

84TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY

REGULAR SESSION

MARCH 19, 1985

PRESIDENT:

The Senate will please come to order. Will the members be at their desks. Will our guests in the gallery please rise. Prayer this afternoon by the Reverend Samuel Pusateri, St. Bede's Abby, Peru, Illinois.

REVEREND SAMUEL PUSATERI:

(Prayer given by Reverend Pusateri)

PRESIDENT:

Thank you, Father. Reading of the Journal.

SECRETARY:

Wednesday, February the 27th; Thursday, February the 28th; Tuesday, March the 5th and Wednesday, March the 6th, in the year 1985.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH:

Thank you, Mr. President. I move that the Journals just read by the Secretary be approved unless some Senator has additions or corrections to offer.

PRESIDENT:

You've heard the motion as placed by Senator Smith. Is there any discussion? If not, all in favor indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The motion carries and it's so ordered. Message from the House.

SECRETARY:

Message from the House by Mr. O'Brien, Clerk.

Mr. President - I am directed to inform the Senate...excuse me...the House of Representatives has passed bills with the following titles, in the passage of which I am instructed to ask the concurrence of the Senate, to-wit:

House Bills 38, 39, 69, 71, 88, 116, 137, 167, 212, 223, 252, 253 and 284.

Message from the House by Mr. O'Brien, Clerk.

Mr. President - I am directed to inform the Senate

the House of Representatives has adopted the following joint resolutions, in the adoption of which I am instructed to ask the concurrence of the Senate, to-wit:

House Joint Resolutions 15, 16, 17, 18 and 19, all congratulatory.

PRESIDENT:

Consent Calendar. Resolutions.

SECRETARY:

Senate...the following resolutions are all congratulatory or commendatory.

Senate Resolution 62, by Senators Nedza...Senator Nedza and all Senators.

Senate Resolution 63, by Senator Davidson and all Senators.

Senate Resolution 64, by Senator Lemke.

Senate Resolution 65, by Senator Lemke.

Senate Resolution 66, by Senator Lemke.

Senate Resolution 67, by Senator Lechowicz.

Senate Resolution 68, by Senator Lechowicz.

Senate Resolution 69, by Senator Luft.

Senate Resolution 70, by Senators Davidson and all...Senator Davidson and all Senators.

Senate Resolution 71...by Senator Dawson.

Senate Resolution 72, by Senator Vadalabene.

Senate Joint Resolution 21, by Senator...Topinka.

PRESIDENT:

Consent Calendar.

SECRETARY:

Senate Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment No. 22 and Senate Joint Resolution 23.

PRESIDENT:

Executive.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

For what purpose Senator Netsch rise?

SENATOR NETSCH:

Thank you...thank you, Mr. President. Just while we are in limbo, if I might take care of a housekeeping matter, with the permission of the sponsor, I would like to be shown as a hyphenated cosponsor of Senate Bill 249.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

You've heard the motion. Any discussion? If not, those in favor indicate by saying Aye. Those opposed. The motion carries. What purpose Senator Vadalabene rise?

SENATOR VADALABENE:

Yes, since there's a little pause in the action here, I would like to have my name removed from Senate Bill 233 and Senate Bill 101, and I would like to be put as the sponsor on Senate Bill 263. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Is there any discussion? You've heard the motion. Those in favor indicate by saying Aye. Those opposed. The Ayes have it. The motion carried. Senator Vadalabene, on 263, was that cosponsor or are you asking to be the chief sponsor?

SENATOR VADALABENE:

No, hyphenated.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. If I can have the attention of the membership for just a moment...thank you. There are a number of bills that have been filed for introduction and I think, next, we will go to that order to allow the members an opportunity to recognize the fact that it is St. Joseph's Day and in that spirit, Senators Nedza and Lechowicz and Lemke and others have provided...what should I say, St. Joseph Fair. A St. Joseph table for...to which they invite everybody to partake. They are cooking...for those of you haven't been in the back

of the Chamber, they are cooking in my office and you can't miss the...aroma. So, that I'd suggest during the course of the introduction...and please don't leave yet, during the course of introduction, you may want to go back and avail yourself of their hearty fare and grab a sandwich. Then, we will go to the Committee of the Whole. Senator Berman and Senator Maitland have a number...I guess two, at least, witnesses who are prepared to discuss educational reform and respond to your questions. Allow me, if I can get their...their attention, Mr. President, allow me to say I apologize for starting late. I just returned from Detroit where I was privileged to be a member of a delegation meeting with the chairman of the board of General Motors and the new president of the Saturn Corporation; and as one of sixteen individuals representing business and labor and government and politics in this State, we left for Detroit at seven-thirty this morning and just returned, and I...had the opportunity to represent all of you and I will share with you, obviously, this afternoon the written materials which were presented, but I think it's fair to say that we were extremely well received. The group was called together by Dan Rostenkowski...Congressman Rostenkowski who is the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee and we had the presidents of banks and utility companies and Representative Daniels and I...from the House represented the General Assembly and Director Woelffer flew back from China to represent the Governor; and I think, in general, we visited with the GM people for in excess of an hour and toured their newly automated and newly built plant in Detroit, and I think we made a presentation, the likes of which, at least in Chairman Smith's words, he had not received from anyone, and I think the array of people that were assembled and each of us had something to say truly impressed them. Our information is that they will be prepared to make an announcement...final

selection, if you will, in mid-June or certainly by the first of July. So, I think I can represent without fear of contradiction to all of you that our State has been very ably represented. We have presented the hard data to them in terms of tax advantage and tax incentive and programs we are prepared to move forward with, obviously, stressing the centrist nature of our State in terms of transportation and energy resources. All in all, it was well received and I hope you will be hearing a lot more about it. They are most welcome, obviously. So, if we can, Mr. President, I think the proper moment is now for introduction; and on behalf of those who will be providing the food, I wish you all a very happy St. Joseph's Day and then we'll get on with the Committee of the Whole.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Before we go to that, Mr. President, we do have Ann Fink and WICS, they request permission to tape the Senate Session today. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. We have Senator Newhouse that sought recognition. Senator Newhouse.

SENATOR NEWHOUSE:

Thank you, Mr. President. I have asked permission of the sponsor of Senate Bill 191, Senator Netsch, and been granted permission to be a hyphenated cosponsor on that bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

You've...you've heard the motion. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

Thank you. I would like to see Senator...Judy Barr-Topinka as cosponsor of Senate Bill 109...hyphenated with me.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

...Senator Topinka. She's not sure, Senator. Senator Deauzio. Senator Zito. Senator Zito, oh...

SENATOR ZITO:

Thank you, Mr. President. At the proper time, I'd ask leave of the Body to add Senators Kustra, Nedza, Vadalabene and Poshard as cosponsors of Senate Bill 172.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Is leave granted? Leave is granted. Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH:

Yes, Mr. Chairman, I beg leave to ask that the name of Senator Emil Jones be placed as hyphenated sponsor on Senate Bill 75.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

You've heard the motion. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Yes, with leave of the Senate, I'd like to have Senator Dunn added as a hyphenated cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 9...hyphenated.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

You've...you've heard the motion. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

I'm sorry, would you...correct that to Senate Bill 107? Judy Barr-Topinka.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

You...you've heard the motion. Senator Fawell seeks leave to have Senator Topinka placed on as a hyphenated cosponsor of Senate Bill 107. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Thank you, Mr. President. I would like to point out to the members of the Senate, on this St. Joseph's Day,... (Italian phrase)...and I just want to say that it's an extremely important Italian holiday, and I would like to add my name to this...this little circular that's being circulated around.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Your name will be added, Senator DeAngelis. Senator Newhouse.

SENATOR NEWHOUSE:

I just want to tell the Senator, I understood him a little better the first time around.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Jones.

SENATOR JONES:

... (foreign word)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Introduction of bills.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

Senate Bill 302, by Senator Davidson.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 303, by Senator DeAngelis and Nedza.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 304, Senator Collins.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

305, by Senator Schuneman, Jones, Philip, DeAngelis, Weaver, Davidson and Schaffer.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 306, by Senator Demuzio.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

307, by Senator Dudycz.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

308, Senator Schaffer.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

309, Senator Sangmeister and Barkhausen.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

310, by the same sponsors.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

311, by Senator Davidson.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

...313, by Senator Luft.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 312, by Senators Demuzio, DeAngelis, Rock, Savickas, Chew, D'Arco, Luft and Vadalabene.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Disregard that last 312.

Senate Bill 314, by Senators Mahar, Schaffer, DeAngelis, Karpel, Schuneman, Coffey, Kelly, Maitland and Friedland.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

315, by Senators Mahar and Topinka.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

316, Senator Maitland.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

317, Senator Maitland.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

318, Senator Luft.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

319, Senator Luft.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

330, by Senator Luft.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

321, by Senator Vadalabene.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

322, by Senators Vadalabene and Holmberg.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

323, by Senator Vadalabene.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

324, by Senator D'Arco.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

325, by Senator D'Arco.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

326, by Senator D'Arco.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

327, by Senator Vadalabene.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

328, by Senator Vadalabene.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

329, by Senators Welch, Rock, Newhouse, Darrow and
Holmberg.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

330, by Senators Rock and DeAngelis.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

331, by Senator Jeremiah Joyce.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

332, by Senator Jeremiah Joyce.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

333, by Senator Jeremiah Joyce.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

334, by Senator Etheredge.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

325, by Senator Mahar.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

336, by Senator Coffey.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

337, Barkhausen.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

338, Holmberg.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

339, by Senator Holmberg.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

340, by Senators Berman and Rock.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

341, by Senators Geo-Karis, Lemke and Barkhausen.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

342, by Senators Demuzio, Rock, Savickas, Chew, D'Arco,
Luft and Vadalabene.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

343, by Senators Netsch, Lechowicz and Degnan.

Committee
of the
Whole

Page 10 - MARCH 19, 1985

(Secretary reads title of bill)

344, by Senators Netsch, Degnan and Lechowicz.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

345, by the same sponsors.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

346, by Senators Barkhausen and Carroll.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

1st reading of the bills.

PRESIDENT:

Resolutions.

SECRETARY:

Senate Resolution 73 offered by Senator Geo-Karis, congratulatory.

Senate Resolution 74, by Senator Kelly, congratulatory.

Senate Resolution 75, by Senator Macdonald and it's congratulatory.

PRESIDENT:

Consent Calendar.

SECRETARY:

Senate Joint Resolution 24 offered by Senators Kelly and Smith.

PRESIDENT:

Executive. Senator Coffey, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR COFFEY:

Thank you, Mr. President. I'd like to have leave to be added as a hyphenated sponsor on Senate Bill 262.

PRESIDENT:

262, the gentleman seeks leave to be added as a hyphenated cosponsor. Without objection, is leave granted? Leave is granted. All right, can we take the caucuses off the Floor and I'd ask the members to please take their seats. Senator Maitland, for what purpose do you arise, sir?

SENATOR MAITLAND:

Thank you, very much, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate...of the Senate. I would...would move at this time that the Senate resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole.

PRESIDENT:

All right, Senator Maitland has moved that the Senate resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for a special order of business, again, to consider the issues of education reform and education funding. Any discussion? If not, all in favor of the motion indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The motion carries. I'd ask the members to please be in their seats...the members will please be in their seats. The Chair has requested of Senator Berman and Maitland that we attempt, at least, to hold this discussion at this time, there will be other opportunities...about an hour so that those of you who have committees and witnesses awaiting to appear figure on the committees starting around two-thirty. All right, the motion is carried. The Chair will now yield to the chairman of the Elementary and Education...Elementary and Secondary Education Committee of the Senate, Senator Arthur Berman. Senator.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (SENATOR BERMAN)

Thank you, Mr. President. Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, the Committee of the Whole is now in order. Today we will be hearing reports on two...commission reports that have addressed the issue of education reform in Illinois, the Commission on the Improvement of Elementary and Secondary Education and the Illinois Project for School Reform. Following today's Committee of the Whole, we have two more Committee...of the Whole Sessions scheduled; one on March 26th where we will hear testimony from Reg Weaver, president of the Illinois Education Association; Bob Healy, president of the Illinois Federation of Teachers; Doctor Paul Young, president of...of the Illinois Association of School Adminis-

trators and Joan Leavy, president of the Illinois Association of School Boards and we will have a concluding Committee of the Whole meeting on April 10th. It is my pleasure at this time to introduce Senator John Maitland of the 44th District who was elected to the Illinois Senate in 1978. He is the Minority Spokesman on the Senate Committee on Elementary and Secondary Education and was a member of the Illinois Commission on the Improvement of Elementary and Secondary Education. He is vice-chair of the Agriculture Food Policy and Nutrition Committee of the National Conference of State Legislators. He is active in the...central Illinois as the president of the Illinois Wesleyan University Board of Directors and numerous other community and civic organizations. In 1984, Senator Maitland was presented with the Friend of Education Award and he did yeoman service on the Commission on the Improvement of Elementary and Secondary Education. Senator Maitland.

SENATOR MAITLAND:

Thank you, very much, Senator Berman, my colleagues in the Senate. If "A Nation at Risk" did anything at all for this nation, it once again put education back on the front burner. For all too long the enthusiasm for education across this nation was dwindling and, indeed, the quality of education was dwindling also. That report called..."The Nation at Risk" report called for some far-reaching changes in education. As a consequence of that, the Legislature, the General Assembly of the State of Illinois, created Senate Joint Resolution 61, in 1983, to react to those charges, to build on what Illinois had that was very good in education and do away with what we had that was not very good. The commission set about the task of holding a number of hearings across the State and the report has been presented to the General Assembly. I'm proud to have served on that commission. I see the young people in the galleries today and I think about what

we...truly need to be committed to in...in Illinois. This year can be the year for educational reform. I am convinced of that. Senator Rock referred to the GM plant, the Saturn plant, the possibility of getting it in the State of Illinois. Just this morning, driving down here, the president of GM said on the radio that tax incentives weren't the only determining factor for coming into a state. The quality of their educational program was a part of this decision making process also. Yes, 1985 can be the year for educational reform. We're proud and pleased to present this report to you this afternoon, allow you to view it and listen carefully to it and, hopefully, this will be the year for reform in Illinois. Thank you, very much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (SENATOR BERMAN)

Thank you, Senator Maitland. At this point, I wish to introduce our colleague, Senator Joyce Holmberg of the 34th District who was elected in November of 1982. She is the vice-chair of the...Senate Committee on Elementary and Secondary Education and serves on the Committees of Higher Education, Local Government and both Appropriations Committees. For the 1985 Session, she will also serve as vice-chair of the State Infrastructure Committee. She is also a member of the Legislative Study Group of Children and Family, the Committee on the Status of Women and Council of Women Legislators. She has worked ardently on behalf of the report of the commission and I'm pleased to present at this time for remarks, Senator Joyce Holmberg.

SENATOR HOLMBERG:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, colleagues. As a member with Senator Maitland on the Commission on the Improvement of Elementary and Secondary Education, I had the privilege of serving with other colleagues here in the Senate; Senator Davidson, Senator Etheredge, Senator Newhouse and, of course, Chairman Bertram who co-chaired, with Representative Dick

Mulcahey, the commission which so ably brought its report to all of you. I think one of the significant things about the commission is the makeup of the commission as it was voted in the Senate resolution. The twenty members, I think, represent some of the most significant thinking in education in the State. Senator Rock, as President of the Senate, and Speaker Madigan chose the educational leadership of the Senate and the House. Representative Gene Hoffman, head of the School Problems Commission, chose five members of the School Problems Commission and Governor Thompson had the foresight to pick some very creative members with his choices; such as, Sarina Bellmann, the issues analyst of Illinois Bell; Doctor Bob Goodall, who is head of in-service training at Illinois State University; Doctor Orley Herron, the president of the National College of Education; Bud Thompson, from the State Board of Education and Reg Weaver, head of the IEA. Those members worked very diligently. Beginning September 1st, 1983, they decided to hold thirteen commission hearings around the State in Springfield, Grayslake, Carbondale, Glen Ellyn, Moline, Champaign, Flossmoor, Rockford and several in Chicago. This was a key decision because I have long felt, as did the members of the commission, that the schools belong to the people. So, when you're talking about improvement and you're talking about reform, it's time to go to the people. What we did is we went in a body and it was not uncommon to see fifteen to eighteen of the twenty members at any given hearing, and when we...were in a school auditorium, the auditoriums would be packed and the commission members were curtain to curtain on the stage. We then met to write the document together, and Serina Bellmann gave us a great deal of help, and word for word, we approved the wording based on what we had heard from the public. What had happened over those one and a half years is that we had been able to absorb and then finally

articulate what the public had told us; and, basically, in this document, we have made them an offer they can't refuse, because we have given to them what they told us, and I think we should be able to win the public and all of your constituents' support in the funding of what is needed in the way of improvement of education. It's a consensus document, it's a strong foundation upon which the Senate can build its work in education this year and I, like Senator Maitland, support the commission report.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (SENATOR BERMAN)

Thank you, Senator Holmberg. There has been distributed to all of the members of the Senate the report of the Illinois Commission on the Improvement of Elementary and Secondary Education. The resolution which created the commission called on the State Board of Education to provide the necessary staff support for the commission's deliberations. Mrs. Gail Lieberman served as the contact person for the Illinois Commission along with other persons on the staff of the State Board of Education, but Gail did a yeoman job in organizing and carrying out all of the staff duties, ninety percent of it, for the commission. She has been with the Illinois State Board of Education since 1971, was a teacher prior to joining the State agency. All of us on the commission have saluted Gail for her dedication and talent, and I'm very pleased to introduce her to the Senate today to present the report of the Illinois Commission on the Improvement of Elementary and Secondary Education. Gail Lieberman.

GAIL LIEBERMAN:

Mr. Chairman and members of the Senate, thank you for the opportunity to present information today about the Illinois Commission. As a member of the State Board of Education, I was assigned to assist the commission with the implementation of Senate Joint Resolution 61. Senator Maitland has already noted the need for and the background of the commission.

Many of the conditions deplored in the national reports have already begun to improve. The real issue, therefore, is not the rising tide of mediocrity, since that tide has already begun to recede, but rather, what we must do to build on the schools' recent start toward self-improvement. Senator Holmberg noted the public hearings. The public was asked to address select theme questions and those questions were key. They were: How adequate are the State's expectations for instructional standards and pupil performance across all ages? How should time in school be specified to assure effective instruction and meet our expectations? How can we recruit, educate, retain and reward more good teachers and educational administrators? and finally, How can we assure that our schools are adequately preparing youth for higher education and/or the public/private employment sector? The State's responsibility to adequately fund public education was of concern to all of the members. Discussion of school finance, however, was deferred in order to have the recommendations for improvement drive the need for school finance. Upon completion of the hearings, the commission reviewed the testimony received from the public. The testimony, as you've heard from Senator Holmberg, reflected the care and concern of Illinois citizens about the quality of education in our State and their desire to be involved in the process of improving education for all school children. The commission recognized there would be a price tag to the recommendations and discussed the fact that future support for public education, both financial and political, would depend, in large part, on public education's willingness to assume a greater level of accountability. The hearings were open, yet certain points of view were specifically solicited, hoping to hear from the business and education and instructional community, the university sector, parents and a number of others. The commission heard from more than three hundred and fifty

groups and individuals which represented many Illinois citizens. Those who participated, as you heard described, in these open dialogues realized soon that they were give-and-take and not just a usual hearing and the opportunity for questions by all the commission members was present. You as members of the Illinois Senate also heard from the commission periodically. There were individual letters to all of you last March regarding the mid-point status and progress and then again later on regarding the preliminary and final report. After the initial round of hearings, members deliberated on the theme questions I mentioned earlier and then the public recommendations. The result last July was a document called, "Excellence in the Making: A Preliminary Report" and the document was circulated widely. Following that document's distribution, two more public hearings were held in Springfield and Chicago in order to obtain citizen comment on those preliminary recommendations and, finally, to hear suggestions on school finance. The mission, as mentioned by Senator Maitland, was to report findings and suggest necessary legislation to improve education in Illinois. After fourteen public hearings, a preliminary report and much deliberation, you now have that final report, "Excellence in the Making." The suggestions for necessary legislation are embodied within that report. Let me share with you some of the specific findings and recommendations. In traveling throughout Illinois the commission heard that the quality of our State's public school system must be significantly improved, and that we must renew our commitment to excellence in education. Towards that end, it has fashioned recommendations in three areas: instructional programs, personnel and organization of the schools. The recommendations will require action, as specified in the report, by the State and/or by local school district. The major recommendations are: students will

demonstrate academic proficiency at grades three, six, eight and ten, according to State criteria; the school district will regularly and thoroughly evaluate and assist teachers in their teaching role; teacher salaries will be raised in order to both retain current competent staff and attract new and capable beginning staff; and that administrators must meet standards for...recertification every five years. The commission feels that the ability of the State to establish reasonable goals for schooling is perhaps the most important contribution it can make to the improvement of student learning. There is dissatisfaction with Illinois' present system of setting educational priorities only through course requirements or mandates for schools. The present system fails to clearly outline the State's compelling interest in education. Commission members believe that schools must be held accountable for the academic progress of students. The commission recommends: identifying the primary purposes of schooling and the use of resources consistent with this purpose; requiring local assessment systems and public reporting; encouraging full day kindergarten programs; having programs to prevent at-risk youth from dropping out and expanding options for high school pupils who don't adjust to the regular school program; and having a process to commend those top-achieving school districts in Illinois. With regard to specific personnel recommendations, the commission feels that you improve the quality of education by starting with those who provide the service. It recommends: requiring staff development programs and continuing individual professional education for all teachers and administrators; requiring administrative recertification every five years; supporting scholarships and internships for women and minorities in administration; raising the statutory minimum salary for beginning teachers to twenty thousand dollars by 1987-88 and also improving the salaries to retain current competent

teachers; developing a recognition process for outstanding staff performance; meeting performance requirements in basic skill areas prior to entering teacher training; passing an examination prior to receiving initial certification; establishing criteria for regular evaluation of all personnel; training administrators regarding effective personnel evaluation and remediation processes; and awarding scholarships in the areas of teacher shortages. One of the many national reports viewed by commission members was called, "Beyond the Commission Reports: The Coming Crisis in Teaching." That document opened with the following want ad. "Wanted: College graduate with academic major, masters degree preferred. Excellent communication and leadership skills required. Challenging opportunity to serve a hundred and fifty clients daily, developing up to five different products each day to meet their needs. This diversified job also allows the employee to exercise typing, clerical, law enforcement and social work skills between assignments and after hours. Adaptability helpful, since suppliers cannot always deliver goods and support services on time. Typical work week forty-seven hours. Special nature of work precludes fringe benefits such as lunch hour or coffee breaks, but the work has many intrinsic rewards. Starting salary twelve thousand seven hundred dollars, with a guarantee of twenty-four thousand dollars after only fourteen years." The conditions described in this want ad depict many of our current teaching assignment and the commission echoes those who say that a society that generally fails to adequately pay members of the teaching profession is implying that that occupational class which educates our children is of less importance than other professions. The report also stresses a need for Illinois school districts to provide a more efficient operation of local schools. This was a familiar theme to many of the members. The allocation of responsibilities among the various

levels of the educational system is unnecessarily confusing and contributes to inefficiency in the planning and delivery of education. Consolidation and streamlining of regional structures would be in the interest of local school district. The report recommends reviewing and proposing a more productive service delivery system; local review of local school size and district organization; recognizing effective schools; and a local review of the school day and year to maximize time available and emphasize academic learning. In summary, the commission concludes that the State Board of Education should prepare an annual report to the General Assembly and Governor on the status of education in Illinois, specifically identifying problems and recommending solutions; and that the commission should reassemble in three years to assess the outcome of these recommendations and comment to the General Assembly, Governor and the public. These recommendations and much more are contained in "Excellence in the Making," and I'd ask, if the Pages haven't done so already, to make sure that the copies of the report are distributed. The report was issued in January of 1985 to each of you, individually, and to Governor Thompson, and then released to the general public. To date, more than fifteen thousand copies of the report have gone out, plus over a hundred copies of the half-hour videotape on the commission. Let's talk about money. The commission asked staff to cost out the recommendations. Staff of the State Board of Education presented a lengthy paper and reviewed with the commission the items and assumptions behind Appendix E which is the cost chart located near the end of the commission report. The commission also heard from the Bureau of the Budget and the Economic and Fiscal Commission, and staff of the General Assembly Revenue Committees were also asked to prepare information on potential revenue options. The commission, with that background information, now has estimates of the

necessary costs. Without reprioritizing local and State activities or funds, it will take an additional two hundred and twenty-five million in Year One at the State level for these reforms. It was acknowledged by all that the State will need to raise additional revenue. The commission recommends increasing the income tax to a level required for the support of these educational reforms. It recommended no specific amount of increase. The media has covered well the various reform reports, beginning with "A Nation at Risk" and accelerating the pace of information to the public. Coverage at the local and national level on the rising tide of reports is making the public aware of issues in instructional reforms, personnel and school finance. One of the latest educational pieces was a series of editorials by the Chicago Tribune. The first editorial opened with: "If Illinois' public schools are ever going to improve, this is the year to set changes in motion." The final editorial in the series of four concluded with: "The danger is that in its eagerness to avoid increasing income taxes, the General Assembly will settle for raising teachers' pay in exchange for only token reforms. The extra money will sink into salary scales and nothing will change. That would be a dismaying waste of the efforts of thousands of committed people who have worked on the reform reports, of public sentiment for education change and of the irreplaceable years in the lives of children who depend on the public schools for their future." The commission's report was entitled "Excellence in the Making." That title was also the result, like the recommendations, of much discussion and reflects the perception that Illinois education is good and could be better. The report began with a quotation from John Gardner. Let me end with one now. He noted that, "Those who achieve excellence will be few at best," but added that, "many more can achieve it than do now," and that society benefits not only from those who

achieve excellence but also from those who strive for it. It was the commission members' hope that the General Assembly could work towards a single major package on educational improvement between January and June. Members have pledged their effort towards that goal, towards excellence in education in Illinois. The commission urges you to seek meaningful educational improvement in Illinois. It's time to stop talking. It's the season of decision. Thank you for the opportunity...to present today.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (SENATOR BERMAN)

Thank you, Gail. What...because of our time restrictions, I'm going to ask Gail to stand by and have the report from Doctor Bakalis and then we'll open it for questions for either or both of the presentors. Doctor Michael Bakalis has had a distinguished career in education and government affairs. He served as Superintendent of Public Instruction from 1970 to 1974, State Comptroller from 1976 to '78 and was a candidate for Governor in 1978. In...in addition to a distinguished career in teaching at Northwestern University, Doctor Bakalis also served as undersecretary for intergovernmental affairs in the Department of Education during the Carter Administration. His most recent undertaking has been as executive director of the Illinois Project for School Reform. It is a pleasure to have him here today before the Illinois Senate to speak...to the issues contained in his report, "Education for a New Illinois." Doctor Michael Bakalis.

DOCTOR MICHAEL BAKALIS:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, President Rock, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. First of all, I appreciate the opportunity to be before you and share with you our ideas on school reform from the Illinois Project for School Reform. I think it is a fine idea to give this kind of a forum to all of the individuals who are involved in this impor-

tant...important endeavor this year. And secondly, to congratulate the...the Senate and the House for their Legislative Commission report. It is a fine report and I hope as we go through these next few months in this State that we are not holding one against another but recognizing that so many people in this State have worked together on a common interest that I think all of them have something worthwhile to say, so I do congratulate the Legislative Commission on...on what they have...what they have done. President Reagan, about two years ago, initiated what may in retrospect be perhaps the most significant educational reform effort in this century. I think that is significant because if you think about that report entitled, "A Nation at Risk," what strikes me about that report is that it stimulated a flurry of activity for school reform across this country. In fact, over three hundred commissions and boards across this country to improve our schools, it stimulated that activity without one penny being offered by the Federal Government and without any kind of sticks being offered over the heads of school people. In other words, the President stimulated activity in thinking about schools by recognizing that the time had come and by providing the kind of moral leadership that a President ought to provide. I think that's an important lesson in 1985, because in our project, which is the result of the sponsorship of the private sector of this State, our project recognizes that so much of education can be improved without money as well...as the substantial needs of money for the public schools. So, we want to make that clear in the beginning. We believe the schools need money, but we believe the schools need much, much more than money; they need the opportunity for creativity, they need the opportunity to stretch people's minds to really identify talent and to allow men and women to really reach their potential. What we are saying is that the twenty year history of our country, from 1965 to

today, has seen the gradual escalation of decision making power in education to higher and higher and higher levels. We think in many ways that's been good. It's unlikely, for example, that schools would have been desegregated had things been left only to local people. It's unlikely that bilingual education would have been provided to young men and women if things had only been left to local people. It's unlikely that we would have been provided opportunities for special education if it had not been for bodies such as this and State agencies, but we think we have to really balance that and recognize that when it come to the academic learning side of things, the record of taking decision making power away from local people has not been quite as good; and so the major recommendation of our report is that we need, in whatever way we can, to restore local control to people, to recognize that men and women at the local level have the ability and have the talent working in conjunction with teachers and students and community people to deal with these problems. So, what I am suggesting to you, ladies and gentlemen, is that you have a very important role to play as a Legislative Body, but it may be a role different than what we have played in the past and that the role today, in 1985 and beyond, may be really for you to act as stimulators and encouragers of people at the local level to be empowered to do things on their own. I think in the long-run that may well be the most significant role that government can play in the future of education. We have, I think, ironically, the most educated or at least the most schooled nation in the history of the world and, yet, we have systematically taken away from that school population the capacity and the ability to involve themselves in decision making. That, I think, is ironic and that, I think, is tragic, and that we have a historic chance now in this State to really reverse that tide and empower people to do things on their own. This is what

we seek to do. Our report does not believe that education is going to change over night and, consequently, we make recommendations for many pilot programs that I'll touch on. We believe that education is not going to be changed by any one group, and so, consequently, we believe that school boards and administrators in partnership with teachers have to change the schools. We believe that this can only be done by people being activated and given the opportunity at the local level. Two recent scholars have viewed the reform movements of this country over the past two years and have come up with some interesting kind of conclusions. A gentleman named Michael Kerst from Stanford and a professor named Patricia Cross from Harvard have viewed the whole educational ferment of this country. Professor Cross, I think,...offers some very interesting kind of observations. What she finds as she looks across this country is that in many ways we're getting the same old things; more mandates, more requirements, more kinds of things coming from on top down to local people, and what she suggests is that maybe we ought to look at the private sector a little bit today, because in the private sector they are coming to the conclusion finally that in order to...increase productivity, in order to really make us competitive again that they have to understand how...human resources are developed, how you nurture human resources, how you tap them, how you identify that kind of talent and those are being done in a variety of ways which create environments whereby that kind of talent can find fruition. She suggests that educators have forgotten that kind of thing and that simply we believe that more laws, more mandates, more requirements are going to do the job. I happen to think Professor Cross is right and that we need to approach school reform in a different kind of way; and that is, first of all, by trusting people; by trusting people at the local level to really follow some broad general guidelines that you in the

State Office of Education will provide but by and large empowering people to do the job. Let me give you a couple...specific kind of suggestions that we have put forward that will give you a flavor of what we're talking about in our report. Clearly, I can't go over everything in the time period today. We believe...the title of our report, by the way, is "Education for a New Illinois: The Public Schools in a Changing Economy," and we believe, as Governor Thompson said to this Body a few weeks ago, that the future of Illinois is tied to its schools, that the economic future of this State will be directly tied to the quality of schools and the quality of men and women who come out of those schools. We believe that we can really foster that kind of quality by recognizing that in the twenty-first century, I don't have a very clear vision nor do I think do you, probably, of what those requirements are going to be. We do know this though, that these young...men and women are going to have to change jobs and change them again, that they're going to have to be trained and retrained and retrained, that jobs will be created that aren't even around today, that the best legacy that we can give those young men and women is the capacity and the ability to learn and to relearn and to relearn. In other words, they have to have those basic kind of skills and anything short of that really won't do the job. In many ways the irony is that it calls for, in some ways, a very old-fashioned kind of education for a very modern kind of era. We are suggesting in our report that the State Board of Education establish some broad general guidelines about what those curriculum goals ought to be but that we allow local districts to provide individual curriculum plans on their own, that each district in this State in conjunction with community people and teachers working together and administrators and boards would submit a plan to the State determining what that curriculum is that they want. We believe

also that school districts ought to be freed up and liberated in terms of other kinds of restraints, that we think they ought to have control over the time and place where education takes place. There's nothing magic about Monday through Friday, nine to three, September through June. There's nothing magic about a school year that is...simply the one that you and I understood, but that is a carry-over from the nineteenth century...rural economy and probably has no bearing to the twenty-first century. We need to free local districts up, give them the opportunity to create that school year or school calendar; in other words, utilize time and place any way they want to as long as...it is educationally sound, as long as it receives the approval of the State of Illinois. We don't think the State ought to fold its tent up and go home; the State, after all, has a constitutional responsibility for education, but we think the State has to play a new role of stimulating that kind of creativity at the local level. We believe then that curriculum has to be created at an individualized basis. We believe that we need to improve the quality of teachers in at least three ways...that the quality of teaching has to be attacked three ways; on the...on the requirements to get into teaching, on the compensation which is only partially monetary; and, thirdly, on the whole issue of status of teaching. We believe we have to raise requirements to get into teaching. It's just simply too easy to become a teacher in the State of Illinois. That's not only bad for the kids of Illinois; frankly, it's bad for the profession, because I don't respect a profession, and I'm part of it, that is easy to get into, and I don't think most people do, and we make recommendations for that. We make recommendations for a gradual escalation of teachers' salaries to a starting salary of twenty thousand dollars a year after three years, but our recommendation is a little different. We believe that twenty thousand dollars a

year ought to be for a twelve-month job, a twelve-month contract. We think there's work to be done in this State educationally, not only for kids who need special help, not only for curricular revision, not only for professional development but for the status of teachers. Teachers shouldn't have to go out and moonlight to make a buck. They shouldn't have to do that unless they want to, perhaps, but they shouldn't have to do that and we think that twelve-month contract is important and, frankly, our...our involvement of citizens, and we involved over three thousand citizens in this past year, indicates to us that the citizens of Illinois are a little skeptical about paying people twenty thousand dollars a year for what they perceive as a part-time job. So, for political, educational and all kinds of reasons, we think that has to occur. We also believe that teaching can only be improved if we understand what we all...so clearly understand in the private sector, and that is that people are motivated not only for money; when I talk to teachers across this State, they're telling me they're leaving teaching not because of the money, they are leaving teaching because it is to them boring, there's no place to go, it is not challenging any longer, they are not finding the kind of excitement that they believe they ought to have in a career, and we have to understand that those things that are true in the private sector in terms of motivating people almost totally don't exist in teaching, almost none of the things that we know as motivators of people; and until we address that problem, ladies and gentlemen, we will not address the best and the brightest coming into teaching. We believe we need to have career ladders and that we ought to try those on a pilot...pilot basis and we make recommendations for those kinds of career ladders. We make a recommendation for an Educational Leadership Academy in this State. It goes beyond just a Principals' Academy, involves teachers and school

board members and the private sector in a joint effort to continue the impetus for school renewal. We're worried about what's going to happen a year from now when all this school stuff is suddenly forgotten. We're worried about how the impetus for school reform is going to continue, and we think we need to have people involved on an ongoing basis to continue this effort over and over and over. We believe there are too many school districts in this State and we think we need to reduce the number of school districts and need at least to go to unit districts, perhaps even more than that. We do not say that every small district is bad or every big district is good. In fact, we make a recommendation that Chicago is probably too big. We think the key is what kind of quality can a district provide. If that district can provide high quality, we say keep it; if it can't provide high quality, we say change it. The key ought to be quality, not necessarily size. We believe the State Board of Education is too big and we think the State Board of Education ought to be reduced in size. We have a new State Superintendent. I think he's a fine man. I want him to succeed. I want that board to succeed. Our recommendation is that the State Board of Education be reduced from seventeen to nine members. We think it needs to be more manageable in a variety of ways. There are many more recommendations, and my time is coming to a close here, but I just want to mention a couple of things. We've worked very diligently on recognizing that we have special conditions in this State as we do in the nation. Almost eighty percent of the taxpayers of this State have no children in the public schools. We think that is a very significant statistic that this Body needs to address and think about in many, many ways. It's not that those people aren't interested in education, it just simply...it's not on their minds every day, it's not the kind of thing they wake up with and go to bed with at night and yet they are the taxpaying

public, they support the schools. We believe you need to reconnect those people to public education and we make recommendations to do that. We think school districts in this State have not paid the attention that they need to pay to those people. When people tell me as I go around the State that I'm a taxpayer but I...I want to use the school gym to...to jog and the school district tells me, I'm sorry you can't use that, and that individual tells me, well, I pay for those schools, don't I? Well,...I don't have a very good answer to that, very frankly, and yet we go back to those people and ask them to dip into their pockets to pay for the schools, but we don't really go out of our way to provide them with a connection to public education. We think there are many things that need to be done in this year of school reform; only some are legislative, and you will have before you those recommendations, but I would encourage you, in conclusion, to at least think carefully about that role I suggested in the beginning, that role of providing some seed money, providing some incentive money to local districts to do the things themselves. We need to trust people. I believe we can trust people and I think we will find that if we do that, we will really...we will really stimulate a flurry of activity across this State that will result in some of the most creative things we have seen in a very, very long time. We have a chance to do something important. We have a chance to do something different. We have a chance to do something very, very significant that no other State, frankly, in the union has done. I hope that in the months ahead you'll call on me in any way that you would like, both sides of the aisle, to help in this endeavor. It's a very important one and I think we have a chance now to do it as we never have before. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Page 31 - MARCH 19, 1985

END OF REEL

REEL #2

MR. CHAIRMAN: (SENATOR BERNAN)

Thank you, Dr. Bakalis. Mike, would you stay up here, and Gail would you come back up here. And...if any Senator has a question of either of the presentors, to address your question to either or both of them, we'll try to respond and we've got approximately ten to twenty minutes under the guidelines set by the President. Senator Netsch.

SENATOR NETSCH:

One question. Gail, I'm not sure I heard you address this one way or the other, and Michael Bakalis, I think it was not on your list of three things that had to be addressed about the teaching profession. It is obviously one of the more controversial things. Did you have any recommendations that deal with incompetency in teachers who are in the business as opposed to obviously higher standards for those who are going to be entering...and hopefully higher incentives in the way of higher pay for them to stay in and be excited about it? What about those who are not doing the job?

GAIL LIEBERMAN:

The commission recommendations talk about a regular evaluation of all school district personnel and further training of administrators on how to do that and do that better. So that's their...their answer tied with staff development efforts in terms of the current personnel.

SENATOR NETSCH:

Just to be clear, you say training for those who are in the system, including the teachers, is that what...is that the...

GAIL LIEBERMAN:

Staff development for all personnel as well as training of administrators in evaluation and assisting teachers in

improving their skills.

SENATOR NETSCH:

What about those who don't improve their skills, have you...did you address that problem?

GAIL LIEBERMAN:

They did not deal with dismissal procedures, if that's where you're heading, except to modify that process. And there's one recommendation creating a three-person teacher hearing dismissal panel dealing with that issue.

MICHAEL BAKALIS:

Senator Netsch, our...our commission did address that issue. We addressed it in this way, in our...in...in light of our philosophy that people at the local level ought to be involved in this, we suggested every district in the State submit to the State Board of Education a personnel evaluation plan. In other words, this plan would, in effect, spell out the rules of the game in terms of how teachers and administrators would be evaluated. So what we're saying is that every district in the State would submit to the State Board of Education this plan which would say how poor teachers would be remediated, how good teachers would be rewarded and how bad teachers would be terminated. And so the State Board would make a judgment on that plan. There may be, literally, a hundred different plans across the State. We don't think that's a problem, we think it's an important first step to get local people to put in that kind of a recommendation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (SENATOR BERMAN)

Senator Schuneman.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, a question of Dr. Bakalis. You made special reference to the idea that schools should perhaps be...a teaching job should perhaps be a twelve-month job. And I...I find that suggestion particularly appealing and I think it would be very, very popular in most local

school districts, because I...I agree with...with your premise that much of the opposition comes from the belief on the part of people that...that teachers are working only part-time and therefore ought to be compensated on a part-time basis. But I can see all kinds of problems in...in what you suggest also. Could you elaborate a little bit on some of the details of what would have to be done if we would go to a twelve-month school system and exactly how you perceive it might work.

MICHAEL BAKALIS:

Okay. I want to make it clear, I am not talking about having kids be in school twelve months a year, first of all. I am talking about having teachers be on contract for twelve months a year, and our proposal, as I suggested earlier, Senator, that we are suggesting that local districts, for example, be very active in submitting their own curriculum plans. We think teachers have a very major role to play in that whole effort and that so the summer months, the summer month or month and a half, whatever it's going to be, they would be spending doing a number of things. Gail said professional development, we think that's the time for really serious professional development of an individual. We think that's the time they would be working on these curriculum plans. We think that's the time they could be working on these plans for how they're going to be evaluated. We also think there's much to be done in terms of using teachers in ways we haven't used them before. One of the great complaints of teachers is a sense of isolation, and as much as they love kids, frankly, dealing with just kids all the time is not something they always want. And we think, for example, that...the private sector offers enormous opportunities for men and women to work out in the education there. The private sector is spending over sixty billion dollars a year in education these days. We...we have so many thousands

of adult illiterates in this State, adult illiterates, we think the teaching force can be used for that. In other words, we're saying we've got to redefine the role of a teacher and in...in the same way we define the role of a physician or a lawyer and obviously we do not say a lawyer is only a lawyer when he's in court, we...we make a broader definition of that, we think the same has to be true of teaching. I don't know what the problems would be that you're referring to specifically.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Well, okay, I...I guess perhaps the problem came about in my perception of what you were saying, and apparently we had a misunderstanding because I thought that your response to my question was going to be, we have kids who are falling behind all the time, we need teachers to teach those kids and the time to do it would be in the summertime.

MICHAEL BAKALIS:

Yes, I did make reference...

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

But you didn't say that. The other problem would be that if we're going to keep the schools open all the time, there are probably all kinds of playground activities, recreational programs that teachers could...could supervise, but I didn't hear you say that. What I heard you say was something that frankly disturbs me a little and that is, if we're going to pay teachers to take a sabbatical in the summertime to go off and study, you know independent study, then I don't think the public is going to buy that.

MICHAEL BAKALIS:

I agree with you, Senator.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

But if you're going to do something for kids in the summertime, I think the public will buy that and will support increased funding for it. So I was curious to know...

MICHAEL BAKALIS:

I agree with you, Senator, they're not going to buy...

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

...what...what you were saying.

MICHAEL BAKALIS:

...they're not going to buy that kind of a...what looks like a pain for you to go to school or something like that, I agree with that. And I wasn't suggesting that. I...I don't think it's courses...I'm talking about work activity in the district. Certainly, I alluded to that in my more formal remarks that there are young people who need that kind of help very seriously in the State and those summer months could be ample opportunity to give that help.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (SENATOR BERMAN)

Senator Poshard.

SENATOR POSHARD:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Dr. Bakalis, I'd like to ask you a question. I know we're dealing with some very complex issues here that demand some complex answers but I'd like to simplify something, if I may. Trusting people at the local level to do what's right in education for our children, I agree with that. But it seems to me that just offering some broad, general guidelines for education to our people at the local level, what's different in doing that than what we've been doing for years in education? I remember your A-1 '60 program that you initiated some twelve or thirteen years ago, that's what you did, and you required the local districts to comply with some specificity toward that. But it was broad, generalized suggestions for local districts. Now it seems to me that if...if we don't standardize some things, maybe reading quality and math appreciation and the ability of children to read at certain grade levels at certain times chronologically throughout their educational experience, it seems to me that we can never be sure, whether it's a kid in

Cairo or a kid in Chicago, whether they're getting exactly what they need in terms of the level of performance of every other student. What's wrong with a minimum competency test to be given to children at the third and fifth and seventh and eleventh grade levels to say, I know how my child is doing in comparison to children in LaSalle or Peru or wherever? What's wrong with that in terms of requiring the local districts to do that? And...and before you answer that, I'd like to ask Miss Lieberman to please follow up the comment that you made to Senator Netsch in regard to the three-person ...hearing panel. How does that differ from the process that we already have legally in the school districts of providing the school board with a list of five hearing officers for those teachers that are supposedly being called up on the carpet for not doing their job well? Is that threemember board...who appoints that board? I'd be interested to know that and how is it going to be more partial than...than the system that we already have? And...I'd like to know, you know, the cost of such a measure, are...is that intended to save money or is it going to cost more money or whatever? Doctor Bakalis.

MICHAEL BAKALIS:

That's a good question, Senator. The...there's nothing wrong with what you said, what's...when you said what's wrong with having people be able to make comparisons and make sure that their children are reaching certain steps, absolutely nothing wrong with that at all. We do make recommendations that local districts will do testing at periodic times so that the community will know exactly where they are. We think the State Board of Education would establish these guide...these...these general guidelines. That would really be general only in the sense that they would say to a district...for example, obviously in our view a child coming to maturity in the twenty-first century is going to have to

have some basic kind of skills to be able to learn, relearn and relearn. Certainly, I would be very surprised and dismayed if the State Board of Education would approve a...a program coming from a local district where there was no math, for example, or there was no English. I mean, obviously, that is not a minimum kind of...of program. All we're saying is that the State Board of Education can establish those kind of requirements, but how you get there, the road you take to get there, can be individualized. We make three specific recommendations in our report. We say, number one, maybe you want to go to a core curriculum. So a district can go to a core curriculum, a tough kind of traditional curriculum. Maybe they want what's called, learning outcomes, as the State Board has suggested. We say, fine, you submit a proposal for that. Maybe it's interdisciplinary, we say, that's fine. All we're saying is that there is not necessarily any one road to get to those...to those goals and that we ought to allow people the freedom at the local level to choose that road. But you're absolutely right, if the State sat back and said, you guys do whatever you want, I don't think anybody would support that kind of program.

GAIL LIEBERMAN:

The commission's recommendation is to create a three-person hearing panel which is different than the current system of a...a single hearing officer hearing at the local level. Last year we had thirty-three cases of hearing officers being requested and hearing a case all the way through the process. What this would have is instead of using twenty, thirty, forty different hearing officers for cases, would establish a three-member panel. The commission did not deal with the selection process. That would have to be addressed in a...in a revised Statute. In terms of the cost, last year...or FY '84, the State spent about a hundred thousand dollars in terms of teacher hearing panel. And the

recommendation is the cost would increase, we figure the number of cases would also increase as it has every year, and approximately two hundred and fifty thousand dollars was the estimate for the first year for this recommendation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (SENATOR BERMAN)

Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I just had a couple of questions of Ms. Lieberman. Could you tell me what the term "nonprejudicial error" means according to your report?

GAIL LIEBERMAN:

The term "nonprejudicial error" was dealing with items that are not meant to be substantive in nature but more procedural in nature.

SENATOR WELCH:

Could you give me an example of...what you...

GAIL LIEBERMAN:

In terms of a...a specific time line as an example.

SENATOR WELCH:

What revisions in the tenure law would be necessary to make nonprejudicial error not a basis for reinstating dismissed personnel?

GAIL LIEBERMAN:

The commission did not deal with the specific wording in the law within their recommendations. They said this is the concept of the recommendation and you'll be seeing in bills over the next few weeks the specific wording, so I'm unable to address the wording of the Statute.

SENATOR WELCH:

Well, wouldn't the determination of a prejudicial or a nonprejudicial error...mainly be a court function as opposed to a hearing board function?

GAIL LIEBERMAN:

The recommendation of the commission was to not make it

part of the hearing officer's process.

SENATOR WELCH:

One final question. Has there been any attempt between your commission and Doctor Bakalis' commission to come to some mutual agreement as to legislation you're going to introduce?

GAIL LIEBERMAN:

The commission is in the position of having ceased its operation in January when the report was issued to you. And so, since January, and that report having been filed, there has not been a formal discussion between the commission per se and the Illinois Project for School Reform. I know members of both have discussed the issue.

SENATOR WELCH:

Well, my understanding is, there's going to be something like three bills out of your commission. So, we're going to be given a choice of either the commission or Doctor Bakalis, we have to decide one or the other, there's not going to be any attempt to work together on the two, is that correct?

GAIL LIEBERMAN:

I can't address that, it's beyond the scope of what the commission did and finished its report.

SENATOR WELCH:

Perhaps the chairman has an idea.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (SENATOR BERMAN)

The chairman does have an idea, if I might. The purpose of the introduction of bills which will be done tomorrow regarding the improvement commission...is the introduction of the embodiment of the fifty-two recommendations of the commission that require legislative action. Once those bills are introduced and the public has an opportunity to digest them, I expect them to go through the process that we are all involved in and proud of, and that is...of evaluation, critique, negotiation and hopefully involvement of everyone,

the Senate and House members in particular and people outside of the halls of the General Assembly including Doctor Bakalis, Governor Thompson, the State Board of Education, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera. So there is nothing that I'm aware of, and I think Mike will agree with me, that is chiseled in granite yet. Senator Geo-Karis. Before Senator Geo-Karis, let me indicate the following people have indicated their request for questions; Senator Geo-Karis, Senators Kelly, Vadalabene, Schaffer, DeAngelis, Smith and Kustra.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Thank you. I'd like to address my querries to both Doctor Bakalis and Ms. Lieberman. Three of the things that I've...that bother me, and I don't know whether they've been taken up in your...course of your investigation and...and summary. Many of my teachers complain that we're top-heavy in administrators who don't have the guts to survey a teacher who's in for the first year and... because they're...they don't want to make enemies, they don't botherdoing anything about anything and the teacher gets tenure and whether she's...she or he is well qualified. Number one, I will ask you if you address that. The second thing that I'm...I'm concerned about is the fact that teachers have the right to strike. I think that is wrong 'cause I am a great believer in collective bargaining, mandatory arbitration and right of appeal to the courts if the standards aren't followed, but has anything been done by your committee on that point? And the third thing, I...since I understand you said seventy-eight percent of the people don't have children? Well, I'm one of those who has been paying taxes for many years to help other people's children and I don't resent it at all. But in view of the fact that we are in the majority of the pairs, in the minority of having any children, what is being done...what you're suggesting about a greater emphasis

of cooperation between those of us, for example, who don't have children and the...the use of the schools and what have you, I think is a good point, 'cause I think you're absolutely right. We pay taxes to support the schools. And the forth point is, I'm not opposed to private education and I'm wondering if your committee took that into consideration considering the fact that people who support private education are also paying taxes for public education. Four points; one is, did your committee address the fact that we're top-heavy with administrators? Two, what about the right of strike instead of binding arbitration, no strike and right of appeal the courts, when tailored to the...if it's not tailored to the guidelines? Three, how about private education? And four, as I said, a better community spirit, as you suggested, between your teachers and the local community and the fact that they were...they get paid for twelve months of the year even though the children aren't there for twelve months of the year, I happen to agree with you there. How does that strike...have you gone into it, how will it affect...you...the possibility of...education with... what kind of cooperation...are you going to get from the teachers' unions, that's what I'm driving at?

GAIL LIEBERMAN:

The commission heard from a number of folks, a number of teachers, who said they had never been evaluated in the classroom, particularly in the critical beginning years, and that's why the recommendation of administrators having a plan for personnel evaluation, being trained to do it and doing it effectively was so critical. The commission did not address administrative personnel within a school district or numbers in any case, too many or too few, teachers or administrators within a school district, nor did they hear from or address the issue of striking. They did talk a little bit in terms of an extended school year and public use of facilities.

Like Doctor Bakalis mentioned, the commission did want local school districts to consider an extended school year for remedial services or staff development or any number of issues. They also talked a little bit in terms of private education but wanted to put the focus on improving public education because they felt that was the area where the majority of families did not have a choice and the State had a compelling interest to assure a quality education. We did hear, as a commission, from members of the nonpublic sector though.

MICHAEL BAKALIS:

Senator Geo-Karis, the four points you...you mentioned, our commission did not look at the issue of the legitimacy or changing the law in terms of teachers' strikes. We did certainly address the issue of the poor process that is being used and has been used for years in terms of evaluating teachers. We don't think teachers are evaluated very well in this State and consequently we did not support a merit pay kind of a recommendation because the evaluation procedure we don't think is...is adequate. What I addressed to Senator Netsch before I think deals with that issue and that is that the local recommendation for personnel evaluation plans would evaluate administrators and teachers, but we did not address the issue of are there too many administrators or too few administrators. On the issue of the seventy-eight percent of the people who have no children in the public schools, we're suggesting every local district...do a conscious effort to submit a community outreach plan to the State Board of Education. We don't think...we think that's kind of done helter-skelter now; if you have time, you get around to thinking of these people, but, in fact, we ought to be thinking about them really right up-front because as you suggested, the overwhelming majority of citizens in this State now are not directly connected and...and...and yet

supportive. We think we need to involve them in...in a lot of ways, that has to be done systematically. We also make a...a unique recommendation which I didn't want to get into here 'cause I think I'd be here all day long, frankly, it's called the...an educational bank. And in a nutshell, the educational bank proposal in effect says that a certain percentage of local property taxes would be put into a new entity called an educational bank. From that bank, individuals whether they had children in public schools or not could withdraw funds for their own further education or for their children's post-secondary education. We think you've got to give some people some incentives to support public schools and the way to do that is in a very concrete kind of way, and I'd be happy to provide you with some of the details of that, Senator.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (SENATOR BERMAN)

Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to ask either of our witnesses or the chairman or Senator Maitland, but...in reviewing all of these reports, I really don't see where there's been a...much attention given to the differences in the funding, the wealthy versus the poor school districts, and I'd like to get a rating if, in fact, that issue is being overlooked. I think it's important whether we are able to do anything or not about it, that it's an issue that ought to be on the table. And I'd like to get some response if, in fact...do you think enough attention has been given in these reports to the differences in the funding of the poor and the wealthier school districts in Illinois?

MICHAEL BAKALIS:

I can do that quickly, Senator. Our...our commission did not address the issue of the formula at all and so that just wasn't a part of our consideration.

GAIL LIEBERMAN:

The commission had a...a similar discussion. We discussed briefly the general State Aid Formula and some of the proposals like the resource cost model and others but did not want to come to closure on formulas, instead said, these are the dollars that should be used behind these specific reform efforts and stop there.

SENATOR KELLY:

And...I suppose on that same vein you'd have difficulty in determining whether or not children attending the wealthier districts would have a...more of a likelihood of having a higher rate of competency in passing a test. Is that...that, you never got into that issue? Okay, thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (SENATOR BERMAN)

Senator Vadalabene.

SENATOR VADALABENE:

Yes, thank you...Mr. Chairman, Doctor Bakalis. Just recently I attended a...a seven-county meeting of the unit superintendents and the school board members in the Tri-City area and the meeting was held at Edwardsville. And one of the...one of the questions posed to me by the moderator was the...in regard to the...the dismissal procedures of the teachers. Now, it's been bantered around here on several of the people who have asked the questions but no one has come directly into mentioning the two powerful lobby groups, the IEA and the IFT in regard to the dismissal of teachers. Has your commission or will the commissions be in contact with these two big organizations in regards to what procedures they would accept in the dismissal of their tenure teachers? Whether they're competent or not, I believe they are going to have a strong position in regard to their membership. And I'm wondering if you are going to pursue or the commissions are going to pursue some type of a meeting with these two powerful teacher organizations.

MICHAEL BAKALIS:

Senator Vadalabene, in the construction of our report, we had a statewide advisory committee which had on there Mr. Weaver from the IEA and representatives of the Chicago Teachers' Union and the Illinois Federation of Teachers, they were part and parcel of our process. That doesn't mean they agree with everything we...we've said. Our recommendation, as I indicated earlier, is for local districts to submit that kind of personnel evaluation plan. My...my...if I'm correct, I believe the Chicago Teachers' Union has submitted a very similar kind of proposal in their own package, so I...I can't...obviously, I can't speak for either of those groups. But I think you might find that really what teachers are looking for is some fair, equitable procedure evaluation which recognizes that...that the evaluation of teachers probably ought to be done best in conjunction of teachers and administrators. I think that's what they're looking for and I...my feeling is the time might be right to get something like that.

SENATOR VADALABENE:

Yes, to follow up that question then, in the event that either teacher organization does not support the claims that the teacher is incompetent, like Senator Geo-Karis said, do you think that would promote a strike so that those teachers would be maintained?

MICHAEL BAKALIS:

Well...over the years I suppose I've had as many disagreements with the teachers' organizations as anybody. I must say on this issue I have to be with the teachers in terms of how they view their own profession. The evaluation of teachers, Senator, has simply not gone on very well in this State or around the country. And I think Senator Maitland, I recall, at a...at a hearing, a couple of times I've heard him speak, indicate how surprised he was at the

number of...at really the poor state of teacher evaluation, the few times that administrators go into the actual classroom. So, until we get the ground rules set and administrators have the time, the capability to be managers in the true sense of the word, I think teachers are going to justifiably, frankly, be upset about the way evaluation goes on right now. So...so...they...we've got to address that issue of fair, equitable evaluation. To answer your question, yes, they probably would go on strike if the...if the process was in...in their view not fair.

SENATOR VADALABENE:

So, what...so what I'm really saying is, once you get all these recommendations into place, there still is going to be some type of a problem with these two major organizations in regard to their teachers.

MICHAEL BAKALIS:

Well, I can't...obviously, I can't speak for them, I don't know what those problems will be. I'm just suggesting, I think that both of those very important organizations have made some steps and said...made some sounds that indicate to me they are seriously looking at the issue of teacher evaluation.

SENATOR VADALABENE:

Okay. This is just a statement, though. I don't know what problems there's going to be either, but when some teachers are going to get laid off, I think there are going to be some problems.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (SENATOR BERMAN)

All right. We have four more questioners. Let's try to bring these to a reasonable closure. Senator Schaffer.

SENATOR SCHAFFER:

Apparently both you are planning on...on the...both of the committees will be introducing legislation in the next few weeks, obviously, before the thirteenth of April. I have

kind of a reoccurring nightmare, and the nightmare is that we sit down here in our all-seeing wisdom and pass a whole series of bills to reform education, and I get back to my district to find out that we didn't fund any of those reforms for my districts and that because of the unfunded reforms, class size for grade school is going to be fifty-six kids and we're going to not be able to teach English in the high school class to the third year 'cause there's no money left 'cause everything went into the reforms. I sincerely urge you and...and hope that your legislative proposals, and I'll ask the question, include the...the fact that we're going to fund them. If we don't fund them, they ought not to be inflicted in the form of mandates. The second thing which Senator...Kelly addressed somewhat, I come from a part of the State that has pretty darned good school districts that turn out pretty good educational programs and do a pretty good job with the kids, and our papers right now are filled with cutbacks and layoffs and eliminations because of one thing, not because our people aren't highly taxed; oh, they're highly taxed, let me assure you of that, they are brutally taxed because the formula is not fair. And to many of us from the suburban and collar county and I think some downstate areas, to talk about reform and not talk about the formula is the biggest piece of hypocrisy going. I gave Superintendent Sanders a hard time for copping out, I guess I have to give you the same kind of thing. How can we talk about reform when the whole structure is based on a formula which is on its very face unfair? How can we not talk about coming up with a formula that each of us can go back...I can go back to my people and say, we get thirty percent less than City x because we're thirty percent wealthier? I can't go into a district and say, well, you're actually...poorer than City x, but they get four times as much 'cause they got more clout in the Legislature. How can you not talk about formula

reform? It makes the whole rest of your report really a bit of hypocrisy.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (SENATOR BERMAN)

Is...is that a question?

SENATOR SCHAFFER:

Yeah. At least I ought to give them a chance to defend themselves.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (SENATOR BERMAN)

All right. Defend yourself, Mrs. Lieberman, and then Doctor Bakalis.

GAIL LIEBERMAN:

I think the commission members would both share the fear that you mentioned with increased class size and layoffs and share the hope that there's the dollars behind the reforms. The commission members did not address a specific formula, not that they weren't interested. And I think that the ongoing legislative members will address those issues, but they decided to look at what were the needs for school improvement and then focus on the finances for those and raising the revenue for the finances for those reforms; not that the formula doesn't need addressing, they all said it did.

MICHAEL BAKALIS:

Senator, our group, as I indicated, was a private group having no real governmental status of any kind, of course. And it was our view that we could only do...certain things with the time we had and the money we had and consequently that...we did not deal with the issue of reforming the formula. What we did say is that the funds that will be needed for this...our package will...should be raised in a number of ways. Our major recommendation is...is what we think is the fairest one in the long-run. We think we need to raise the income tax in this State and simultaneously give property tax relief over the next four years, so that by 1990 the State

would have a responsibility for about fifty-one percent of education. But we saw a number of groups, the State Board of Education and others, looking at the formula so we just...given as I said, the scope and the money we had, just didn't do it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (SENATOR BERMAN)

Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DE ANGELIS:

Yeah, thank you, Mr. President and Mr. Chairman. I'm not going to talk about the...the formula once again. I...I do want to commend Doctor Bakalis though, because when I first received his letter I was wondering if it was the third launch of Superintendent Bakalis' political career, and I almost studiously avoided participating. However, after reading a little bit more, I went ahead and did as directed and did, in fact, appoint by formula, if...if you may, the people that he suggested, and I would like to share with you just two small experiences from those meetings, quickly. He indicated that I should...that the proper makeup should be twenty people composed of all the various groups including business people. Well, I dug into my file and took out a particularly harsh letter from a businessman who wanted to know why enrollment had declined by twenty percent at this one particular school and costs had gone up sixty percent and appointed him to that. I appointed also a member...a local president of one of the school districts that had a particularly serious problem between the teachers and the administration. At the end of the meetings, over the two-or three-month period, the businessman was backing a tax increase for education and the local union president had submitted a lengthy paper on how teachers and administrators could get along better. And so I want to commend you if for nothing else creating a dialogue within districts. And I might tell you that some of these people had never sat down

to talk to each other before, had merely talked to people of their own belief or their own particular interest. And I have to tell you, it generated a considerable amount of interest and we have gone forth and carried forward from our report to meet regularly with the same group on the continuing problems of education. So, first, I want to apologize for questioning your motives; secondly, I want to commend you for the end results.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (SENATOR BERMAN)

Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman and to the people who are present here at this meeting. I'd like to address my question to Doctor Bakalis, please. First, I want to commend you for your presentation here this afternoon, and I'm very much encouraged about the updating of our teachers' system, you've talked about the money, but I'm very concerned about the recipient whom we are all talking about but it just seemed like it's a passing. I would...and I heard you use the word "basic," getting back to the basics. What provisions are being made after you've upgraded the teacher and...and the school and the system, et cetera of giving the student the basic needs of knowing how to read, how to write, how to spell? That's our whole dilemma among our young people today in our society. And you go across the country and you go around the world, in Japan you study eleven months out of the year and they know how to read, they know how to write, they know how to spell. This is the dilemma of our children in our...in our society. What efforts are being made as you are upgrading our school system, our taxes, our money, et cetera to help the child to be a productive citizen here in the State of Illinois?

MICHAEL BAKALIS:

Well, Senator, I would hope that all the recommendations

coming out of the Legislative Commission, ours, and everybody else, they're all...in that respect, all after the same goal. We want young people to be able to survive productively in the twenty-first century. So none of the things that any of us have done, I...I think side-skirt that issue. We do think, though, that what you have to do is create incentives for people at the local level to really get on people if...if they are not doing the case. One of the groups, for example...we make a recommendation which another group has made in this State called Designs for Change, which is that local school buildings have councils and those councils really oversee to make sure that the kind of curriculum is going on in that building that ought to be going on, that kids are reading, kids do have the kind of ability to compute mathematically, so forth. The State clearly has a responsibility here, don't...I want to repeat that again, and the State cannot turn its back on that responsibility. We're just saying again, let districts and people at the most local level determine how that's best done. But no one should misinterpret my words in saying that the State should let everybody do anything they want or...or we should abandon those kind of things. We can't abandon those things.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (SENATOR BERMAN)

Senator Kustra, with the closing question.

SENATOR KUSTRA:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My question is of Doctor Bakalis. Doctor Bakalis, as you know, I formed one of those local groups that was put together and we met out in my district and I hoped in some small way, anyway, contributed to the final product. The one question that I do not remember my local group talking about and you mentioned here today is the...the question of the role and the size of the State Board of Education, and this may be a slightly difficult question for you since, as I remember it, you served as the last

elected State...Superintendent of Schools. You asked us today to consider your recommendation reducing its size from seventeen to nine, isn't that correct?

MICHAEL BAKALIS:

Yes, sir.

SENATOR KUSTRA:

I guess I...I have always had great difficulty since 1970 and since the end of your tenure trying to figure out just what the State Board of Education is and what it does and what positive and significant role it plays in education. And I wonder if your group or you considered as an...as...as alternatives too to the proposal that you gave us today; number one, going back, as some have suggested, to electing the State Superintendent and that may be sensitive given the fact that you were the last one to do that or having the Governor appoint that State Superintendent the way we appoint the head of Transportation, Mental Health, Public Aid, whatever major issue and...and direction we must deal with here in the General Assembly and in State Government. I find the State Board to be neither fish nor fowl. You can't compare it to the local board because it doesn't have taxing authority, it can't...it isn't elected. In a sense at the State level we're the...we're the State Board of Education. The School Code is passed by the Illinois General Assembly. Perhaps you can enlighten us on...if you consider those alternatives and if either one of those alternatives make as much sense as just reducing the size of a board that has yet to be able to define what it does for public education in the State of Illinois.

MICHAEL BAKALIS:

The recommendations that came from a variety of people in the State, there were obviously some that talked about returning the State Board to an elected position. I did not honestly see any kind of groundswell for that around the

State at all. I think you're absolutely right, Senator...I've said this many times in speeches and to the State Board that you are the State Board, you are the ultimate State Board of Education, this legislative Body. I think one of the interesting things is that as you think back to 1969, '68, what we were trying to do is...is we hope to depoliticize education by moving from an elected to an appointed superintendent. What, of course, none of us could have seen at that time is that education was becoming more and more politicized every day. I always tell the story, if the Chair will permit me one second, when I ran for State Superintendent I went to the IEA in 1970 and I asked for their support, and their response to me was, well you seem like a nice guy, we never heard of you, but we don't endorse candidates, we don't give any money to candidates and we don't put anybody in precincts to elect candidates, that's not our role. I said, okay, thanks a lot. Two years later they were the largest contributor to Governor Walker's campaign. So in that short period of time we went...we really politicized education, but as I said, we couldn't have known that. I've honestly told...now, as I said, I wouldn't say anything that I haven't told them directly, I told Superintendent Sanders my opinion was that...that he was the last chance for the appointed superintendent to remain and that I thought...and I honestly am very pleased by his appointment, I think he is a very able educator. And so I'm...I'm optimistic about the future, Senator.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (SENATOR BERMAN)

On behalf of the Senate we want to thank Doctor Bakalis and Mrs. Lieberman for their presentation. Senator Maitland.

SENATOR MAITLAND:

Thank you, very much, Mr. Chairman. I would move that the Senate rise from the Committee of the Whole.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (SENATOR BERMAN)

You've heard the motion. All those in favor signify by saying Aye. Opposed. The motion carries and the Committee of the Whole does now arise.

PRESIDENT:

The Senate will come to order. Resolutions, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

Senate Resolution 76 offered by Senators Fawell, Philip, Karpziel, Hudson and Etheredge and it's congratulatory.

Senate Resolution 77 offered by Senator Lemke and Savickas and it's congratulatory.

PRESIDENT:

Consent Calendar. Committee reports.

SECRETARY:

Senator Savickas, chairman of Assignment of Bills Committee, assigns the following Senate bills to committee:

Agriculture, Conservation and Energy - 292; Appropriations I - 306, 308, 339 and 342; Elementary and Secondary Education - 317 and 340; Executive - 290, 296, 311, 312, 314, 316, 327, 345 and 346; Finance and Credit Regulations - 318, 326 and 329; Higher Education - 338; Insurance, Pensions and Licensed Activities - 293, 294, 301, 309, 324, 331 and 337; Judiciary I - 297, 300, 310 and 344; Judiciary II - 333 and 341; Labor and Commerce - 313 and 320; Local Government - 298, 307, 315, 321, 322, 323, 335 and 343; Public Health, Welfare and Corrections - 295, 299 and 325; Revenue - 319, 330, 332, 334 and 336; Transportation - 291 and 328.

PRESIDENT:

Introduction of bills.

SECRETARY:

Senate Bill 347 offered by Senator...introduced by Senator Fawell.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 348 introduced by Senator Schuneman.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

1st reading of the bills.

PRESIDENT:

All right. With leave of the Body, we'll move to page 2 on the Calendar. The hour is growing late, so we'll move through Senate bills 2nd reading. If any members have any bills they wish to move, now is the appropriate time. Senate Bill 1, Senate Bill 29, 31, 39 or 40, Senate Bill 50, Senate Bill 105, 123, 132. You wish that bill moved? On the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading, Senate Bill 132. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

Senate Bill 132.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDENT:

Are there amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDENT:

3rd reading. 134, Senator Carroll, 141, 145, Senator Carroll. 67, 68, 174, Senator Hall. Senator Hall, for what purpose do you arise? We're on the order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading.

SENATOR HALL:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen. Would you...I...I wonder if you'd get back to Senate Bill 40, it's an emergency. If...I'd like to have it read.

PRESIDENT:

All right. With leave of the Body, we'll move back to Senate bills 2nd reading, top of page 2, Senate Bill 40. 4-0, read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

SB 263
2nd Reading

Senate Bill 40.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDENT:

Are there amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDENT:

3rd reading. 180, Senator Karpel. 263, Senator Demuzio. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

Senate Bill 263.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd reading of the bill. The Committee on Executive offers one amendment.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Demuzio, on Committee Amendment No. 1.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Committee Amendment No. 1, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, took out the State Loan Guarantee Program at the request of the lenders. It expanded the definition of operating loan and clarified that the program was not to be established to refinance any of the preexisting operating loan. It put an immediate effective date into the proposal and I would ask for its adoption.

PRESIDENT:

All right. Senator Demuzio has moved the adoption of Committee Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 263. Any discussion? If not, all in favor indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The amendment is adopted. Are there further amendments?

SECRETARY:

No further committee amendments.

PRESIDENT:

Any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Senator Demuzio.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

This makes some technical...changes also, but more importantly it reduces the cap for the loan from a hundred thousand dollars to fifty thousand dollars and I would move its adoption.

PRESIDENT:

All right. Senator Demuzio has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 263. Any discussion? If not, all in favor indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The amendment is adopted. Are there further amendments?

SECRETARY:

No further amendments.

PRESIDENT:

3rd reading. All right. Any other member have a bill on 2nd reading? Senator Welch. Senate Bill 1. Top of page 2, on the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading, Senate Bill 1. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

Senate Bill 1.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDENT:

Are there amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDENT:

3rd reading. All right. Prior to proceeding to committee, which we will do momentarily, and prior to the adjourn-

ment, we will be adjourning until Wednesday, tomorrow, at the hour of noon. In the meantime, we have a death resolution. I'd ask the members to please be in their desks...at their desks, in their seats. I'd ask the doorkeepers to please keep the doors closed. Yes. Any announcements prior to that order of business? Senator Carroll.

SENATOR CARROLL:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. The scheduled meeting of Appropriations I will convene immediately following adjournment in Room 212. We would ask the members to try and get there as quickly as possible as there are other meetings scheduled for that room later this afternoon. I do not anticipate it being a long meeting, but if we could meet immediately after adjournment in Room 212.

PRESIDENT:

All right. Senator Sangmeister.

SENATOR SANGMEISTER:

Yes, one of the meetings that Senator Carroll was referring to is the Executive Committee is supposed to meet at four o'clock and we will be meeting, hopefully, right at that time or, if not, as soon as the Appropriations Committee adjourns.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Lechowicz.

SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Purpose of an announcement, the Senate Executive Appointments and Veterans' Affairs Administration Committee will meet tomorrow morning at 10:00 a. m. in...in Room 212.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Berman.

SENATOR BERMAN:

...thank you, Mr. President. The Senate Committee on

DR 78

Elementary and Secondary Education will meet in Room 400 tomorrow morning at 9:00 a. m. sharp.

PRESIDENT:

And Senator Holmberg.

SENATOR HOLMBERG:

Not an announcement, but I wonder if I might be listed as hyphenated cosponsor with...I have permission of the major sponsor on Senate Bill 330.

PRESIDENT:

The lady seeks leave to be listed as the hyphenated cosponsor on Senate Bill 330. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. All right, let's get to the resolution. All right. Will the members be in their seats and will our guests and the doorkeepers please keep the doors closed. Resolutions.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

Senate Resolution 78 offered by Senators DeAngelis, Philip and all members of the Senate.

(Secretary reads SR 78)

PRESIDENT:

Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

I think for all of us who had the opportunity to share our lives with Joe we know that he was a sincere person, a sympathetic person, a warm person and probably the best thing is a great sense of humor. I remember on the closing days of each Session when we tend to get a little irritated and the tensions are great, I would walk to the back of the room and Joe always had a smile and we'd crack a little joke and it would cut a lot of the tension that was out of the air. I would like to on behalf of the Senate, Mammie and Judy, extend our sympathy and condolences for somebody we're going to miss.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Kustra.

SENATOR KUSTRA:

Thank you, Mr. President. I've never stood on a death resolution before and maybe I wouldn't be this time if I had known about Joe's death in time and I would have been there at the Cathedral to pay my respects. You know, you get these little yellow telephone messages, we all know they come throughout the Session and they start multiplying toward the end of the Session, and about half of them you can do without. And when they land on that desk by that person who is delivering them, you sometimes confuse who it is whose name you see on the telephone message with who it is that's delivering the message. And every now and then I see a member, perhaps, kind of rebuff at the thought of getting that message. In my case, most of my messages were delivered by Joe Maher and I have to say that in all of those days I can remember when some of those messages were tough and you'd just as not soon take them and you were ready for debate. It was a...a real pleasure and a special opportunity to make a friendship with a gentleman who was really, as Senator DeAngelis said, so full of vitality and an Irish sense of humor and an Irish wit that I don't think this Body will see very often. It was infectious. I know that in the last two years I've served here he made my life infinitely more easy and I will miss him very much. I can just imagine how his family will miss him and I just wanted to stand, I know we get caught up in our legislative duties, for a moment to reflect on Joe's passing how much we'll all miss him and also perhaps we ought to reflect at this moment on the importance of those human relationships, not only in Joe's case but those who served with him and who still serve us. May he rest in peace.

PRESIDENT:

Senator DeAngelis has moved to suspend the rules for the immediate consideration and adoption of Senate Resolution 78.

All in favor of the motion and the adoption please rise.
Senate Resolution 78 is adopted. The Senate stands adjourned
until noon tomorrow.