. Again, your experience on the ground is that teachers are individuals, and they have different capabilities, and they have different levels of talent. They put in additional time, and some do, and some don't and all the rest of that. If I am assembling a team as a principal, I think I would like to have that available to me. I would be trying to attract talent.

I once suggested that a school ought to take their teaching budget, put it out on eBay, describe the teachers they want and see if they could get them all within that budget. I don't know.

There are a lot of talented people who want to teach, but a lot of them don't like the system the way it is currently constructed.

MR. HASKINS: Another question.

MR. CASTLE: Just a comment.

MR. HASKINS: Go ahead.

MR. CASTLE: The teachers I speak to essentially raise the question of who would judge us, and you hear that constantly. Now I don't know if that is just a way to say we don't want it, and that is how we are going to afford it, but I hear that a lot. Is it going to be a principal who may not like me that much or an administration that doesn't know anything about what I am doing in the school or whatever? You keep hearing that.

That is one of the hurdles that are going to have to be overcome before we can get into some sort of methodology of having a performance-based system. Constantly, when you raise it with those who don't want it, they are going to put that and other hurdles in front of you. That is the one I hear the most at this point.

MR. HASKINS: Right next to you there.

QUESTIONER: My name is Amy Reno. I am a policy student over at Georgetown.

My question is do you think that the High Quality Teacher provision of No Child Left Behind has widened or narrowed the possibilities for alternative certification of teachers to enter the teacher labor market and is that something that is going to be revised in this reauthorization?

MR. MILLER: Good question.

MR. CASTLE: I will have to let George answer that. He is the one in the majority now.

MR. MILLER: Nothing more frightening to a politician than a bright

young person.

I think it was a good beginning. I don't know if it narrowed or widened it. I think it said again that this is a profession. We expect you to have subject matter competency and demonstrate that in some fashion, in this case, a major or minor. I don't think you can run around having people teach subjects that they really have little or no experience or education in. That is unacceptable.

But as it says in the report, it is a pretty blunt instrument. It is not what you would choose, but it probably has helped districts and states and others say this is the minimum; we are forced to do this. I think that has helped.

I was worried in my own state. Before No Child Left Behind, we had 60,000 teachers on all kinds of provisional certificates that were supposed to be for one year. There were teachers that were on those certificates for there, four, five years. I don't think that is the way you want to run this system. I think the kids are entitled to something more than that.

We are going to struggle on this bill of how we move. We have high quality teachers. A lot of reports now want to talk about the effectiveness of those teachers. I think that is an important concept. How do you move to that and how do you do that is difficult. It certainly, I think, should be explored during the markup, but it is not easy.

MR. CASTLE: I don't think things have really changed dramatically or at all because of No Child Left Behind's provisions as far as teachers are concerned.

I think there is a movement out there to have alternative certification in the various states and school district persuasion, et cetera. So I think you see a movement that is sort of happening in this country at this point, but I don't think that is necessarily either slowed or sped up particularly by No Child Left Behind is my own view. Somebody here may have a contrary view, but that is what I think.

MR. HASKINS: One more question, a short question and short answers, right here.

QUESTIONER: I am Charlotte Frank. I am with McGraw-Hill.

The question I want to bring up is something that was talked about, schools of education, and you defined it in your own way. Lots of people would say there is a big problem. Martha Living has written extensively of that. The words used today: getting results, growth model effectiveness, growth to proficiency, continuing like that.

Are you going to do anything about looking at schools of education since they are the major source of professional development, of getting good teachers, good supervisors, getting the right leadership in the classroom and in the school and in the district?

Is there anything we are going to do other than say there is a problem there?

MR. MILLER: Well, quickly, this has been sort of a pet concern of mine or project of mine. I had one stab at it when Bill Goodling was chair of the

committee, to try to measure what was happening with the graduates of schools of education. That sort of worked out and not worked out. We had the Higher Education Act later. We have too in this act.

No, I plan to pursue this because I will tell you that in all of the conferences that I have attended, at some point in the conference, there is agreement among most of the scholars that Congressmen, you better back up and go look at the schools of education. When I talk to new teachers and ask them whether or not they have had to take technology courses, whether or not they have had to take courses on dealing with students with disabilities, very often the answer is no. It is hard for me to believe that you can go into public education this day and age and not be prepared certainly in those two areas, but there is a whole range of areas.

I led an effort again along with former Chairman Goodling. We put a lot of money into schools of education in terms of grants and loans for students that are going there. In many instances, they turn out be stepchildren in those institutions. There has been some effort to upgrade those, and there are obviously very good schools, but they are not meeting their mission overall.

MR. CASTLE: I have to agree with that. I think schools of education really do need to do better, and I think your point is well taken. We need to look at them.

I also think we need to consider the profession of teaching and I think we

need to elevate the profession of teaching. I think we denigrate it too much sometimes. I think, first of all, it is extremely honorable. As I have already indicated, I think there are benefits to it that we sometimes never count and nobody wants to talk about which are there. I think as we attract better students to go into education instead of going to Wall Street or whatever it may be, the schools of education will automatically improve to a degree. So I think it is a combination of who we are attracting to schools of education in terms of the best students we can find in America and making those schools actually better.

But we do need to focus on that. That is not something that should be ignored, and I think it is a responsibility that we should be looking at in terms of our hearings and the Higher Education Act. We invite you all back next week for a seminar on higher education.

MR. HASKINS: Please join me in thanking the members of the panel.

MR. MILLER: I have to run.

(Applause)

MR. HASKINS: I know that. Thank you very much for coming.

Please stay in your seats if you can because we are going to start the second panel right away.

PANEL TWO:

MR. HASKINS: I have to make an important announcement. I said that the Hamilton event tomorrow at 9:30 is going to be here. It is going to be at the Press Club. So if you come here, you are going to miss it. It is at the Press Club. Thank you.

MR. LUDWIG: Good morning. My name is Jens Ludwig. I am a Professor of Public Policy at Georgetown University.

It is my pleasure to introduce the second panel. Let me introduce the speakers who will give very brief opening remarks, about six minutes per person. Then we will open it up for questions and answers.

The first speaker is Dr. Deborah Jewell-Sherman. She is currently Superintendent of the Richmond Public School System. She is a member of the Advisory Board of Harvard University's Urban Superintendents Program and was recently elected as a member of the Council of Great City Schools Executive Committee.

The second speaker is Tom Kane. He is a Professor of Education and Economics at the Harvard Graduate School of Education.

Our third speaker will be Kate Walsh, President of the National Council on Teacher Quality, and the final speaker will be Randi Weingarten, President of the United Federation of Teachers.

Full biographies are in everybody's packet.

With that, everyone will just be speaking from their seats for six minutes to keep the trains running on time, and let me turn that over to Dr. Jewell-Sherman then.

DR. JEWELL-SHERMAN: Good morning, everyone.

I got to hear a bit of the conversation about No Child Left Behind or NCLB, and while we may have differing opinions about it, it certainly has made all of us realize the urgency of the conversation.

From our perspective in Richmond, public education is not a spectator sport. We understood very clearly that if we did not make substantive progress in closing the achievement gap and ensuring gains in the achievement of all students, someone else would do it for us. Most of us in Richmond who are in leadership roles started as classroom teachers, and we recognize that a knowledgeable teacher who cares about students' success is paramount to our increasing achievement.

But there has been a paradigm shift in that the era of accountability has forced us to change our focus solely from teacher inputs to student outcomes, and we acknowledge that the imperative of improving student achievement does not negate that there are other variables that figure prominently in the equation of what makes an effective teacher.

Richmond is urban district, and we grapple with every other challenge that other urban districts grapple with. We are surrounded by affluent and growing

suburban communities. We have a decaying infrastructure, a decreasing tax base and an aging citizenry often without children, and yet we still have to attract the best and the brightest teachers and provide meaningful and useful new teacher induction, find a way to compensate them fairly so that we can retain them and not just be a place where teachers are trained and then stolen away to other districts. The competition is great.

In Richmond, we are fortunate that our business community has stepped in. They loan us planes, and we fly across the country with them on those planes to job fairs, and they help us recruit. They are some of the best recruiters anywhere because they are not only selling the school district, they are selling the quality of life in an urban setting. They have also helped us to gain such incentives as celebratory activities for our new teachers throughout the year, no interest loans for housing, banking incentives, no deposits on rental. So everything that is humanly possible for us as an urban district to do to get our teachers to come, we do do.

We seek teachers who want to work in an urban environment with our students and teachers that understand the challenges that they are going to face. We use the Gallup Urban Teacher Perceiver Screener online so that we are sure that there is as good a match as possible between the candidate and what he or she is going to face. We have developed a stronger relationship with our teacher organization over the last five years, and that has really helped us hone in on those

things that attract teachers to working in an urban environment.

We partner aggressively with all manner of groups in our city because on our own, we certainly do not have the means to provide all that is necessary to garner teacher morale and higher student achievement.

We use the Harvard University tool, the Balanced Scorecard, to keep us focused on student achievement, student achievement, student achievement, and we have many indicators that we feel are also very teacher quality and effectiveness focused. For example, we have an extensive new teacher induction process. We used new teachers from previous years to serve on that, and the response that we got last year was very, very positive because we didn't only focus on content and curriculum, but teachers worked with them on survival skills and how to do the nuts and bolts. So it was content and pedagogy, and that worked very well.

I am running out of time.

I want to talk a little bit about the extensive professional development we offer in our district. We partner with all of our local universities to not only provide what teachers think they want, and we respect that. But also what we feel that they need to be effective and successful in our district. We also have our own RPS University that provides lots of incentives.

Our retention rate for teachers who have been with us five years or fewer last year was 96 percent. So we know that what we are doing is working. Our

Highly Qualified Rate for 2006 was 99.25 percent, and we are working on that. But you can see that the efforts we have made to get the right person in the right seat in each of our classrooms have really worked.

We, like other districts, have incentives for hard to fill positions: math, science and special education. We have lots of other professional development incentives that we think are making a key difference in the work that we are doing.

I would be remiss if I didn't say that when I took the job in 2002, we only had 10 percent of our schools meeting the state benchmarks for full accreditation and No Child Left Behind, and last year 90 percent of our schools were fully accredited and 87 percent of our schools made AYP. So we know that it is working, and we know that it is because of the dedicated, stellar and effective teaching corps that it is my privilege to lead.

My last statement is they are carrying the torch of excellence lit by our predecessors in the profession, and my teachers' commitment to the youth of Richmond City should be noted and celebrated by all.

(Applause)

MR. LUDWIG: Terrific, thank you very much.

Tom Kane?

MR. KANE: I am going to be speaking from a handout in the back. I couldn't resist having some piece of paper to try to organize my thinking. I have

just five points I was going to try to make.

First, the report talks about trying to get much more selective at the point of teacher tenure decisions but is somewhat ambivalent about certification requirements, whether or not to keep them. I was just going to point out for two reasons I am not sure that those two recommendations are consistent.

More selectivity at tenure time, I think will require looser pre-service requirements, and there are two reasons. One is just numbers. Given the demographics of our teaching force, over the next 10 or 20 years, we are going to have to recruit large numbers of new teachers. Many districts were already having a hard time doing that even without a serious decision at tenure time. Being more serious about that decision is going to make the pre-service certification requirements stricter, I mean more constraining.

Second, as you open up alternative routes into teaching and create a serious hurdle at tenure time if you do so, it makes less sense for people to enter a pre-service training program to begin with. Why would I put all of my eggs in that basket if a pre-service teacher training degree is neither a necessary nor a sufficient condition for a career in teaching? As you open up alternative routes, fewer people will take the traditional route. So we need to have policies that recognize the behavioral responses to what we are doing.

Second point was just on professional development. When we talk about investing in professional development, we often talk about it as ways of

remediating problem teachers, but I am not sure that that is the most efficient way for districts to spend their professional development money.

We have looked at data on changes in teachers' effectiveness from their first to their second to their third year of teaching. If what was happening was that there were some people who show up in the classroom who know classroom management skills and who are just sort of naturals in the classroom and they stay about the same level, but there are other people that lack classroom management skills and they are catching up. If that were the model, that there were some people who knew what they were doing and everybody else just needs to catch up, what you would see is over time the distribution of teachers' effects would converge. Teachers would become more equal over time.

Just the opposite happens. If anything, effects spread out. People who start out in their first year more effective grow more quickly in terms of their impacts on student achievement.

And so, do we invest a lot early on during the first couple of years while provisional teachers are on the job or do you invest a lot more after the tenure decision in people who have cleared that hurdle? We need to be clear about our strategy there.

Third, principals' interest and the districts' interest are not necessarily aligned in this tenure decision. Just providing better information and just providing information to principals on teacher assessments will not necessarily

lead to a dramatic change in tenure decisions, the degree to which principals take this tenure decision seriously. The reason is that principals on average could expect to spend four more years in a school. Even if they are interested in trying to maximize achievement or maximize the quality of the intellectual environment of the school, they are only thinking in terms of four years, but a district should be thinking in terms of 40 years.

In higher education, we have faced this same trade-off, and no department gets to make a tenure decision by itself. There is always a central oversight that flips the default, which makes it harder to grant tenure.

Fourth, that I think is fundamentally important, and I have been part of the problem in this debate in thinking about this, and it is that very often we hear that any measure of teacher performance, whether it is value-added or whether it is subjective ratings from principals or peers or parents, will have error. I and my co-authors have written some of the papers emphasizing just how many statistical problems there are in trying to measure growth, but we need to recognize that mistakes will be made in any system like this and there is no such thing as a system without mistakes.

What we should be looking for is what are the indicators that help us identify effective teachers and if there are indicators that have any information at all, even if it is noisy, we need to be using it in the decision. The reason is that after the second year, if you have decided to offer job protection to somebody

who is an ineffective teacher, that is a very costly mistake. It is a more costly mistake than being unfair to a teacher who was perfectly reasonable at the second year. Mistakes like that are the cost of job protection. So if you don't have job protection, it is easier to live. You don't necessarily have to have higher stakes at the tenure decision. But given the job protection that comes with tenure, there has to be a high hurdle or else it doesn't make sense.

Fifth and my last point is that I think it is just historical accident that we have posed value-added measures and statistical value-added measures as being in competition with more practice-based assessments like the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. I think it is the certification debate that has posed those two as opposite poles but, of course, we don't have to choose between them. That is a false dichotomy. Any assessment system for effective teachers would include both.

We have got a study that will be forthcoming in a couple of weeks in L.A., focusing on National Board Certified Teachers in Los Angeles. We asked, suppose that you had the scale score from the National Boards assessment process and suppose that you had estimates of a teacher's value-added during a few years before this assessment was going on, which or either have any predictive power in predicting how well a teacher's students are going to be doing this year? The answer is not one or the other. The answer is both.

In any sort of system, we need to be developing systems that don't focus

just on value-added alone but also don't just focus on subjective assessments alone. We need to come up with a system that includes value-added statistical-based methods as well as peer and principal-based assessments.

MR. LUDWIG: Great, thanks, Tom.

Kate Walsh?

MS. WALSH: Hi, it is my privilege to be here this morning.

It is certainly a little daunting to be told to come up with what your own thoughts might be about what to do about NCLB round two, and it brings out my most competitive nature. If I can't come up with something wholly original and then everybody reacts, oh, why didn't I think of that, but truth be told, originality has limited value in this context. There is something to be said for some consensus thinking around Washington, and there are certainly a lot of people around town, talking about the need to change the uniform salary schedule and to introduce performance pay and to use the federal muscle to persuade states and districts of the importance of doing so. I am firmly in that camp, recognizing the challenges that we face in doing so.

I think there are a couple of just very practical caveats and points I want to make about performance pay. First being that there are certainly some issues of local control in terms of the federal government stepping in and starting to pay the supplemental salaries for high needs schools and math, science and special ed. That may be something that we consider on a matching scheme with states and

districts and deescalate over time, but there is no question that that should be thought of with great caution.

There is certainly already $3 billion that we could use tomorrow that is already appropriated, and that is the Title II money which is to my thinking is largely being wasted. It is money being poorly spent at this time and could be reallocated for performance pay. It is being spent mostly to reduce class size by one or two children in a class which has absolutely no impact on student achievement. So I think that is something that Congress ought to look hard at and ask some very tough questions.

It has become a nice pot of money for states and districts to do not very much. I was at a conference yesterday, and someone asserted that states and districts right now could be doing performance pay, and they choose not to on the menu of items from Title II, and therefore one can conclude it is not desirable to them. They don't want to try performance base. Truth be told, if you set up a menu of options and you put one of them that is going to require a huge fight with the unions over, the districts are going to run the other way. If it is an option that must be embraced, that you don't have a menu of selections before you, like you can reduce class size or you can buy new computers or you can have a lot of really unpleasant meetings with your local unions, which are you going to pick? We all know which one districts chose to pick. So it is important that the federal law, if it is going to do something about that problem, make sure it is strategically

thought out.

I just want to bring to attention a little bit of a problem with teacher quality. We hear a lot about the importance of teachers, but what we don't hear which is not quite the crowd pleaser information that you don't hear so often is how few teachers meet that measure of effectiveness that we all hear so much about. Erick Hanushek, who is a rather conservative economist, has been so bold as to say that if you give a child an effective teacher five years in a row, he or she, that child can overcome the detrimental effects of poverty. That is quite a statement coming from someone like Rick Hanushek.

But what you don't hear so much about which isn't something that is received well is that only one in seven teachers is capable of pulling that off. A Child's chance of being assigned a teacher like that in one year is one in seven; over five years in a row, one in seventeen thousand. So the challenge before us as federal policymakers is how do we reduce that 1 in 17,000 down to a number that even stands a remote chance of achieving our collective goal of overcoming the achievement gap.

One of those things you can do is performance pay, of course, but the point I want to make, though, is it doesn't do anything about the supply. We simply have to address the poor supply of teachers. George Miller's words this morning on ed schools was music to my ears. Until we start holding ed schools accountable the way we think we are holding schools now accountable, I am not

quite sure why ed schools get off the hook. If there is one good reason to use value-added and to make sure that every state in the United States has the ability to do value-added and match teacher and student records, it is to trace the graduates of an institution back to the teacher prep programs and hold them accountable for producing results and start shutting down, if necessary, some of the 1,400 institutions in the United States that continue to provide us with so many teachers.

As Brian pointed out, Chicago has 10 certified teachers applying for 1 spot. We do not have 10 high quality teachers applying for 1 spot, and we are lucky if we have 1. Part of the next round of NCLB, not just HEA but NCLB, is incumbent upon us to think about the supply of teachers and how they get there.

Thank you.

MR. LUDWIG: Great, thank you.

Finally, Randi Weingarten.

MS. WEINGARTEN: There is actually a lot that I want to say, so I will say it really, really, really quickly. If you remember four things that I say and then you will ask me these questions.

Look, my experience is from the ground, and the more I hear about theory, the more actually angrier I get because theory and practice are totally, totally different. Number one, you have to really think through the practical application and the consequences, both positive and negative, both intended and unintended,

of any kind of theory that somebody hoists on a school system or a school district or a school. We have seen that over and over and over again.

A perfect example is using student test scores to evaluate teachers. I just wrote an article about this for the *New York Times* which is attached, I think, to all of your packets. That is number one.

Think through the consequences. I am tired of hearing people, who don't spend any time in schools anymore, talk about how to be tough on teachers. That is why I was so respectful of what you just said in terms of what is going on in terms of Richmond and how that is working. That is number one.

Number two, the real issue in teacher quality these days, and this is coming from a local president who just worked with Mayor Michael Bloomberg to hugely ramp up teacher salaries under the Uniform Salary Schedule, which is not so uniform by the way, and both the mayor and I will say that New York City probably has the highest quality teaching force we have had since the mid-seventies, since we lost the captive labor market of females.

So after doing that, what we are seeing over and over and over again is retention is the issue, not the issue, with all due respect, of tenure decisions. We lose, and Lankford and others have said this as well, we lose routinely 35 percent to 50 percent of our new teachers in the first three to five years. It is a huge amount of money that we spend training, mentoring. Whether that money is spent wisely or not wisely, we lose a huge amount of money and a huge amount of

talent because people are leaving. Good people are leaving because of the conditions or the support, lack of support, on and on and on.

I want to get to the tenure issue, but the issue of retention and keeping good people is far more important than the issue of the one or two or five teachers that get tenure inappropriately.

Number three, collaboration, and I think the Richmond superintendent said it better than I could. When you have real collaboration, not make-believe collaboration, then people on all sides take responsibility. Education is a very labor intensive endeavor, and you need people everywhere to take that responsibility, not to do what Richard Parsons used to call -- I love this term, that is why I use it a lot -- malicious compliance. The worst thing you can do in schools is you can have somebody top-down tell you all the things that you should do. You know what happens is teachers kind of sit there with their hands like this, because teachers by nature are very polite, and they sit there and they say, sure, fine, yes, right.

That is not what you want of teachers. You want teachers, every single day to say: What can I do? What can I do? What can I do? How can I do this better? Let me pull you in and say let us meet for five minutes in between our classes to figure this out.

That is what you want. That is why collaboration becomes so important, and it has to be embedded in all sorts of different levels.

So, retention, collaboration, think through the consequences.

Last thing, teachers -- teacher believe. A belief system is really, really, really important. A teacher's belief system is based upon fundamental fairness and based upon wanting to make a difference in the lives of kids. The notion of using some incentive measures that work on Wall Street is totally and completely antithetical to who teachers are as people. If teachers wanted to be on Wall Street, they would be on Wall Street. Most teachers want to make a difference in the lives of children and want to have basically the following social contract which is you treat me fairly, I will work really hard.

Now that doesn't mean we shouldn't have incentives. There are a whole bunch of incentives we should have, but the incentives have to have a notion, have to have some connection to what will actually incentivize teachers as opposed to what will turn them off. That is the kind of stuff that we should be doing in terms of focusing on teacher quality.

Now, we have done a ton of things in New York City that have worked, most of which have been done pre-Chancellor Klein. For example, the best situation we had was when we created the chancellor's district. We did several different things that realigned staff in a way. We increased pay in these hard to staff schools by 15 percent. We increased time by about 40 minutes a day. We used half the time for professional development, and we used half the time for tutoring. We tutored the kids that were falling behind. We lowered class sizes,

and we did all sorts of other things in terms of parental engagement.

And what did we do? Within one year, we changed the "maldistribution" of teachers in those schools. One year, we changed that fully. Within two years, we were routinely getting schools that had never done well for kids off our low performing school list and in ways that they have been created really, really good schools.

So I am actually quite optimistic that we can do things, but we have to do it listening, listening, listening to what teachers need and teachers say and then doing some of the hard stuff.

The last thing I will say is on tenure. We just did a contract change in New York City and got a 90 percent ratification on this contract change. It included a percentage increase but it included something on tenure. What we said was this: It was basically that I had said a couple of years ago, let us police our own profession. I am not afraid of policing our own profession because teachers do not want incompetent teachers teaching side by side, but they want fairness as I said before. So let us police our own profession. The chancellor wouldn't let us do that.

But what we did do was we came up with a provision that says this: If there are people who are really, truly in trouble -- meaning are really, truly incompetent, the system says that they are really, truly incompetent -- let us create a kind of peer review process which we are going to do, right now going to do.

We are going to do it jointly, and we are going to allow these peer reviewers to actually testify at a hearing about competency of the individual teachers.

Now, why do I tell you that it was a 90 percent approval rate? Because what management allowed us to do was they allowed us to talk to our members about it in the way we thought appropriate. We said we are going to do this in a way we think is appropriate in a professional way, and it worked. We will see what happens in a year or two when it gets implemented, but that is the way you take control of your own profession.

Thank you very much.

MR. LUDWIG: Great, thank you.

I wanted to start off by asking a question that I think brings the Future of Children report together with some of the themes that have come up. Suppose that we adopted some of the recommendations that we have been talking about this morning and that are talked about in the Future of Children's study, things like using value-added gain scores plus other criteria to change the tenure bar, to do more in the direction of performance-based pay, to do more to make it easier to dismiss ineffective teachers and maybe also including pay bonuses to teaching in disadvantaged schools. All of this together seems to me could potentially represent a pretty substantial change in the work environment that both existing and prospective teachers might face.

I was wondering if the panelists could each say a little bit about what they

think this would do the number of people who would want to be teachers, the number of people who want to stay as teachers, what it does to the supply of the sort of teachers that we want and to get the panelists to say a little bit more about the other types of complementary changes that we may or may not need to make sure that we have the supply of teachers that we want within the context of the Future of Children proposed changes.

Dr. Jewell-Sherman, do you want to start?

DR. JEWELL-SHERMAN: Sure, thank you.

First and foremost, I have to concur with my colleague to my left. I think that what makes teachers want to teach, attracts them to the profession and makes them want to stay is not as easily quantifiable as it is in other professions.

I know that in Fairfax County which is in Virginia, some years back, they had pay for performance plan that obviously wasn't well thought out because the outcomes or the consequences were at variance to what they hoped would occur. What they found was that teachers became competitive instead of collaborative, and our work necessitates that we be collegial in getting the work done, that there was a finite amount of people that were perceived to be eligible for that ranking. It did not bring about the improvements in student performance; it did not lead to teacher planning and teacher thinking about issues related to their profession; and so it was disbanded.

I think that any future conversations about this as a policy, especially

coming down from the federal level will have to think through very, very carefully what the consequences are because teachers are unique individuals. I still consider myself first and foremost to be a teacher. I just now teach a lot of older people than I used to.

I think having respect for teachers, certainly looking at all of the disincentives that there are to working in an urban environment and trying to come up with strategies that help people want to stay. Our work is a burnout. If you are good at what you do, if you are doing all that is necessary to ensure student achievement, and for us failure is not an option. We start with the premise that student achievement will improve. Therefore, how do we backward map? How do we do our work to bring about that as a result? It is incredibly hard work.

So what do you do for somebody who has taught, even if you are giving them incentive pay, in a very challenging school? How do you do that year after year after year? I started my profession in Bed-Stuy, then went to Newark. When I came to Fairfax County, I thought I didn't know that working conditions existed like that. I don't know. I think that we have to think about how we keep people in that almost combat environment, making a profound difference.

But how do we nurture them? How do we support them? It isn't just about money.

I will turn it over to my colleagues.

MR. LUDWIG: Tom?

MR. KANE: I still think that by focusing on retention which has been sort of a buzz word in the education policy debate for the last ten years or so, we may be missing a key issue. Lots of professions have lots of turnover. So zero turnover is not necessarily a good outcome to be working towards.

The key issue should be are the right people staying and are we losing some really good teachers. Clearly, we are losing some really good teachers. But until we have some sort of assessment system for identifying who those good teachers are, we can't develop incentive system to try to retain the right ones and not retain the others. Again, I am not talking about post-tenure; I am talking about at the tenure decision, we need to be brining information to bear.

Now, as Randi was suggesting, there are ways to do this that recognize teachers' expertise and teachers' knowledge on the ground. It is just a little bit hard to figure out how to do that. So suppose that teachers within a school building played a key role in assessing the performance of the provisional teachers at that school because, as Randi was saying, when there is a weak teacher down the hall, everybody's job is harder. It is clearly in the teachers' interest to try to police the quality of the profession at the point of tenure.

The hard point is humans are social beings. If I have seen pictures of one of my colleague's kids, I have maybe been to their kids' birthday parties, I have had lunch with them, it is really hard, even if it is in my self-interest, to make a

tough call and say, you know, I am not sure that they are helping the school be where it needs to be. Maybe they ought to choose something else.

In higher education, we face this problem all the time. We have a lot more information at the time that we hire people than the typical school would have. We have somebody come in, spend a whole day with us, present, do a seminar. We call up their advisors, and we talk to them about where they think this person is going, what they are doing. We spend a lot of time on every hiring decision, a lot more time than any district has time to spend in hiring an individual teacher.

But then, all of the good departments make a second cut, and again it is not left up to the department. There is oversight in the central administration that tries to make sure that only the top folks get to stay for the long term. The departments that do that have thrived. The departments that don't do that, that aren't wiling to make those tough calls, pretty quickly sink and that is despite having lots of information, a lot more information at the front end.

So how do we set up a system that allows for peer assessments at the school level but also then requires that tough decisions be made? I am not sure. I have some ideas about what is the right way to do it, that second part, but I think the second part is critical because peer assessment without forcing hard decisions is not going to work.

MR. LUDWIG: Kate?

MS. WALSH: Do you want to take some other questions?

MR. LUDWIG: We will go down the panel, and then we will open it up.

MS. WALSH: Okay, I just have two points to make.

One is about fairness. The current system we have now is patently unfair. The current system of how we compensate teachers is grossly unfair to really excellent teachers and awards too much money to teachers who are not strong enough. So if we are interested in fairness issues for teachers and more importantly fairness issues for children, I think we need to relook at how we are compensating teachers.

The other one is the very limited value of value-added, but it is still very powerful. It would be unconscionable to judge a teacher, I think, and make a decision about hiring or firing based on value-added scores alone. It is not possible to do it in any sort of fair way, I think, without also bringing in some other considerations and that includes both the feedback and observation from principals and from fellow teachers. Teachers agree that the thing that drives them most crazy is having teachers in their school who aren't pulling their weight, and that is very demoralizing to effective teachers. By all means, teachers need to be brought into that equation.

What value-added does, I will just reiterate what Tom said. What value-added does is it gives you an objective measure. Without an objective measure, it is very hard to make tough decisions. It is very hard to make a tough decision that is in favor in children as opposed to the adult needs in a school. So that is why we

need that ingredient in the mix. It shouldn't be the only ingredient, but we do need that in the mix.

MR. LUDWIG: Thanks.

Randi and then we will open it up.

MS. WEINGARTEN: Look, maybe Kate and I are just disagreeing a lot today, and I am not disagreeing as much with Tom.

What teachers want, you know I spend a lot of time talking to teachers, and it feels to me that if you actually want to figure out what teachers think is fair, you have to ask them. Overwhelmingly, teachers want to make sure that their base salaries are sufficient enough that they can live and provide for their families and that their families do better than they did themselves. That is fundamental fairness in terms of how do you create base salaries as sufficiently high enough so that people can be in the middle class, and then you can do all sorts of other types of things.

It is interesting. We have a lead teacher program in New York City that we and a parent group brought to Klein's attention. He now goes around the world, telling people that it was his idea. But this was embedded in a career ladder model, and people really accepted it. It actually worked in the district that we did it in initially, and it hasn't worked around the city since it has now been unilaterally selected by principals rather than the embedded model that we had.

So I am really high on the issue of career ladders. I actually like issues of

how do you incentivize to get people into hard to staff schools. I think the thinking through both money as well as other types of incentives so that people feel like that urban setting is something they can do and do well and feel good about it. So those kinds of incentives, incentives in terms of paying for skill, I think those are really interesting kinds of incentives. I think you can do a whole bunch of incentives on top of something that is significant enough so that people can feel like they can live.

In terms of some of these other issues of performance and how you wrestle with evaluation down the line, where I disagree with Tom is this. I see this far more in terms of principals than teachers. Teachers are far harder on their colleagues than principals are. I see your evaluation that you just said in terms of the teacher sees a colleague's babies or whatever, and they are going to be hard on them. They are much harder than the principal is. I find that a lot, at least in my experience.

I have been in New York City schools for 22 years now. I have been the President of UFT for nine years, and I run two schools. We run two charter schools. I find that more and more it is a principal who says I am just not going to take the steps that I need to take because somebody is incompetent and then blames the union contract or this or that, but it is really someone doesn't because of that human dimension.

I think that we need to look at that and we need to look at this kind of stuff,

but, bottom line, the schools that work in New York City are schools where there is real collaboration and a real focus on children. When you have real collaboration, a real focus on children and one more thing, a skilled workforce, those are the schools that work. How do we work to make that happen in every single school?

MR. LUDWIG: Thanks.

Questions from the audience?

QUESTIONER: Thank you. I am Peggy Orchowski. I am the Congressional correspondent for the Hispanic Outlook on Higher Ed. I also have a Ph.D. in Education Administration from the University of California-Santa Barbara.

I have had really good teachers tell me that the three best things about teaching are June, July and August. I think we have to deal with some of those really great benefits that Representative Castle was talking about in teaching incentives. Having lived abroad many years, I know we are the only system now in the western world that still has a three-month summer vacation. How important is that vacation in recruiting teachers and what impact is that having on the achievement levels of our kids compared to other countries?

DR. JEWELL-SHERMAN: I would say that the teachers in our district are providing extra instruction before school, in the middle of the day, after school. Many of them, we pay to work on Saturdays. To make the kind of difference that

we have in our district, our teachers are working phenomenal amounts of time. Many of them are going to be working in July and August to compensate or to supplement the salary that they are not receiving from the district. Unfortunately, many of the best and the brightest don't get those summers off.

I think that if we want large numbers of teachers to achieve the kind of results that we very proudly proclaim in Richmond, then we are going to have to pay people more.

Randi said earlier, you don't have a captive workforce anymore. We, as women, have other options, and younger women are availing themselves of those options. So that is not enough.

The other thing is that we are pushing for an extended contract because we know that for our students not just to be competitive in Virginia but nationally, more time has to be put in. I don't know over the long term if June, July and August will continue to be the great draws that they have been in the past.

MR. LUDWIG: Does someone else want to comment?

MS. WEINGARTEN: We actually don't have June, July and August. I mean what tends to happen is we have July and August. We have actually, in exchange for the 45 percent increase, 43 percent increase, I thought it was really important on a symbolic level to have a pay scale that has a $100,000 number in it.

But what we actually do is, for example, our kids with significant

disabilities, they have the option, the right to come to school over the summer. I would think that we should be doing that more and more with kids that are falling behind or kids that need or want to have different kinds of programs where you end up making sure that summer work is special and different and you have more kinds of voluntary time on task. That is the way one would see it.

Frankly, in countries around the world, there is actually less class time during the school year than there is in the United States of America. Frankly, we just added a whole bunch of minutes to the school day for tutoring in a very rigid, inflexible way, and I don't think it is working.

I think that you have to really think through the day in terms of not just time on task, but we don't spend nearly enough time allowing teachers to get their arms around issues and then be able to practice it because it is very, very difficult in any kind of public setting to go to the public and say, oh, by the way, we are buying more time for professional development so that teachers can work amongst themselves to try to figure out how to best do things. It becomes a really politically torturous route that I think policymakers avoid doing so that they want, if there is more time, they will do time on task. But I am not all that sure in watching it, particularly in New York City as well as around the country versus around the world, that all this additional time on task without doing something that is different is working.

MR. LUDWIG: Additional questions?

QUESTIONER: Thank you.

In Washington and I think probably a lot of other areas, charter schools are playing a larger role. The KIPP schools, for example, have the highest test scores, and they have an entirely different schedule. I would just like some of your views on the role that charter schools have.

MR. KANE: I think states and districts have a responsibility for policing what is going on in charter schools. I think actually the charter holders often have some responsibilities of overseeing what is going on in the schools, and I think that very often, they have completely fallen down in that responsibility.

Now, that said, there are some promising models out there. The KIPP model, at least some of the prima facie evidence on their impacts is compelling, but there has never been a serious evaluation of the KIPP model and what its impact is on student achievement. But that is about to change because the KIPP Foundation is funding, is in the process of requesting proposals for an evaluation that will compare kids who they have admitted versus kids who are on their waiting list who by lottery were not admitted.

I think we will know a lot more in two or three years about what the impact of the KIPP model really is, and it could be that it really is having the dramatic impacts that just a superficial reading of the test scores would imply which would be terrific, but I think we need to hold off a little bit until we see those results before concluding that pieces of the KIPP model are the key pieces. They may

be, but we still need to learn.

MS. WALSH: The KIPP model is very interesting for what it says about teachers. Those teachers are on duty 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. They have horrible attrition. It is a very young teaching force. It is hard for them to have a personal life.

DR. JEWELL-SHERMAN: They are not going to do it for long.

MS. WALSH: Pardon?

DR. JEWELL-SHERMAN: I am sorry. I forget that this is on.

MS. WALSH: Feel free to chime in.

They are a very successful model of school. Is it a model that can be applied widely? I don't know. It poses an interesting challenge to us all about the teaching profession and how it fits into that kind of model.

MR. LUDWIG: Thanks.

I just saw a hand in the back.

DR. JEWELL-SHERMAN: Can I just make a quick comment?

MR. LUDWIG: Oh, sorry. Yes.

DR. JEWELL-SHERMAN: I think that our challenge always has to be are we going to have a set number of boutique schools because anyone of us is capable of coming up with X number of schools that have an admission requirement. Even if that admission requirement is only that you have an adult who is willing to apply, it says that that adult values education, and that adult is

going to have some influence on that student and how he or she performs.

So are we going to be satisfied with any number of models that I call boutique schools or are we going to make it our mission to make our school districts, districts of excellence? I can tell you in Richmond, that is precisely what I was determined to try and bring up. No, not try. I was determined to bring about for however long I stay there.

It is not enough to have a school that anybody in the city can identify as a premier school, and they know if they can get their child in this elementary, that middle and that high school, that their child is going to have an exemplary education, and the hell with everyone else. It is incumbent upon every single one of us to make our schools indistinguishable from any other by virtue of the student achievement that is represented by that school. I am so pleased that right now I can tell you that if you look at our data, you cannot tell which schools are on the affluent west end and which are in the poorer east end, and that is the challenge of public education.

Until charter schools are willing to take that challenge on, I don't have the time. I just don't have the time.

MR. LUDWIG: I think we have time for one more quick question. So let us go in the back.

QUESTIONER: Well, I have to be on the fence of the teachers. I am a teacher, a former classroom teacher for 27 years, and I taught in a very rural

school district. I haven't heard anything about rural teachers, and so I advocate on their behalf.

My question is do you believe that all the teachers in America should have the same certification requirements?

One of the issues we are having is that different states have different requirements, and I wonder how easy is the recruitment from one state to the other. Do you believe that should be standardized or do you believe that we should continue the way that we are right now? Thank you.

MS. WEINGARTEN: I believe that we need to have some baseline certification, but our whole certification process right now is completely and totally ridiculous. I can't even tell you anymore what the New York State certification process is for different people. It is so differentiated based upon various different levels and things like that. It is very problematic. I think it needs to be very, very simplified, and there are some core concepts.

Frankly, just to answer your other question, I find from my experience in New York that rural teachers and urban teachers sometimes have very much the same issues that they articulate, the same issues that they talk about, the same challenges that they face. We have tried to, in New York, get some conversations going between rural areas and our urban areas. It has been very, very instructive.

But in terms of teaching credentials, people need to have a want and a will to work with children. That notion is very much embedded, and that has to be

seen and detected in an interview process and things like that.

Number two, you need to have, and I am just borrowing from something Al Shecker said to me a long time ago, you need to have a proficiency in your content. You can't be one page ahead of the child. You need to really have a deep understanding of content, whatever that content is, whatever area it is, and we need to figure out how to assess that but not in the Byzantine ways it is done these days state by state.

Number three, teachers are physicians of the mind. We need to transmit information to children, and I don't mean it that unilaterally as it sounds, in different ways. Children are all different, and so the notion of how we transmit information, how we communicate to children is very, very important.

Those three skills -- the willingness to work with kids and make a difference in children's lives, real content expertise and your transmission of the pedagogy -- that is what we have to assess for in terms of any new teacher.

MR. LUDWIG: Great. Thanks so much to the panelists. Thanks so much to the crowd for coming today.

(Applause)

* * * * *