

# Education Matters

October 2006

A publication of the Association of American Educators



## STUDENT PERFORMANCE MALES vs FEMALES

HELPING  
THEM BOTH BE  
WINNERS!



BY JUDITH KLEINFELD

**W**omen's advocacy groups have waged an intense media campaign to promote the idea that schools shortchange girls. Their goal has been to convince the public that women are victims of an unfair educational system and that they deserve special treatment, extra funding, and heightened policy attention. Their sophisticated public-relations campaign has succeeded. The idea that schools shortchange girls has become the common wisdom—what people take for granted—without a thought concerning whether it is true.

This idea that girls are not well served by our schools—that gender differences in performance result from institutional unfairness—received its greatest boost from a highly publicized report, "How Schools Shortchange Girls: A Study of Major Findings on Girls and Education." Published in 1992 by the respected organization, the American Association of University Women (AAUW), along with a survey of self-esteem and aspirations

among boys and girls, the AAUW report quickly became the basis for countless newspaper articles, magazine features, books, and university courses on gender and education. The AAUW report makes three principal claims: First, girls fall behind boys in science and mathematics; second, girls participate less than boys in class or, as it is said, are "silenced" in the classroom; and third, girls suffer a major decline in self-esteem at adolescence while adolescent boys gain in self-esteem.

In its 1998 study "Gender Gaps: Where Schools Still Fail Our Children," the AAUW claimed that a gender gap was opening up in the field of computer science. Again, the accusation received great attention while dissenting opinions were ignored. Certainly, the AAUW has done women and the nation a service in drawing attention to the gender gap in science and mathematics and in encouraging an array of policies and programs designed to boost female performance in these fields.

However, most of the other findings of the AAUW are either misleading or false, and even its findings on the math and science gap need to be put into perspective. Indeed, the fact is that policy makers should be as concerned about the educational progress of boys as they are of girls. For it is boys, not girls, who lag behind in verbal skills, who are falling behind in college attendance, and who believe that schools are hostile to them.

### Who makes the grades?

If schools were shortchanging females, such gender discrimination should be easy to spot. Schools give clear and measurable rewards: grades, class rank, and academic honors and prizes. Which group—males or females—receives a disproportionate share of the school's institutional rewards? The answer is undisputed: females.

From grade school through graduate school, females receive higher grades, even in mathematics and the sciences.



They also receive more academic honors in every field except science and mathematics. The female advantage in grades appears in virtually every study.

Mathematics and science honors are the single area of male advantage, but females are catching up. Take performance on the Westinghouse Science Talent Search, a contest notable for producing winners who later receive the Nobel Prize. Westinghouse finalists used to be overwhelmingly male. From 1950 through 1959, for example, only 22 percent of the top forty finalists were female. In the late 1990s, in contrast, close to 40 percent of the top forty finalists were female; in 1997, the proportion of female finalists was 45 percent.

On standardized achievement tests of basic school skills, females surpass males in writing ability and reading achievement, while males surpass females in science and mathematics. Generally, these gender differences are small. The one exception is the significant female advantage in writing skills. Indeed, the female advantage on standardized tests of reading and writing achievement substantially outstrips the male advantage on standardized tests of science and mathematics.

As for the male advantage in mathematics and science, it is shrinking. The National Assessment of Educational Progress has measured the knowledge of 9-, 13-, and 17-year-olds in mathematics and science for over twenty years. In

mathematics, the gender gap among 17-year-olds has declined significantly since the 1970s and no longer reaches statistical significance. In science, the gender gap has also declined.

### **Do schools shortchange boys?**

In virtually every category of educational, emotional, behavioral, and neurological impairment, males are over-represented. According to the National Center for Education Statistics, more than double the number of males compared to females is enrolled in special-education programs.

Just as the greater number of males at the top in science and mathematics does not necessarily mean that the schools are shortchanging girls, so too the greater number of males at the bottom in special-education classes does not necessarily mean that the schools are shortchanging boys. The fact is that males are more variable than females on many neurological dimensions.

The policy that does the most to boost female achievement in math and science was, in fact, not designed specifically for girls. That policy is stricter requirements for high-school graduation. In the 1980s, high-school girls were far less likely than boys to take science and mathematics classes. According to the National Center for Educational Statistics, this particular gender gap has closed. Female high-school students now take as many mathematics and science classes as males do. The exception is physics: In 1994,

27 percent of males compared to 22 percent of females took a course in physics. But females surpassed males in taking courses in chemistry, algebra, geometry, precalculus, and biology. In trigonometry and calculus, the percentages of males and females are the same.

### **Silenced girls?**

If girls make higher grades in school, get higher ranks in class, receive more academic honors, surpass boys on standardized tests in two subjects (reading and writing), and lag only a little behind in two other subjects (mathematics and science), enter and graduate from college in greater numbers than boys, attain more master's degrees, and are closing the gap in more advanced degrees, then what is the basis for the charge that schools shortchange girls? A fair judge might look at the evidence and call it a draw: Females do better in some academic areas and males do better in others.

Well, as it happens, the AAUW's charge that schools shortchange girls is based not on such objective and comprehensive measures of educational attainment but instead on soft criteria, like the supposed "silencing" of girls in the classroom. The AAUW report emphasizes dramatic, highly publicized findings by David and Myra Sadker who claim that "research spanning the past twenty years consistently reveals that males receive more teacher attention than do females." According to the AAUW report, the Sadkers "report that boys in one study of elemen-



## **TEACHERS BY CALLING, PROFESSIONALS BY CHOICE.**

Across the country, over 250,000 teachers have made the professional choice to join the Association of American Educators or its sister organizations at the state level.

association of  
american educators   
[www.aateachers.org](http://www.aateachers.org)

tary and middle school students called out answers eight times more often than girls did.” Even more inflammatory, the study supposedly found that when boy’s called out comments in class, the teacher usually listened; but when girls called out comments, the teacher socialized them into “good girl” behavior, making such comments as, “Please raise your hand if you want to speak.”

The Sadkers’ findings, if true, are indeed shocking, and the media have spread them with a vengeance. The problem is that the research on which these dramatic findings are based has strangely disappeared. When I telephoned David Sadker to ask him for a copy of the research, he could not locate one.

Leaving aside the Sadkers’ lost study, what other evidence do we have that teachers give more attention to boys or even that boys talk more in the classroom? First, the question carries a hidden assumption—that differences in teacher attention actually influence how much students learn. No study has shown that talking in class or getting attention from the teacher makes any difference in student achievement.

Second, the meaning of “getting attention from the teacher” is unclear. Suppose, for example, that a teacher asks a fourth-grade boy a question in class. Is this a genuine academic question that will help him learn the material? Or is the teacher’s question actually a reprimand in disguise? The teacher may see that the boy is acting up and use the question to get him back on task.

Third, we do not have large, representative studies that objectively describe what goes on in different classrooms, different subject areas, and different locales.

In short, the research on classroom interaction does not show any pattern of consistent teacher favoritism toward either boys or girls. Boys do get more attention in elementary schools, usually for disciplinary reasons. But we have no clear evidence that boys get more academic attention, and we have no clear evidence



that talking in class boosts academic achievement.

### **Self-esteem: girls versus boys**

Another highly publicized AAUW message—that adolescent girls have lower self-esteem than boys—rests on equally shaky grounds. However, a careful review of the literature on gender, adolescence, and self-esteem reveals a picture far different from the message of the AAUW re-

port. First, self-esteem itself turns out to be a muddled concept. No study shows that adolescent self-esteem depends on success in school; rather, it is rooted in friendships and physical appearance. Second, boys and girls (and young people from different ethnic groups) turn out to have quite different areas of proficiency in mind when they respond to vague questions such as, “I like most things about myself.”

On the vague and general questions that many surveys use to measure self-esteem, boys indeed are apt to score higher than girls. But the differences tend to be quite small and can be explained, in part, by the tendency of boys to choose the extreme response categories on multiple-choice

questions. The Commonwealth Fund Survey of the Health of Adolescent Girls, released in 1997, and ballyhooed in the press as showing once again that adolescent girls lag behind adolescent boys in self-esteem, is an illustration.

What this survey actually shows is unreasonably high levels of self-confidence in both boys and girls, although boys are more apt to give extreme responses. But if the “strongly agree” and “somewhat agree” categories are added together, the much-lamented self-esteem gap disappears. As an example, on the question, “I feel that I have a number of good qualities,” 70 percent of boys “strongly agree” and 67 percent of girls “strongly agree.” If we add the category “somewhat agree,” we find that exactly 87 percent of girls and 87 percent of boys believe that they “have a number of good qualities.” This is the stuff of which the self-esteem gap is made!

In fact, problems with the concept of self-esteem have become so obvious that even feminist researchers have quietly retracted the original charge of a gender gap.

### **What’s the harm?**

In their zeal to advance the interests of women and their own organizational interests, the AAUW and other feminist advocacy groups have distorted the achievements of women and the experience of girls and boys in schools. True, many of

**“The research on classroom interaction does not show any pattern of consistent teacher favoritism toward either boys or girls.”**

these groups are retracting some of their previous positions, acknowledging that the gap in adolescent self-esteem may not exist and that the math gap is, in fact, closing. But they are searching for new areas of female victimization, such as the low numbers of females in engineering and computer sciences. Meanwhile, resources and attention are drawn away from the group that the schools truly fail, African-American males. Unfortunately, the feminist agenda, because it is pushed so strongly and receives so much attention from media elites, distracts us from the real problem of low educational achievement among African-American males and boys more generally.

Recently, I was on a panel with several school counselors. The first question to the panel was the AAUW chestnut, "What can we do to help girls, who suffer such a loss of self-esteem at adolescence?" The first speaker, a school counselor, launched

into a fiery description of the emotional problems of teenage girls. Adolescents she knew had changed from vital children who spoke their minds to bored and passive teenagers. This counselor was not aware that she was repeating chapter and verse from the AAUW report. These ideas were just in the air, promoted for years in teacher education workshops and university courses (such as the courses I myself taught).

I came next on the panel. Should I flat out contradict this counselor and tell the teachers in the audience that the research actually shows no differences in adolescent boys and girls in self-esteem, that this research has been politicized to serve a feminist agenda? As diplomatically as I could, I did so. The school counselor's reaction astonished me.

"I'm so glad you said that!" she proclaimed with fervent relief. "I know that boys have problems, too. But we just

don't give the boys much attention." Other teachers chimed in. "Come to think of it, I have four suicidal adolescents in my classes this year, and all four are boys," one teacher said. "Get the word out," said the sole male teacher at the workshop. "We're too busy to read the professional literature. We didn't know this."

Teachers have limited attention, time, and energy. Schools are hectic, crowded worlds. Teachers are honing in on the problems of girls—and they are overlooking the problems of boys. ■



*Judith Kleinfeld is Professor of Psychology and Director of Boys Project at the University of Alaska. For more documentation, visit [www.boysproject.net](http://www.boysproject.net).*

## For Every 100 Girls

For details on these sobering statistics, visit [www.boysproject.net](http://www.boysproject.net).

For every 100 girls enrolled in high school, there are 100 boys enrolled.

For every 100 girls who graduate from high school, 96 boys graduate.



For every 100 girls suspended from public elementary and secondary schools, 250 boys are suspended.

For every 100 girls expelled from public elementary and secondary schools, 335 boys are expelled.



For every 100 girls diagnosed with a special education disability, 217 boys are diagnosed with a special education disability.

For every 100 girls diagnosed with a learning disability, 276 boys are diagnosed with a learning disability.

For every 100 women enrolled in college, there are 77 men enrolled.

For every 100 American women who earn a bachelor's degree from college,

73 men earn a bachelor's degree.

For every 100 American women who earn a master's degree from college, 62 American men earn the same degree.

For every 100 American women who earn a first-professional degree, 107 American men earn a first-professional degree.

For every 100 females ages 15 to 19 that commit suicide, 549 males in the same range kill themselves.

For every 100 girls ages 15 to 17 in correctional facilities, there are 837 boys behind bars.



# Don't Know Much about History

Civics without history is superficial

By Will Fitzhugh

If your friends look at you strangely if you don't seem to know who Bow Wow or Busta Rhymes is, you are probably an American teenager. If your friends look at you strangely because you do know who Ruth Bader Ginsburg is, you are probably an American teenager.

I went to high school in California in the early 1950s, and there was special "teen" knowledge required then, but those requirements were not yet backed up by zillions of dollars of advertising and millions of product placements and the whole hip-hop gangsta commercial enterprise. We had to know a few "teen" words that our parents did not use, and also know about some people our parents thought very unimportant, but we still knew that we needed to know something about history, literature, math and science—not that all of us did.

Of course, popular culture is one of our main export successes, and it also soaks up a good chunk of the approximately \$150 billion our teens spend every year. We shouldn't want to throw all the writers, sales people, and sound engineers at Hip Hop International or at Hollywood out of work. It would be an unemployment disaster of the first order.

But to know Curly, Moe, and Larry, or Homer, Lisa, and Bart, while believing that the three branches of American government are local, state, and federal, cannot be what we desire most from our high school students. They may all know who left Jennifer for Angelina, but most do not know what Presidents of the United States were in command at Yorktown or the Battle of New Orleans.

Of course, teenagers need and will continue to value their own "words" and their own "groups" and other things to help differentiate themselves from the adults they will someday become. But when NAEP finds that 57 percent of high school seniors score below basic in U.S. history

and that only 11 percent were found to be proficient, it causes one (as well as it caused Thomas Jefferson) to wonder about their competence to be voters in our democracy.

## Novels and Nonfiction

In a recent article in *The Washington Post*, Michael Skube notes that his college students are unable to distinguish between novels and nonfiction books. This may very well be the result of the virtual banishment from the high schools of complete history books. The only complete books students are asked to read are novels, it seems, so no wonder they think all books are novels.

Many of the major foundations now focus their education efforts on math, minorities, and science. Of course, we are all worried about our ability to compete with Indian and Chinese scientists and engineers. However, if our students get better in math and science and they both cannot read and know nothing of our national history, is this an outcome that will do us much good?

## Reading about History

Many educators complain that No Child Left Behind has pushed aside creative efforts in the arts, which might affect our ability to produce and sell movies and popular music here and abroad, but when they complain that the focus on reading and writing allows no time for social studies, I often wonder why students cannot be asked to read history? That would be reading, and it would also be history. Unfortunately, those who focus on reading often have no interest in history and would not think of it when planning what students will read in their classes.

There is a good deal of federal support for civics. However, even if it is a good thing to know the three branches of the American government and how a bill becomes a law, this information alone is not



**"We need to rescue reading and writing from the English Department...."**

enough. Such facts are not very valuable if the student has no idea of the history of how the three branches have balanced each other since 1789, or of the effects of any bill that has been passed in the last 200 years. Without history, civics is necessarily quite superficial.

We need to rescue reading and writing from the English Department and urge history departments to encourage high school students to read at least one complete history book and write one serious history research paper each year. That might at least restore some balance in the kinds of knowledge deemed essential by their peers in the teenage years. ■



*Will Fitzhugh is a Harvard graduate who taught high school for ten years in Concord, Massachusetts. He founded the Concord Review, the National Writing Board, and the National History Club.*

*For more information, visit [www.tcr.org](http://www.tcr.org).*

## Hating to Read

### Why the author who hated to read as a child is writing books for boys

While he was growing up, Max Elliot Anderson hated to read even though his father was an author who published seventy-seven books. Five years ago, Max decided to look into why he didn't like to read. That research resulted in his decision to begin writing the kinds of books he would have enjoyed as a child.

Because of his research, Max writes books with stories that move rapidly. Each book has completely different characters, settings, and plots. As a child, he could never accept the concept of a group of friends, or cousins, or a brother and sister who would get up every Saturday morning, go out into the back yard, and save the world ... again!

His books for boys (ages 9-12) now include *Newspaper Caper*, *Terror at Wolf Lake*, *North Woods Poachers*, *Mountain Cabin Mystery*, *Big Rig Rustlers*, *Secret of Abbott's Cave*, and *Legend of the White Wolf*. Children have said that reading one



Max Elliot Anderson



of Max Elliot Anderson's mysteries or adventures is like being in an exciting movie.

Anderson's professional background is in the production of films, television commercials, and video programs. He incorporated visual concepts from those experiences into his writing. For example, readers won't find these books to be heavy on descriptions.

Recently, he was invited to speak to a gathering of educators and administrators at Northern Illinois University to discuss new approaches that would help raise the standardized reading test scores in their schools. Teachers agreed that the style of Anderson's books was exactly what their students needed, especially the boys.

Judging from the response he has received from readers, his books are working. A mother wrote, "I can't believe it ...

as the concerned mother of two struggling readers...I think I have purchased every book recommended for reluctant readers; however, they have all fallen short until today. We were able to purchase

*Newspaper Caper*, and we're hooked!"

A teacher reported, "This year, we started with your *Legend of the White Wolf*. The students are already finished with it. Our school only planned on using three of your books for the whole year. Now we'll have to buy more titles."

A school administrator wrote, "It is a joy to see our students, especially boys, asking for more! I can recommend every book without hesitation. While reading *Terror at Wolf Lake*, I had trouble putting the book down."

Anderson has also written an extensive teacher's manual for each book. These can be ordered from the publisher, Baker Trittin Press. Books are distributed by Baker and Taylor. With the success of his first seven books, Anderson has twenty-seven more titles ready for publication.

Teachers who wish to order signed copies for their students may contact the author at [mander8813@aol.com](mailto:mander8813@aol.com). The author's website address is [www.maxbooks.9k.com](http://www.maxbooks.9k.com). ■

## Differential Pay Catching On?

From coast to coast, there is a wave of new programs designed to increase the number of math, science, and special education teachers. Even just a year ago, these experimental programs were hard to find, suggesting that the notion of paying some teachers more than others, by virtue of what they teach, is gaining some traction.

**Los Angeles:** The City of Angels recently launched an incentive package designed to draw teachers in these fields into LA Unified's lowest performing schools. The three-pronged approach offers these educators a \$5,000 recruitment bonus, plus \$5,000 in tuition reimbursement, and finally a \$5,000 retention sweetener for those who remain for at least three years.

**New York:** In the Big Apple, science, math and special ed-

ucation teachers are eagerly responding to a \$14,600 housing subsidy incentive introduced last spring. With ninety-one teachers already expected to receive subsidies, the City is quickly closing in on its target of 100 program participants.

**Massachusetts:** The University of Massachusetts at Dartmouth is collaborating with local districts to attract career-switchers and recent liberal arts graduates to teach math and science. Program participants will be placed in classrooms with highly qualified teachers and receive a stipend for one year. This initiative is modeled after a similar program at UMass-Amherst called "180 Days," which has demonstrated that applicants with a full year of this apprenticeship-style experience in the classroom are more successful than most first-year teachers.

# Study in Japan

## Japan Fulbright Memorial Fund Teacher Program Applications Available

The Japan Fulbright Memorial Fund (JFMF) Teacher Program allows distinguished primary and secondary school educators in the U.S. to travel to Japan for three weeks in an effort to promote greater intercultural understanding between the two nations. This year up to 400 educators from all over the United States will be selected to participate in the 2007 program.

Participating educators will begin their visit in Tokyo with a practical orientation on Japanese life and culture and meetings with Japanese government officials and educators. They then will travel in groups of twenty to selected host cities where they will have direct contact with Japanese teachers and students during visits to primary and secondary schools as well as a teachers college. They also will visit cultural sites and local industries in addition to a brief homestay with a Japanese family.

The Japan Fulbright Memorial Fund, based in Tokyo, oversees all aspects of the Teacher Program. The program is sponsored by the Government of Japan and was launched in 1997 to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the U.S. government Fulbright Program, which has enabled more than 6,000 Japanese citizens to study in the U.S. on Fulbright fellowships for graduate education and research. The Institute of International Education acts as the agency for the Japan Fulbright Memorial Fund to coordinate the recruitment and pre-departure activities of the Teacher Program in the United States.

In 2007, up to 400 educators from all fifty states and the District of Columbia will be invited to visit Japan in June and October (200 in each group). To date, more than 5,200 primary and secondary educators visited Japan through the JFMF Teacher Program. Upon their return, program participants share what they have learned about Japan with their students and communi-

ties through a variety of outreach projects.

Primary and secondary school educators throughout the United States can apply to take part in one of the two trips to Japan scheduled for 2007, as guests of the Japanese Government. Teachers of all disciplines, including art, physical education, English, ESL, history, geography, math, science, and special education, from every region of the United States, are encouraged to apply. Applicants are not required or expected to have previous knowledge of Japanese or Japan.

**The application deadline for both 2007 trips is December 7, 2006.**

For more information about the 2007 competition, please refer to <http://www.fulbrightmemorialfund.jp> or contact 1-888-527-2636 or [jfmf@iie.org](mailto:jfmf@iie.org). All applications must be completed online. Applications will be available at [www.iie.org/jfmf](http://www.iie.org/jfmf).



## Special Education Regulations Released

The U.S. Department of Education has released the new regulations for Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). The final regulations are intended to further the goal that no child—including each and every one of America's students with disabilities—is left behind.

The Department has prepared a user-friendly website to help guide the public through these changes: [www.ed.gov/policy/speced/guid/idea/idea2004.html](http://www.ed.gov/policy/speced/guid/idea/idea2004.html). In addition to the actual text of the regulations, the site includes an analysis of the public's comments, a summary of the major changes since publication of the proposed regulations, and several appendices, including an index and additional guidance for implementing the regulations. A fact sheet on the new regulations can be found at [www.ed.gov/admins/lead/speced/ideafactsheet.html](http://www.ed.gov/admins/lead/speced/ideafactsheet.html).



# An Unknown School Reform

## The four-day week is worth more attention

By David Kirkpatrick

Public schools are perhaps the most reform-resistant of all institutions. One reason is that, as some studies have shown, individual educators tend to be unusually conservative (small “c”), tradition-bound, and averse to change. At the same time, parents and the general public have an image of what schools should be like and they are not very receptive to anything they regard as experiments with children.

Even allowing for these conditions, the lack of interest by educators in their own field of endeavor and interest is disturbing. In a time of long overdue reforms, educators seem to have little detailed knowledge of alternatives such as charter school and voucher programs other than they oppose them.

And the media is of little help. You can find something about the schools virtually every day in newspapers but you have to go to the sports pages. Attention is also given to adoption of school budgets, taxes, and other controversial topics. But in-depth reporting of educational programs is relatively rare.

An example of one school reform about which you have probably heard little or nothing is the school week of four ten-hour days.

School year requirements in the states tends to be indicated by total instructional hours. Typically this is about 900 hours at the elementary level (180 days of 5 hours each) and 990 at the secondary level (180 days of 5.5 hours each). The 180 days is met by having roughly 36 weeks of 5 school days each.

A four-day week of conventional daily 5 to 5.5 hours would require a forty-five week year. This might perhaps ease the learning loss over the usual summer break, which would be reduced by over half. It would, however, result in no saving in transportation costs since buses would still be used 180 school days a year. As a result, the introduction of the four day week that involves an extended school day of about 10 clock hours increases the daily instructional hours so the state requirement can still be met in a standard 36-week school year.

This was introduced in Jefferson County, Colorado more than thirty years ago. After just one year the district reported a more than 200 percent increase in productivity, more than 50 percent less use of sick leave and a nearly 70 percent reduction of overtime. One of the intangible, difficult-to-measure results was increased morale, one contributing factor to which was the introduction of three-day weekends. Disadvantages included increased fatigue among some employees and the necessity for adjustment in family and other off-duty times necessitated by the longer work day.

One reported result of shorter weeks is increased attendance by both staff and students, as high as 95 percent for students in the East Grand school district in Colorado. Nearby West Grand school district has only 520 students. At the beginning of the 2005-06 school year, it was reported that about one third of Colorado's districts were on a four-day week. Fewer ab-

sences by teachers allowed schools to hire fewer substitutes, freeing up some funds for other purposes. A Louisiana district reported a rise in grade-point averages and a sharp drop in failing grades.

Another Louisiana district said it receives 6 to 12 applicants for each job opening. This compares with one to three applicants in a nearby district with the usual 5-day school week.

In Webster County Kentucky, the district, with 1,900 students, reported saving \$200,000 on bus service, substitute teachers, and utilities.

By the 2002-03 school year it was estimated there were 100 districts utilizing the four-day week. All of them were rural and most of them were small. Since these districts tend to be lower income areas as well, efficiencies of the four-day week made it possible to keep art, music, and other classes that are often subject to being the first ones to be cut in adjustments to tight budgets.

Four-day weeks also tend to be from Monday to Thursday, thus freeing up Fridays for field trips, football games, and events such as homecoming. There are, however, districts in which Monday is the non-school day.

That small rural districts are not in major media markets is undoubtedly a reason for their invisibility.

But a reason is not an excuse. ■



*David W. Kirkpatrick is Senior Education Fellow, U.S. Freedom Foundation and Senior Education Fellow, Buckeye Institute, Columbus, OH. David is former President of NEA-affiliate Pennsylvania State Education Association.*