Good evening everyone, special welcome to everyone who's come for the final university lecture of the fall semester. The university lectures--this lecture is cosponsored by the School of Education and is--the university lectures in general are made possible by a generous gift from a friend of the university Robert Minshall [phonetic]. Here's the point were I asked you to please turn off any potentially distracting technology that might buzz, ring or otherwise contribute to the atmosphere of communication here this evening. And then I'm going to just talk for a minute about the events coming forth in the spring semester. As exciting as the ones have been this fall, we're almost done and we've--we're going off to a spring full of exciting events as well. And our first lecture in the spring semester will be Eloy Rodriguez, who's a scientist, educator and advocate for science education. And he is going to be talking that genesis of natural medicines and that will be February 17, 2009 so we'll be well buried under snow. So this maybe our last rain sleet university lecture [laughter] as well. It's always my great privilege to introduce the introducers although I do wanna say that this lecture--our guest this evening have especial significance to me as I came here 3 years ago from the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign where tonight's guests were my senior colleagues in the Department of Educational Policy Studies. So it's a particular pleasure to have them come together and come here tonight. But I'm gonna introduce--I'll leave the intro--the further introducing to dean of the School of Education and also my new colleague and my boss, my dean, Doug Biklen who's the dean of the School of Education here and a great, nationally known advocate of inclusive education.

[ Applause ]

Thanks, Cal [phonetic] and welcome to everyone that's come out on this beautiful Syracuse evening. Our speakers tonight come from the same department, the same university. They have never been on stage together in quite this kind of format. The rules for this evening's event are that I'll ask the first questions and at some point we'll be welcoming questions from the audience. The audience has agreed to keep quite throughout the proceedings. And our speakers this evening cannot see the audience. [Laughter] Does anybody get this? [Laughter] Actually, this will be a very free flowing event tonight. Our topic will range across--actually, we'll have multiple topics but the major part of the focus will be desegregation and how segregation occurs in the United States and particularly focus on race. Let me tell you a little bit about our speakers and then I'll ask the first question and we'll get underway. James Anderson who is furthest from me, here is chair and professor of Educational Policy Studies at the University of Illinois at Champaign-Urbana. His past research has focused on the history of African-American education in the south from 1860 to1835, the history of higher education desegregation in southern states, the history of public school desegregation, institutional racism, and the representation of blacks in secondary school history textbooks. His current research projects include the history of African-American public higher education and the development of African-American school achievement in the 20th century. He is--among his humors awards he was Spencer--a winner of the Spencer Mentor Award and this isn't quite an award but an indication of his service at the highest level in the academic world. He was president of
the History of Education Society from 1992-1993. He's co-author of the forthcoming book Racial Desegregation in Higher Education. Bill Trent, the other gentlemen up here, is also professor in Educational Policy Studies at the University of Illinois at Champaign-Urbana, Urbana-Champaign. His past research has focused on educational inequality, school desegregation effects in K12 and postsecondary, and the benefits and consequences of social organization of school, status attainment, research, co and extracurricular activities, and comparative education. He's also done work on race and ethnicity, social stratification and mobility, and equality of opportunity, and on complex organization and social change and policy. He's principal investigator for an educational reform project that is focused on understanding the role of race, ethnicity, class and gender in school reform. He's also recently served as an expert witness on a court appointed panel in Vaughn's et al versus the Board of Education, a case in Prince George's County, Maryland. He has been a Spencer resident fellow at the Spencer Foundation in 2006 to 2007. He's been a member of the court appointed monitoring team and currently serves in that role in addition to his professorial work in--He's a monitor in a case in Champaign, Illinois. He's written a great deal. He is coeditor of the Transition to College: Lessons from the Disciplines, an article of that appeared in Teachers College Record last year. And is author of Perceptions of Financial Aid among Students of Color, Examining the Roles of Self Concept, Locus of Control and Expectations. So it's wonderful to have these two speakers with us. I know you're gonna enjoy the evening. I wanna start out with a question for Jim. I wanna ask you to discuss how some scholars have explained poor academic outcomes for African-American students where the scholars seem to make assumptions for which there is no evidence. Indeed where the evidence clearly contradicts their claims. For example, that students today maybe showing the effects of slavery of 200 years ago and where the scholars' assumptions set the stage for as you referred to it victim blaming?

>> Thank you. Just to put this in some perspective. If you think about our current focus on the achievement gap as well as explanations for the achievement gap, we didn't start to focus on this until 2000. There's no any discussion about it prior to the year 2000 and there's a reason for it. In 1998, there's a book published by Christopher Jencks and Meredith on the Black-White Test Score Gap. Every chapter in the book is about closing the achievement gap. In fact, African-American students have made such progress from 1970 to the 1990 that they predicted even the number of years it would take to close the math gap and reading gap. And if you go back throughout the 20th century, you will start in 1900 and chart the achievement of African-American students up until 1988, you have 88 years of steady progress without any fluctuations, any declines. It was in 1988, that the test results on the NAPE scores National Educational--Assessment of Educational Progress in reading and math and science, that African-American students for the first time their scores dipped and the achievement gap widen. Now, Jencks and Meredith were already doing their work so it didn't reflect that. But in 2000 people began to take note of this fluctuation.
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>> And it only occurred from 1988 to 1992 by the way. After 1992 the score has started to go back again. But everybody rushed in to give an explanation for this temporary fluctuation and widened the achievement
gap and from Ogbu and his "acting white" thesis, to John McWhorter and his theory about the intergenerational transmission of anti-intellectual values within the African-American community, to the [inaudible] and then notions that it was crack cocaine and rap music that was affecting the achievement of African-American students though all kinds of explanations that focused on pathologies where they were anti-intellectual or acting white theories or theories of cultural pathology to explain this gap. Now, my view as a historian is that we don't have any laws of history or any laws of sociology for that matter [laughter] which we have to remind them but I think there's one thing that we could agree on. People cannot change their culture overnight. That is virtually impossible. It's a matter of generations. So if African-American had a culture that sustained achievement from 1900 to 1988 and calls every expert in the field to think that the achievement gap would be close. It is hardly likely that something happened in African-American community from 1988 to 1992 to fundamentally transform their culture values and their norms and to create a whole different attitude toward schooling, self improvement and learning. And so my home--hope, my mind, I got involved in this and say wait a minute, you know we have to pay attention to this gap. But let's not rush and be like Chicken Little and say the sky is falling when in fact it's not falling. And so these explanations and they don't have any basis that I know of historical scholarship. We are very fortunate to have a very large and rich body of historical scholarship on the very nature of American-African culture particularly since the late 1960s to the '70s and '80s. Most--many award winning books were published, someone like Lawrence Levine's Black Culture and Black Consciousness, looks at the evolution of black culture from slavery 'til--well into the 20th century or a book like Gottman's of the black family that studies of values of the family from slavery to well into 20th century. So we had a lot of scholarship on that. None of it supports this particular explanation.

>> What does it describe?
>> It describes, actually it describes a very different kind of culture. It doesn't require--describe a culture that is in resistance to white culture but one adaptation, one that's able to incorporate elements of a larger culture into its own culture and whether this is looking at its music or its institutions or its churches in so many ways, we're looking at a blending of cultures, not so much opposition and that's critical because the analysis of Ogbu and McWhorter was that somewhere along the way African-Americans start to resist things like schooling and to define it as white and to resist it because they define it as white and to say to themselves that if they achieve they would be becoming white so to speak. Well that really doesn't explain the nature of African-American culture. It is best explained in terms of creolization. It's a kind a creole culture that has blended all kinds of things overtime. And with respect to education the scholarship is exact opposite. It really does document the value of education in the American-African community from slavery through reconstruction on the 19th century into 20th century. And that particular documentation is very consistent with achievement patterns. It's only the recent scholarship that seeks to explain the failure that's inconsistent with patterns of achievement.

>> And so, in what way is it victim blaming, could you discuss that a little bit?
I think, if you take the specific ones, I mean you know some of it is you know. I have to take it seriously but when I think about it, it--it. I mean McWhorter, he says that African people came to America and they came from a background where they lived a life of the mine. And you're thinking, anyway anybody in the 1400s, not ordinarily people will live in the life of the mine. But nonetheless that once they got into America were enslaved, that through enslavement and their inability to have access to educational opportunities they developed an anti-intellectual norm within their community and that that has been transmitted over the generations. And that now you have a community of people who really sees schooling and achievement as anti--who have anti-intellectual attitudes. Well, that then blames them. In fact he said specifically that the only reason they're failing is because of the transmission of this anti-intellectual values from generation to generation and that's the problem. Ogbu had a very different kind of theory but very similar. The notion that African-Americans because they couldn't get schooling, they begun to resist it and to develop oppositional frames of reference and that they begun to identify achievement and being successful in school as acting white and so in term, there was a kind of community effort to resist what is the normal behavior patterns in schools. But once again, it's blaming the children and their families and their communities for their failure. And so and then I don't, I mean with the [inaudible], the notion of rap music and crack cocaine and things like that. You know you get to the extremes of the culture pathology explanations for failure. I've always said let's look at the evidence and my own personal view on this is that we should never be afraid to ask questions because if there are transformations in the norms and values of the African-American community, we'd wanna be the first to know because, you know, we know in terms of human development that they could be corrected. So if there are problems we would clearly want to identify them. But you got to look at the evidence. You have to look at the patterns of achievement and have to ask yourself, what even requires this kind of explanation? How do you explain the 88 years of steady increases in every measure of education, on achievement test, on the graduation rates, reducing dropout rates, college attendance rates? How would you explain all of it? In the absence of the cultural norms and values and yet we get to a point with the temporarily fluctuation and you say it tells us a lot about these people. Then you get the contrast. They're not like other groups that value education that's why some groups you get sort of comparison to model minority notions that these groups are succeeding because their parents value education. These children are not succeeding because their parents do not. So you get these sorts of cultural pathology explanations that really do blame the victims. And I think they paralyze educators and they paralyze teachers. My friend Bill Trent called it a get out of jail free card where you don't have to take responsibility for the failure of American-African kids because they are their own worst enemies.

Well, let's shift to you then Bill because you've described to me, you know, before this session that you're doing work in schools in your own community in Champaign-Urbana and you're encountering educators who talk about the way things are and they have a certain--I think you use the term, you're interested in looking at how people thinking about what's normal. Could--I think it leads directly from this discussion. Maybe you could explain that.
Thank you and good evening everyone! The school district that I'm working in as a court appointed monitor is Champaign Unit 4 School District. And my fellow monitors and myself became very much aware of a pattern of tolerance, this tolerance of this picture of nonperformance on the part African-American children and poor children. It's not peculiar to Champaign. What we have is a situation where people have accommodated this low performance and do not see it as anything unusual except for the people who have parents of these children, who cannot understand why their children are failing to be engaged in school, failing to perform appropriately and failing to behave as they would prefer them to behave. And as Jim was saying, we have a long history of African-American communities making substantial sacrifices in order to pursue education for their children. So the explanation really has to become one of what's transpiring in the schools that's preventing this from occurring. And so we have a situation where as many of us talk about the expectations. We talk about the level of expectations for poor children, for African-American children being substantially different from the expectations that we hold for our children. And this has to do with the larger picture of a construction of what's normal, what's usual. So that when people, they think of the exceptions to what they are accustomed to seeing as an exceptionality.

So a student like Bill Trent becomes an exception to the rule rather than that being the rule. Well, what we've attempted to do is to help teachers and educators in this district find a way to look deeply at the patterns of responses from their students that they are finding in the schools. Most of this is data driven. We found ways to help unpackage what it is that schools do and what teachers do by looking at the performance patterns by identifying patterns of students' non-engagement in understanding which schools, which classrooms, which subjects this occur in and combining that with information we have about the attributes of the teachers and the attributes of the students and the attributes of their communities. What we're finding is that in many instances, this engagement with the reality of the effects of their teaching is causing teachers to take a second look to have to engage questions about their own professional integrity in terms of the sufficiency of their treatment of their children--these children, that is the delivery of instruction to these kids with who differ by race and ethnicity and by social class. And we're seeing that it has some impact. Now, we've also made it possible for these educators to have support. We're working under a consent decree. The consent decree gives the superintendent an opportunity to command resources that the school district might not otherwise provide. We're also operating in the context of this consent decree. We're operating under No Child Left Behind regulations. So there's a fortunate confluence because school districts are required to disaggregate by race and ethnicity and special category for all of their students. Well this--this is an advantage because they have to create the internal infrastructure to be able to monitor educational practice. So this has actually enabled us to get the teachers to do this and we actually in recent meetings have had principals reply to us that they now have a different sense. They have a new normal. Because we have had them inspecting their practices in a way which informs them about the impact of their practices and we've been able to contrast it with
practices very different from what they're accomplishing by showing them evidence on other better achieving schools and so there's--

>> So it's similar to what sociologists would talk about questioning what's—what's natural, what comes natural.

>> The so called natural order of things.

>> Yeah.

>> It's not easy to disturb people's notion of what natural but that's a lot of what we have to do if what we are really interested in doing is changing the expectations.

>> Okay. Now, we hear in the news a lot that we've entered a post racial moment. [Chuckles] Could both of you talk to that issue? What are the implications of a post racial rhetoric entering public discourse? What are the implications of that for schools? For K12 schools or even for higher education?

>> I'll start. The--I have some substantial discomfort with the notion of entering this post racial discourse and engaging it. My concern is that it truly reflects our culture's inability to conceive of change in an appropriate way or to look deeply at--in the evidence that would suggest how gradual change occurs especially on this deeply embedded racial lines, the attitudes and dispositions that we have. And that's across all communities of color or the majority communities also. We just have a very strange notion of change in our culture and people literally think that, you know, we passed the 1964 Civil Rights Act therefore, we ended violations of people's civil rights. Didn't happen then. People don't understand the length of time you have to have enforcement in order to produce substantial change. Ted Shaw, who was the--who was the past head of Legal Defense and Education Fund used to do an interesting numerical calculation. He said, in effect, we had been living some 300--let's say 375 or more years under either slavery or legalized segregation, Jim Crow. By contrast, we have been living since 1964, some 44 years under a public accommodations act. If you do the math, that suggests that we've only been living roughly, I don't know, less than 20 percent of the time in this country under a structure of support for, at least legal pronouncements, for justice and civil rights. Back in Paris when folks who've had the rest of that time to deeply internalize notions of racism, differentiation and to construct that picture of what's normal. The efforts we have had in place to enforce what we've had for the last 44 years. And 44, I know is a very popular number here in Syracuse. [Laughter] Have been tutored about that today. So you think about the absence of enforcement under the several administrations that we've had since 1964. So we haven't had comprehensive enforcement of the 1965 Voting Rights Act. We still have violations of those voting rights. We haven't had comprehensive enforcement of fair housing laws. So the absence of enforcement and the dismantling of enforcement. And in fact, for the last 8 years, we've been living under a justice department that has been proactive in finding and preventing voluntary desegregation in schools. So rather than having the enforcement of a more fair and just set of conditions, we've actually had either no enforcement, minimal enforcement or in fact, proactive opposition. That suggests that we're still struggling with trying to dismantle structures of racism. The other thing that social scientists know is that the attitudes attendant with structures of social stratification persists long after those structures have been dismantled. And people just don't have an appreciation for that. Simply moving the
doors out of view or changing the building structurally doesn't necessarily alter our preferences for how we would like to enter and exit. Now, that's a simplistic example but it helps us to grapple with the idea of how long it would in fact take to really reconstruct the set of rationalized views that we had. That's not an argument that says that we've had no change. Clearly, we have had some change. But it is an argument and a body of social science evidence that suggest to us that the process of change is going to take a great deal more than the symbolic change as great as it is of having a president in place who is an African-American.

>> Okay. So that's an argument for why we're not in a post racialized context.

>> Right.

>> What's the--Jim, what's the effect of a post racial rhetoric on public education or on our society? What's the meaning of it?

>> I think it may have the same effect of a kind of the color blind notions as well. And that it doesn't allow us to look squarely at what's happening in our society. America certainly changed over my lifetime and changed fundamentally and yet, when you look at the evidence and those evidence being produced throughout this process, you know the Stanford University study on race that reminded us of the significance of racial problems that persist. The stereotypes when they asked the people in that survey to--

>> Maybe you could describe this stereotype threat research. Is that what you're referring to?

>> No, no. Not that. That was a no, no. That was a study done by Stanford University during the election.

>> Okay.

>> In about a month ago and they asked people throughout the country. They gave them things like blacks are lazy and it was--

>> Right.

>> A significant number of people said yes to that.

^M00:30:01

>> And there were a number of stereotypes in there that were as negatives as we would have seen 30, 40 years ago and the probably percent of people saying yes to those things would be somewhat lower than they may have been a half century ago that were enough people in those samples up to 30 and 35 percent and 40 percent on some of those things to remind us that we still do have to be very realistic about the society in which we live and the problems that we have to work on and it's not just a study that the work that's been--that we get back on race on America, on different institutions whether they're housing or education or others constantly tell us the we have challenges ahead. So you have to recognize how fundamental the society has changed and yet, you have to appreciate the work that lies ahead. And I have to do this with my students because with younger students, they will also say well, nothing has changed, you know, and you go no. I've lived through the changes and I recall in--when I was an undergraduate at Stillman College in Alabama that we have a professor, Woodrow Wilson, in turn and he was collecting money and food and clothes and he was gonna take it to Tent City, USA which was my home county, Greene County, Alabama and someone told him that I knew how to get there. Well, I really don't wanna go and take him there because it was dangerous but I agreed to do it anyway. And so we drove there and as far as you could see, there are families, African-American families, who
are living on tents on mud floors. And there's just nothing but mud. All of these farmers who were tenant farmers and sharecroppers have been put off their land because they registered to vote. And they got their mail, Tent City, USA. And that's when I was a sophomore in college. Well, that's not the America we live in. We live in a different America. They vote now. As of 1968, they were— in my home county which is 80 percent black. It was 80 percent black in 1860. It was 80 percent black in 1960 and 1968 but it wasn't until 1968 in the reconstruction that there was a single black elected official in Greene County, Alabama. And so we live in a different society and they—you know the young people in that county take it for granted, that they can vote and they can elect people to hold office. I suspect if I went home and talk to them about Tent City, USA, the younger people probably have no memory of Tent City, USA. But once you live through it, you know that that was a different America than the America that we live in today. So my sense is that we don't—we live in a much more racially complex society than we lived in 30 years ago or 40 years ago. We're not post racial. We're just racially complex and the complexity itself creates different opportunities, different perspectives and different notions about society and one of the things that signify this for me and I'll close with this, the New York Times dispatched correspondents to North Carolina and Alabama, my home state, to look at race in this particular campaign. And there was 71-year-old man in Alabama who was very upset with Obama as the candidate for the presidency and at first he attacked him for being a mixed breed and he quoted the Bible and said the Bible say we should come us one and not as mixed. And then he made it very clear that he didn't want him to be president and he went into stereotypes that he would probably tear up the rose garden and plant a watermelon patch and so you think you have this person paid. And then he says in the same paragraph, but I'm not as troubled by that as I used to be and the correspondent said why. He says I have 3 biracial grandchildren. And you go life has become more complex for him. [Laughter] And I was thinking about the Alabama I grew up in where they have the colored and white water signs and you figured okay, your family now is standing at those water fountains. You in the white line, your grandchildren in the colored line and your daughter has to decide which line is she is standing in, with the children or with her father. That's complexity. And that's how society has changed in a lot of ways is that demographically, we're changing. The relationships are changing. Everything has changed in ways that make us more complex. Now, being complex is important and the change is important. That is not post racial in the sense and one of my—I asked this of my class and one student just made the following statement and I think it's accurate that if it's the case that the historical significance of this election is based on race, we're not post racial.

>> But were you gonna add something to that?

>> I was just going to say that it would be difficult to contend that we're in a post racial period when in fact an effigy of Barack Obama was hung on the University of Kentucky campus 3 days before or a week before the election. I think we have a lot of resident problems because of the calcification of so many of these attitudes and the levels of segregation we have in society. We have lots of communities where 77, 80 percent or more of all whites live among whites. And so we don't have the kinds of opportunities, save our schools, to be able to provide an opportunity for
us to learn more about each other. And that's a set of issues that we have to come to grips with.

You've talked about--you've examined various core cases that have to do with desegregation and you've talked about how arguments for desegregation or involvement of the courts in active desegregation has become more difficult, particularly with the notion that it's necessary now to prove that there was intent, that there was, in a sense, evil intent on the part of the district or the policy makers as they configured things or created policies that led to current practice. Is this where we're stuck? Is there a role for courts? Can arguments still be made for the courts to be active around desegregation?

I think an argument can still be made. In fact, the recent Meredith ruling, in fact, left open avenues that would have to not be race based, that you could still construct ways in which you could create schools that have this. The opposition of the Justice Department under President Bush in the deliberation leading up to the case. Now, you must before the Supreme Court. The US Attorney General said we agree with the goal of creating diverse racially mixed settings. We disagree and oppose the means to get there. Now, that's a catch-22 because the very means that were used to construct the situation are absolutely the means that we need to dismantle it. And so on the one hand, I think we have to attack that argument.

So it's kind of a cruel irony. It's a cruel, very cruel irony and that in fact I wouldn't--I won't go so far as to call it cynicism but it was clear that they were quoting from Martin Luther King's text in many instances in posing their opposition to the means that were being made available. That is to treat individuals along the lines of race. But I think we have to--we also have to unpack the deliberate efforts to make it more difficult to prosecute issues of racial discrimination with respect to schooling. The first Bush administration actually opposed the early efforts to pass the 1993 Civil Rights Act, the renewal, the reauthorization, and was done because they wanted to rule out the possibility of class action suits. Now, I think that's been the position of each of the republican administration since then. So in fact, when you rule out the possibility of this, it places the burden of responsibility for demonstrating discrimination on the individual victim. That's a high bar to achieve on, especially for individuals who lack the personal resources and wherewithal to be able to do this.

So it is a fundamental dilemma but it also shows the opposition that exists with respect to bringing these cases that would reinforce or unable more affirmative action or in K12 since more school desegregation. I also think that it's been difficult to develop an audience on the part of the African-American community to continue to support school desegregation, the reason for that being that they're too many examples of its failure. We have in this country in my estimation conflated integration to me no more than desegregation. That is conceptually poor and it leads to policy dilemmas that we haven't fully addressed. Desegregation is necessary but not sufficient. If we're going to have quality educational experiences for all members of our really increasingly diverse communities, it's gonna be because we actually pursue conditions of integration. That would require something that's been more difficult to achieve. Gordon Allport gave us a set of
guidelines back in 1954 for the reduction of prejudice. Recently, Tropp and Pettigrew in the meta-analysis of the research, over 500 different studies, that looked at the pursuit of integrated settings in the workplace as well as in schools and the 4 components that Allport gave us were that the groups will come together with equal status, common goal, cooperative learning experiences and the fourth one was with the full support of the legal or adult authorities in the context. Their study revealed that that's the most difficult one to get. Whether you are talking about the integration of women into previously all male work context or whether we're talking about the integration of children in schools. That shows the hurdle that we've got to achieve. But we only do that by making the differentiation between integration and desegregation and sustaining it. Because it allows us to pursue a set of policies that have to do with professional development that introduces new curriculum materials in the training, pre-service training and in-service training of teachers that enables us to fully address the issues of learning across these different communities that we've been segregated into. And that's not been something we've done consistently in the research on school desegregation or in the practice of developing educators.

>> In the celebration era around 50 years around Brown versus Board of Ed, there was an article came out by Chuck Willy and his daughter who is a professor at Worthmore [phonetic] and really speaking about all the changes that has—it was kind of an optimistic piece about well, yeah we can critique what's happened but at the same time a lot has happened. Somewhat the point you were making but Jim, in your research, you talked about a kind of unintended—maybe I think of it as unintended consequence of the Brown decision which was really to transform what happened to black educators and I wonder if you could talk a little about that aspect of the post Brown history.

>> Yeah. I think it has lots to do with the attitudes that African-Americans in many parts of the country have about the Brown decision and its consequences. The resistance to do segregation and it was massive and led to a number of choices on the part of, particularly the southern states and one of the most unfortunate one was to really come to the conclusion that if schools would be desegregated then African-American teachers could not teach in the desegregated schools. So they dismissed over 50,000 African-American teachers in a very short time.

>> Were they mostly women?

>> Mostly women. And if you think about the structure of segregating education, every elementary school had a black principal. Every high school had a black principal. So if you go from state to state, there would be 600 principals in this state or 500 in that state. North Carolina went from about 600 African-American principals before in a very short time. So there was just this whole sale of displacement of principals and of teachers. And in some cases, the responses were quite humiliating and that if you were a principal one day and a janitor the next day to really make the segregation hurt and make it very painful. It's almost as if some of the states in the districts said if you're gonna push for this, it's gonna be painful in ways that you don't anticipate. And so you move out of the teaching profession, African-American teachers as well as principals and other administrators. That then—and then you close all of the schools, in most cases. Most cases, desegregation may close the black school and bus, you know, transporting
African-American students to the white school. So from the advantage point of the black community, their schools being closed, their teachers being dismissed, their principals being dismissed, and then the other side of the coin was well, what do we get as an advantage? And they really couldn't pinpoint the advantage that they were getting. So it really did create a very and we saw that on the fifth anniversary of Brown. You didn't see any celebration of the Brown decision within African-American communities. In most cases, it was maybe a ritual response, ritualistic response. But not really, not a celebration and there's not much hope about the possibilities of desegregation and then you get, I think something else that's counterproductive. It's sort of nostalgia for something that never existed. You know, let's go back to the days when it was good. Well, it never was good. That's why Charles Hamilton Houston and Thurgood Marshall fought the battles that they did because they understood the inequalities that existed, the low levels of graduation rates. And you know, I think people--
>> And they were organizing in the '30s. I mean they were organizing 20 years before the actual Brown decision right?
>> Yes. And so sometimes you get people thinking things were better than they were because of what happened and actually, things were pretty miserable in during that time period, from Brown right on through to the '60s, '70s and '80s and right into the present. So that was one of the consequences that no one anticipated. I know Marshall didn't anticipate that and at some point, African-American community was fighting the legal defense line over this question of desegregation because of what was happening within those communities.
>> Yeah.
>> Okay, I'm gonna ask one more question and then we'll turn it to our audience. And so my question is if you're in a position--if you were in a position to advice our president-elect on a policy--on policies that would lead to transformation on American education, deracialization of American education, what would you recommend? By the way, they had no access to my questions in advance. [Laughter] I think they're doing pretty well.
>> I'm beginning to think Cal had.
[ Laughter ]
>> Well, I'm pretty much on record for really being an advocate of taking seriously the issue of where we need to strengthen our teaching labor force. And I don't think it can be underestimated. I've seen studies that show the--show several things that many of the weakest teachers consistently get assigned to the most needy children. And that's across the country. We also see that even when we change the curriculum so that it's an enriched curriculum, if we have weaker teachers teaching an enriched curriculum, it doesn't pay the same benefits to the children. So my recommendation would be an investment in finding additional ways to intensify our efforts to improve the quality of our teacher labor force. And that's not just in STEM as everyone has become enamored with. But I think we have a substantial amount of work to do in real fundamentals of literacy. And I don't think it can be emphasized enough. There's so much about literacy that it's pervasive across the curriculum.
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>> So I think we have to do, we have an enormous task in front of us to, if we were really taking seriously the idea that we were gonna put a high quality teacher in every classroom and that is what No Child Left Behind
says. We don't have the infrastructure prepared to develop those teachers, we don't have the dollar investment that it would take to do it, and there are a number of people who wonder if we in fact have the scholarship scholarly research and understanding necessary to prepare that particular teaching course. We may have the scholarship in the area of developing teachers with the content skills. But I think we maybe challenged in developing teachers with the knowledge of the variety of developmental needs that today's children arrive at school with. And the developmental literature and psychology is showing us the differences across culture and we need to be able to make that a part of what teachers are armed with when they enter the classroom so that they can communicate better with the much richer variety of children and not be intimidated by children who pose really no harm to them. But I don't think enough of our colleges of education are equipped or resourced in ways that will enable us to do that quickly. So I think it takes a substantial investment to get us there but I can't think that there is a greater priority right now. We can't produce the caliber of workforce that we need if we don't undertake that task. So I wouldn't focus first on the racialization aspect of it in terms of how schools look in terms of racial composition but I would seriously focus on the competencies that educators bring to the classroom that would enable them to fully address the learning needs of every child.

>> Jim.

>> [Laughter] You know he says--

>> A simple question.

>> Yeah he said something on the campaign that I hope he remembers and he took note of the billions and billions of dollars that we spent over the last 8 years and spin ourselves into a huge, huge deficit and then he said the tragedy of it is that we have nothing to show for it.

>> Was he talking about Iraq or what?

>> Everything.

>> Yeah.

>> And he's right. I mean we don't have anything to show for it. I recall in 2000, I forget that kind of surplus was 1.3 trillion.

>> Yeah, it was over a trillion.

>> Yes and we all got these checks but we have nothing to show for it. At that time and this is gonna be one of my suggestions, the General Accountability Office had done a study of American schools. 'Cause one of the things that--part of it is the segregation and inequality. But another part of it is competition with the world in terms of our performance on international tests on math and science and the very infrastructure of America schooling. The General Accountability made it clear to Congress that it will take initially 100 billion dollar investment to begin to bring us close to a level of quality. And they cited the problems in the study of asbestos in buildings--of ceilings falling down, of wiring that can't take the internet. Otherwise, the infrastructure of American schooling is in no position to compete with places like Singapore at this point. And so if you got 1.3 trillion dollar surplus, if you'd taken a hundred billion, you have something to show for it. You still have a lot of money just that--If you use, you know, I mean the math is very simple. You get 90 percent of what we got, right, rather than 100 percent. But you have an infrastructure of Americans--of schools in all over the country something to show. So one piece of advice should be in your infrastructure plan to rebuild roads
and bridges and others and also as part of your green economy, that you put school construction and schools for the next century as part of that infrastructure that we get the kinds of schools, the kind of infrastructure for the future. Go to Chicago which he knows, go to Detroit, go to Cleveland and go to Champaign, go to Syra--go anywhere in America and realize how much schools have to be part of the infrastructure rebuilding in this country and to include them. Don't just top with roads and bridges, bring schools into that. We know that 50 percent of all teachers retire within the first 5 years because of living and working conditions. If you can't do something about that then bets--all bets off. You go to other professions, 50 percent of the medical doctors retire within the first 5 years. I think we would know what kind of quality healthcare we would have and yet we live with that back to what is normal. We take that as something that we can live with. He has suggested that he wants to do a lot more and given teachers the kind of wages, the kind of pay, the kind of working conditions to do that. The other thing is how do we attract quality people in. Well, we have precedents that I think he can go to and bring by. One would be to recreate the NDEA Fellowships of the Sargent Shriver era, [simultaneous talking] the National Defense Education Act that would give fellowships to people who want to teach, get a master's degree plus certification and you can even target them to areas. They had--I went to Illinois on an NDEA Fellowship for teaching [inaudible] City, yeah. And at one point we regarded teaching in those places are so important that you got an exemption from going to the draft for Vietnam if you decided to teach in Chicago and Cleveland. Go back to those kinds of precedents where you make it an important part and an important value and then you invest in that. Now he has already said he is gonna invest in college students and in return for that they get service. Why not invest in teachers and in return for that you get quality teachers to go in certain places. And I have other ideas too about how to keep them there. Young people starting families, one of the most difficult things to have now is getting a home. And why not say if you come to these places and teach 7 years or 10 years, whatever you wanna--you get them beyond the 5-year period. Let's say you want them to teach for 7 years or 10 years and then you start to think about subsidies for home ownership or condos whatever as part of the package.

>> Right.

>> Then people would stay but you gotta give them a reason to stay. You can't do business as usual because we'll get the same results. And in that 50 percent that retire in the first 5 years, I bet if we look at the quality of that, a lot of quality teachers are getting out within the first 5 years.

>> Because of the working conditions.

>> Yes. And so there are a lot of things that he could do and then in 8 years from now you have something to show for it. Right now we spent all this money and have nothing to show for.

>> Bill?

>> I was just gonna say on Jim's point, Schlechty and Knoblett [phonetic] used the NLS, actually using the NLS for high school and beyond and it showed that of those teachers who were leaving within the 5-year period those were the teachers who ended with the highest SAT scores. And so there are a number of things we can do to recapture them. We can also focus on the governance and administration of our K12 schools. There is
no reason why our K12 schools need to be administered in the same old ways that they were administered when I was a student.

>> You mean what?

>> Huh?

>> Meaning what?

Well, I've been struck by the fact that unlike other professions many of our teachers exit our teacher education programs and have little knowledge about the industry or the organization in which they work and how it's governed, how it's managed, and so it would be difficult for the principal in that school to actually think about those teachers being co-managers in the same way that we produce other professionals who understand their profession. Many medical doctors entered their profession knowing a great deal about the organization of the profession, the organization of the places in which they would work and they actually in some places have redesigned clinics in terms of governance and management in order to have a more participatory environment.

Interestingly enough, that's what people do when they create charter schools, when they create voucher programs and redesigned schools in order to reduce the bureaucracy from the upper levels, and we've seen some success of that on the book the Miracle in East Harlem is a story about how you redesign and reconfigure the management and governance of the school in a way which makes the teaching workplace not just physically more desirable but I think also professionally more desirable place to work in because they have much more autonomy and opportunity to participate in decisions about the nature of the work that's going on there. Young talented people want that as a part of their professional experience.

> Uh-hmm. Great. Okay, why don't we open it up now to questions from the audience. So people have--you have--we have microphone, couple mics, okay. So we have a question up here. It's coming. The microphone is coming.

> Good evening.

Good evening. I'm being told to stand up. Thank you so much for sharing your insights with us. Among our faculty in the higher education department, we often have exchanges about the fragmentation of education. So that we don't see K12 being connected to higher education and I thought it might be really nice if from historical and sociological perspective you would touch on some highlights of the connection of a march toward Brown through higher education, maybe just a few highlights.

> I don't know that I'll necessarily connect it with Brown but what I will suggest is that, there are set of white papers that have recently been completed by 6 subcommittees that were organized by the National Academy of Education in a project called Education '08. And as a part of that, one of the things that's a part of the considerations in there is the coherence in curriculum say from grade school to middle school to high school and on in to college. And we've seen more efforts along those lines in terms of efforts to bring coherence and consistency. Too many kids in situations where the disconnect between what colleges and universities expect them to do and what they're being asked to do in K12
is just really great in terms of the gap. The--one of the connections between what we see in higher education and what we're attempting to do in higher education, right now, higher education in the state like Illinois is one of the last places we have an opportunity to introduce students to diversity so that they can actually have the experience and encounter, because K12 education in the Illinois is one of the most segregated states in the nation. So many volunteers arrived having never experienced any cross-race contact or association, that's problematic. And so higher education has several responsibilities. One is to actually provide that in a productive and effective way, but also to figure out how to develop the course work and curriculum that actually provides these kinds of learning experiences that folks who will become teachers can actually have. So I think there are some melting responsibilities for higher education to be able to do that. Many places are doing that. You look at the work over the past decade, the work by scholars like Jackie Irvine, James Banks out of the University of Washington, Christine Sleeter. Many of these folks embedded in higher education have addressed these issues of multicultural learning and multicultural educational experiences where they've tried to fuse that research and scholarship into practice and they've held sometimes summer-long opportunities for teachers to come into those programs to do that. But I don't know the extent to which that scholarship has become more mainstream scholarship and opportunities within the framework of higher education.

>> Jim?

>> I think you're gonna see this come full circle, because at--in the pre-Brown era, higher education necessity was very involved in secondary education in particular because it worried about the quality of students that it was getting and thought to have some impact on that quality. For a long time, you know, colleges either have lab schools or their own high schools. And in the case of historically black colleges in the pre-Brown era they had more high school students on their campus than college students because each one of them lived in states--existed in states where it's very difficult for African-American to get a high school education. So there were many states that didn't provide public high schools to African-American kids. So the colleges provided the secondary schools. And you went directly from their high schools into their freshmen classes which then had a very close relationship between higher education and secondary education. Fortunately, I think we thought it's a good thing that the expansion of the good public high schools really at mid century. And this is one thing that we forget about our society that as of 1950, two-thirds of our civilian workforce were high school dropouts. I mean most people just didn't go to high school and finished high school. Then we saw the expansion of very good public high schools at mid century that produced the college population of the '60s and the '70s and so forth. And we were very satisfied with the quality of those public high schools and the kind of college student they gave us. We have now reached the point where we're no longer satisfied with that and you're gonna see much closer partnerships, I think, between higher education and K12 than we've seen in the past because the very survival of higher educations dependent on improvement of the quality of K12 education and another factor that's gonna be new in that is that the majority of the school population will be students of color very shortly, and those are the very students who have been sure change in educational system. So as your pool become disproportionately students of color,
that is your freshmen class, you have to be concerned about the quality of education they're getting unless you're gonna go to international students in your freshmen classes in American universities.  

>> Thank you very much for a fascinating discussion.  I'm still concerned by the lack of performance in inner city students and along with that you described the 4-year gap in performance.  Do you have an explanation for it?  You said that the ones that were advanced might not be accurate but how do you draw these students back into enthusiasm for learning when they're in the younger grades?  

>> Okay.  I think the first thing to recognize is that there really hasn't been that much of change in the actual school performance of students.  There's been a great change in our expectations.  So if you look at the actual evidence and I've indicated earlier that what those performances were like roughly from when we started to record the NAPE scores and the ACT and SAT scores around 1968, 69, 70 and those were constantly improved over the next several decades.  Now there was a fluctuation in 1988 but even you go back to the NAPE scores in 2004, there was an interesting result and one thing you notice in this whole affair so to speak, is that the only thing that gets advertised is failure.  Success almost never gets talked about.  When we look at the NAPE scores for 4th graders and 8th graders in 2004, both African-American and Latino kids made significant progress in closing the achievement gap by the very same measures that we used to document the widening of the achievement gap in 1988, but there was a difference.  From roughly 1970 to 1988, the way in which African-American students and Latino students closed the achievement gap was that the academic achievement of white students remained flat for about 3 decades, just a flat line.  And African-American students and Latino students start to increase their scores and that's why the Jenck's book in 1998 predicted closing achievement gap.  Now on 2004, something very different happened.  African-American students and Latino students closed the achievement gap while students gained.  But Black and Latino students gained at a faster rate.  That kind of progress is much more significant than gaining on the flat line.  I mean it's like you're racing against someone and they're standing still and you're gaining on them, what do you expect to gain on them if they're standing still.  But if they run and went at a faster rate and you still gain, that's a lot better in terms of that.  So when we look at the actual evidence on these scores and even when you move to ACT and SAT scores, it's not so much that there had been any change in performance but that our expectation has changed.  Now, when we go into the large cities like Chicago and places like that, what we have to crack is really the impact of high concentrations of poverty on academic achievement.  If you take, you know, I'm familiar with Chicago.  Chicago has about 9 high schools that are selected and magnet where their achievement is just like the achievement in the best suburban high schools.  You know, Whitney Young is an example whereas average ACT score is 28 in the west side of Chicago.  
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>> Now, they have 18 other public high schools where they don't even meet AYP on the No Child Left Behind which is average yearly progress.  But Chicago poverty rate is 88 percent across its district of about 430,000 students which means almost 9 in every 10 kids in the school district is a kid in poverty.  When you have that high concentration of poverty, it's going to have a very detrimental impact on school achievement and this is
the challenge for educators. How do you educate kids for higher achievement when poverty is concentrated at that rate and/or alternatively, how do you brake up this concentration of poverty through other kinds of means? But I will say once again, you know, we don't have any evidence that there have been any significant changes in performance. In fact, all the evidence would indicate that there have been improvements in achievement. But our expectations change, they change with the nation at risk in 1983, when we became concerned that we fell behind other industrial democracies, that we're only ahead of Cyprus in South Africa and Lithuania and all the other industrial democracy were ahead of us, our expectations changed. When we looked at the achievement gap in 2000, our expectations changed. So, and for the good by the way. I mean I support these changes and actually I think our kids can do much better in school. But let's not think that somehow they have changed in their performance or their performance is going down when in fact it is going up.

>> I wanna add that there are challenges that these schools do in fact encounter, that these schools and school districts encounter. In these areas where you have these high concentrations, what we call hyper segregation, where you have high concentrations of chronic unemployment, some of it intergenerational, high concentrations of black and Latino and Southeast Asian, Laotian and among are where you have this hyper segregation. You also have extremely high mobility rates. It's not unusual for a kid to have as many as 6 elementary schools in the course of the year. Very difficult for a kid to learn consistently under those kinds of circumstances and we have substantial proportions of kids who are having these mobility experiences. We also have horrendous conditions. In the nation's capital 2 years ago, they actual closed down schools, third floor because of the leaks in the roof. This is on the nation's capital. So that because the building was not usable on the third floor, so both teachers and children are asked to learn in what are deplorable conditions. But you also have challenges of unemployment, you have high teacher turnover rate, you have high teacher absenteeism, you have a number of problems that challenged schools to be effective with the kids who are residents in those schools aside from the actual resource delivery issues for supplies and materials in those schools. So I don't wanna dismiss the idea of challenges to effective education or effective teaching and learning conditions while at the same time I think it's extremely important to understand that we shouldn't exaggerate the kind of changes that have occurred because of the actual performance patterns that we see on examinations like NAPE and the NAPE results.

>> Question in here.

>> As you guys mentioned earlier that the No Child Left Behind Act supports having educated teachers or teachers with higher standards in schools that have different needs. Now I'd like to ask you guys, how do you guys feel about busing students to higher--to school districts with higher standards? What psychological effects may this have once they return home and compare these schools districts to their very own school?

>> One of the programs almost used as an example with my last comment, Saint Louis, Missouri had an inter-district, voluntary inter-district school desegregation program where African-American parents in the City of Saint Louis voluntarily put their children on buses and we wondered if it would actually happen, and it happened and it happened in substantial ways. And we actually had a student in or a member of the school
workforce, yes, who's here in the audience tonight who grew up on that system, is that right? And while not every one of the suburban districts were fully supportive or fully engaged, the students who participated in it, both the white students and the black students learned important things. Not all wins. Amy Stuart Wells has written very powerful text, wonderful qualitative research, describing the experiences of whites in that district and also of blacks. But let me give you an example of the uniqueness of that program. Irrespective of how many times a black family in the city of Saint Louis had to move, the students went to the same school. So it didn't matter how much housing mobility there was. Kids got on the bus and went to the same suburban school. How important is it for us to make sure that kids have a stable predictable learning experience. We could do that on a lot of places. Busing isn't the problem. We can figure out lots of novel ways to get people to effective learning context. What's important in terms of the social psychological takeaway is in fact the same things that are important to most of us even in environments like this or in higher education environments. We have to find a place that feels intellectually safe, physically safe, psychologically accessible. We look for those kinds of spaces as adults and as adult learners. Kids need the exact same thing. Kids need accessible learning experiences from people who attend to their needs, who are listening to these kids express what they need in order to become more effective learners. Do all these kids communicate that effectively? Probably not. But for those kids who do, they ought to have an educator who has the capacity and the competency to actually attend to those kids learning needs.

>> Barbara, you have a question?

>> I wanna thank you folks so much for the insights that you're giving us, but also personally because I appreciate that you recognize teacher education is so important and because the teaching--the teacher force is predominantly white, I want you to speak a little bit more about what kind of competencies are necessary to help teachers, white teachers, teach in urban schools. I've heard you speak about reducing prejudice and also some type of, you know, cultural relevant learning, but what about teachers realizing that they're white? I also worked in Illinois State and I know my students were predominantly white. They go to Chicago to teach but they didn't know that they were white and I'm not just talking about their skin color, they knew they had white, you know, "white skin color" but they didn't know what that means. And so how important is that in teacher education? You could address something, 'cause there's debate over whether or not, you know, we should teach them about whiteness.

>> Well, there are different schools who've thought about this, but I think the emerging scholarship on white privilege by serious scholars should be taken seriously. Issues of social stratification do matter. The work of Joe Feagin, I think is an exemplar in so many ways. Joe Feagin has done a book, the book--one of the most recent books on schooling is called the First R and what's frightening about the book is that the evidence shows that kids in preschool and as early as 3 are making racial differentiations so that they understand privilege associated with skin color and they actually act on it in the school context, in the kindergarten context which shows that and this is another comment on the post racial society. Our children are learning early on these issues of social stratification and social difference. We have to
be able to dismantle that when we see it occur. That means that a
preschool teacher has to be able to see that as an inappropriate
structure of relationship when it's racialized. Now the difficulty
obviously is how do we prepare people to be able to see that, how do we
do the kind of teaching that helps people to come to grips with instances
where race is being privileged.
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>> I also want to make sure we don't construct these as what whites have
to learn, solely as what whites have to learn. The way segregation
works, people who live on either side develop blinders and distortions.
You know if I used the example earlier today of the allegory of the cave
and people thought they saw a chair. Well, you know, if I'm looking at
the shadow and I'm black and you're looking at the shadow and you are
white, we're both seeing a disfigurement. And the point there is that we
see exaggerations and disfigurements of one another. So in many of these
places and many of these instances, we have to figure out how a classroom
can become a place where trust is an element of the relationship between
teacher and learner. And that's gonna be tough, that's an uphill
struggle in some places. Some educators are really effective at doing it
without racializing the classroom by emphasizing their mastery and their
competency. I actually think teachers who have the gift of being able to
create excitement about the subject matter don't have the same issues of
getting over race. When they're engaging people to be real learners and
approaching the potential learner as a person who can in fact be a
learner and not differentiating that along racial lines. So I think
that's a component of this issue of competency. I don't know that we
understand the range of affect as well as skill and mastery that goes
into really being a master, an educated master teacher, whatever the
discipline is. But you do have to create an invitation for people to
join in learning something you're excited about. And people across race
and gender do that very well and we know the teachers we had who did that
for us. And--but the challenge to create a workforce that's like that is
a part of what we face.
>> One more question.
>> I--
>> Over here.
>> I just wanted to say that when I was working in the schools here in
Syracuse, to prevent violence I discovered that one of the areas in the
country which deals very well with mobility is the United States
Military.
>> Yes.
>> And schools for the military children seem to handle the issue of
mobility quite well, largely because they put a lot of money into
guidance councilors and assistants in making the moves. I--do you think
first of that that could be used as a model for this for our schools
because it's not always possible to prevent the mobility of the parents.
That was the first thing. The second thing was, Professor Anderson's
point about using the notion of financing the infrastructure now and
including in that new finances for our infrastructure the schools seems
to make extraordinarily important. And I was wondering whether we as a
group, and I'm saying here those of us who are here this evening, could
in fact follow up on that. Barack Obama has got a website where people's
suggestions can be put forward. If we could encourage our friends to put
that suggestion forward on that website perhaps we could begin a movement
within the country to make sure that that is adapted in the package that's put forward in the next few months.

[ Applause ]

>> Can I offer just a friendly amendment to your recommendation before it goes forward and it's not really an amendment, it's an enhancement of it. When Jim and I talked about this, I think it's important to say that this isn't just a jobs program but if our educational infrastructure as--is as old as it is, we would also be making a huge dent in our energy deficit by being able to go to green buildings. So it's a triple win. We get to do new schools, an employment program and an energy saving package because those old infrastructures that we've been heating up everyday, they just retrofitted the [inaudible] incentive for the performing arts cost 180,000 dollars to do it. They recouped the savings in something like 6 months. So I think, you know, when we start thinking about that that's huge.

>> Jim?

>> I was glad you mentioned that, you know, those schools, because there was a study on the achievement of black and Latino students in military schools and these defense school that are offered to the children in military. And one thing they noticed in the study, the characteristics of these kids were much like the kids in public schools in terms of SCS and income and so forth. The--but there were--and on achievement, if you separate out the kids of the military schools, they outranked black and Latino students in all 50 states. They have the highest achievement rate in those schools. And I was reading through the studies trying to figure out now, what would be the differences, what did they do? And the first thing that caught my eye in the study when they asked the kids in public schools if their teachers cared about their success, there was about 35 percent that said yes and the defense schools it was at 85 percent. 85 percent of the kids said that the teachers cared about their success. That was the biggest gap in the study that I could see. Almost everything else looked very similar across groups in the military schools and in the public schools. And so I think it could be an example in a sense and back to the only question I want to say about our current teachers in schools, some of them are very effective and there are white teachers who are very effective at teaching African-American kids and there are a lot of African-American teachers that were driven out of profession that were very effective at teaching African-American kids. And one thing for the in-service teachers and teachers who are not very effective would be to have them to engage those teachers that are effective. I think they would learn more from each other than any of us could teach them. To talk to teachers who are effective and who have great success in teaching these kids and so let's not assume that--I mean, it's interesting to me that if you ask African-American teachers who are headed into schools that are predominantly white, all white, if they think they're gonna have trouble teaching and they said no, we're gonna be fine. And if you take white teachers having headed in to black schools, there are all kinds of fears and all kinds of concerns. If they could meet with those teachers that are very effective, maybe some of those fears and some of those concerns could be resolved. So I think we have to have some kind of training programs where they meet with teachers who have enormous success so they see the possibilities.

>> One more question.
Thanks. Maybe going off of what Barbara's question was about whiteness and what you said about needing to improve teacher workforce especially in dealing with teaching children of different races, different background. I guess I'm interested in your thoughts in a program like Teach for America that's been talked about in presidential elections, in the presidential debates at least once. So I guess kind of your thoughts in Teach for America that I—-at least I see as continuing to bring white perhaps under prepared teachers to urban schools?

Excuse me. The Teach for America program does an interesting thing of getting highly able young college graduates to consider going into the teaching profession and doing it for some sustained period of time. What we wonder about is the pre-service training that they actually get that gives them good pedagogical strengths. Well we also have to wonder about other context in which they're being placed given what maybe their needs for being able to be effective with what would be considered or characterized as a challenging population of students or students with high levels of need. I'm not suggesting that they are to be placed differently but I do think we have to make sure that those teachers who are placed in those programs, who are Teach for America kids actually go in with the resident competencies and skills to do that to be able to do that. The other concern I have is for the length of tenure of the Teach for America teachers. And I'm not sure what the longevity is now. I'm not suggesting that it ought to be a 10 or 15 year commitment. But I do think that we have to be concerned about the length of time there. I'm not sure this is addressing your question but the length of time that they're actually in there.

The pre-service portion of it when Teach for America kids are recruited into it, I am not completely convinced about the curriculum that they actually get in preparation for going into the schools. I think there are some OJT that they get that actually enables them to perform better in many instances.

Please join me in thanking our speakers this evening. Thank you.

[Applause]

Thank you very much.

Thank you.

[Applause]

If I could I'd just like to take the oppor--

[Silence]