

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SCIENCE

Science serves its readers as a forum for the presentation and discussion of important issues related to the advancement of science, including the presentation of minority or conflicting points of view, rather than by publishing only material on which a consensus has been reached. Accordingly, all articles published in *Science*—including editorials, news and comment, and book reviews—are signed and reflect the individual views of the authors and not official points of view adopted by the AAAS or the institutions with which the authors are affiliated.

Editorial Board

ROBERT L. BOWMAN	WILLARD F. LIBBY
MELVIN CALVIN	GORDON J. F. MACDONALD
JOSEPH W. CHAMBERLAIN	EVERETT I. MENDELSON
FARRINGTON DANIELS	NEAL E. MILLER
JOHN T. EDSALL	JOHN R. PIERCE
DAVID R. GODDARD	COLIN S. PITTENDRIGH
EMIL HAURY	KENNETH S. PITZER
ALEXANDER HOLLAENDER	ALEXANDER RICH
ROBERT JASTROW	DEWITT STETTEN, JR.
EDWIN M. LERNER, II	EDWARD L. TATUM
	CLARENCE M. ZENER

Editorial Staff

Editor

PHILIP H. ABELSON

Publisher

DAEL WOLFLE

Business Manager

HANS NUSSBAUM

Managing Editor: ROBERT V. ORMES

Assistant Editors: ELLEN E. MURPHY, JOHN E. RINGLE

Assistant to the Editor: NANCY TEIMOURIAN

News and Comment: DANIEL S. GREENBERG, JOHN WALSH, ELINOR LANGER, MARION ZEIGER, ROSEMARY GALLI

Europe: VICTOR K. MCELHENY, Flat 3, 18 Kensington Court Place, London, W.8, England (Western 5360)

Book Reviews: SARAH S. DEES

Editorial Assistants: ISABELLA BOULDIN, ELEANORE BUTZ, SYLVIA EBERHART, GRAYCE FINGER, NANCY HAMILTON, OLIVER HEATWOLE, ANNE HOLDSWORTH, MARCIA JODLBAUER, RUTH KINGLER

Advertising Staff

Director

EARL J. SCHERAGO

Production Manager

RAYMONDE SALAMA

Sales: New York, N.Y., 11 W. 42 St. (212-PE-6-1858): RICHARD L. CHARLES, ROBERT S. BUGBEE

Scotch Plains, N.J., 12 Unami Lane (201-889-4873): C. RICHARD CALLIS

Chicago, Ill., 6 W. Ontario St. (312-DE-7-4973): HERBERT BURKLAND

Los Angeles 45, Calif., 8255 Beverly Blvd. (213-653-9817): WINN NANCE

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE: 1515 Massachusetts Ave., NW, Washington, D.C. 20005. Phone: 202-387-7171. Cable: Advancesci, Washington. Copies of "Instructions for Contributors" can be obtained from the editorial office. ADVERTISING CORRESPONDENCE: Rm. 1740, 11 W. 42 St., New York, N.Y. 10036. Phone: 212-PE 6-1858.

The Great Teachers

The advantage that the researcher has over the teacher in gaining repute outside his own institution has been increased in recent years by the large amounts of external money available for research, the national review system under which much of that money is granted, and the emphasis given to research by federal agencies and universities. Recent reports, comments, and editorials from a variety of sources have warned that a better balance must soon be restored. Teaching, of course, may best be combined with research, but the inevitable increase in college enrollment, the need to provide an excellent education for the next generation of teachers and researchers, and widening acceptance of the importance of full development of talent all call for more emphasis on good teaching.

In the short run, various means can be used to increase the number of teachers, but the basic problem cannot be solved unless the status of teaching is enhanced in the eyes of present and prospective faculty members and the supporters of higher education. One point is clear: the status of teaching is not going to be enhanced by lowering the status of research. Any attempt in that direction would deservedly fail. A second point is clear: if great teaching is to be rewarded, the great teachers must be identified. And here there is a problem for those who contend that the quality of teaching is unmeasurable.

Given enough time, students, measurements, and statistical analysis, we might determine the qualitative improvement in the streams of students who pass through the classes of different teachers. But this approach is impracticable; any realistic effort to identify the outstanding teachers must depend upon the judgment of qualified observers. Three kinds of judges have been used. Judgments are frequently made by faculty colleagues, but the man being judged often can make the just complaint that his colleagues know little about what goes on in his classroom. Administrative officers also pass judgment on teaching quality, but a spy from the president's office is seldom welcome in the classroom. Sometimes student ratings are used. Some teachers rebel at the idea of being graded by their students, but others testify that students discriminate well and that, if given the responsibility, they judge on quality and not on popularity.

Yet the fact must be faced: if the prestige of teaching is to be enhanced, there must be agreement on who the good teachers are. As a start, it should be possible on any campus to collect independent ratings, preferably on firsthand evidence rather than on hearsay. If it turns out that there is reasonably high consistency in the judgments, good; the point has been made that the ablest teachers can be identified. If there is no satisfactory consistency, that is another story, but at least the effort would be good local propaganda for calling attention to the importance of teaching.

The teacher who wishes for enhanced status must therefore make a choice. He can cooperate in efforts to see if the ablest teachers can be identified reliably. If that turns out to be the case, then rewards, privileges, and other means of enhancing prestige can follow. Or he can insist that good teaching is essentially a private and unmeasurable affair. But he cannot hold this view, plead that the ablest teachers be given special recognition, and also honor consistency.

—DAEL WOLFLE