

they had to prove their reasons and that is why I would strongly urge you to change that word to conference rather than hearing. Again, on the tenure, my main point is that we have a uniformity all the way through. I could support the two year for everybody if somebody would want to introduce that amendment but for the time being I'm going to vote for having all the schools on the three year tenure basis. Thank you.

SENATOR CLARK: Senator Wesely.

SENATOR WESELY: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I rise in opposition to Senator Goll's amendment to this bill. As cosponsor with Senator Newell in the original LB 259 and I think you've heard the reasons for that bill. I want to strongly support the intent of this legislation and I think Senator Goll is taking a step backwards rather than a step forward with his amendment. Senator Remmers just talked to you about the fact that he would support two years across the board which indicates from his long experience in the schools that two years is plenty of time for an evaluation to be made of teachers and whether or not they should be granted tenure. It seems to me that the arguments that some in support of the Goll amendment have been that two years isn't enough time have been refuted now, Senator Remmers support for the idea that two years across the board. He has much more experience in that but I feel two years is plenty of time in which to evaluate. The thing I would like to emphasize is this. The steps we have taken with this bill and why it would seem a step backwards instead of a step forward to adopt the Goll amendment. We did originally in the bill call for two years for Lincoln and Omaha school districts just as the rest of the state trying to get uniformity as Senator Remmers mentioned. That is a goal he would support. That was our original intent. We have backed off on that effort and have agreed to a compromise to three years is all we're asking now for the Lincoln and Omaha schools rather than the present system of three to five years in which they have to make a decision on granting tenure or not. So we have compromised on that point and then in this situation to lose ground on the tenure question seems to me again, not to be a step in a positive direction. So I would definitely oppose the Goll amendment and I believe that the experience we've had over the last I believe seven years or so since this bill was passed and the tenure established shows that there aren't the major problems that would warrant a change that has been called for with the Goll amendment and the system has worked well and the changes we're proposing are fine tuning that proposal, trying to improve it but not trying