

basic requirement to get into the teaching field is largely four years of college education. A great percentage of the teachers have five years. They have taken a quarter of a school year or a semester of school year in practice teaching and then they have been under observation or they are supposed to have been under observation for up to five years deciding when that teacher will become tenured. The sad part about this is that few school systems in the state or at least not enough school systems in the state have an evaluation policy to take care of those teachers and if they've got an evaluation policy seldom do they carry it out by having a specific procedure for reviewing each young teacher. And if that teacher is in difficulty, even if your school systems have an assistance program to help that teacher improve so that they can become a good teacher, the real problem is that stretching out the probationary period as Senator Vickers so well said, is not only not good for the student by leaving a teacher in the field to continue poor teaching practices but it is not good for the teacher themselves nor is it good for the school as a whole. What it boils down to it's just not good administration. The important thing I believe for the probationary period is to identify that problem early and to start resolving the problem early rather than carrying it on ad infinitum into the future. In this respect, members, I'd hope that you would vote against Senator Goll's amendment to LB 259. Thank you.

SENATOR CLARK: Senator Hoagland.

SENATOR HOAGLAND: Senator Clark and colleagues, I'd just like to make, as a cosponsor of this measure, I'd just like to make a couple of short remarks in opposition to Senator Goll's amendment. One of the proponents of Senator Goll's amendment made an argument that I just have to respond to about twenty minutes ago and that legislator said it is really better for the teachers if we have three years instead of two years because if at the end of one and a half years if a teacher's performance has not been satisfactory it is better to permit that teacher another year to prove himself or herself rather than cutting them loose after a year and a half. Now the basic problem I have with that is, aside from the fact that it is a paternalistic argument, is that if we're really interested in what is best for the teachers, let's ask the teachers what they think is best for them. I think it is really unfair to come in and make general assumptions about what we think is best for the teachers when we can go to the teachers themselves and say what do you think is best for you. And teachers around the state overwhelmingly support a two year and not a three year argument. Thank you, Mr. Clark. Thank you, colleagues.