DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 077 001 CS 200 466

AUTHOR	Brett, Sue M., Ed.
TITLE	Supervision of English, Grades K-12: A Resource Book for State and Local School Systems. Guidelines, Procedures, Models. Reports and Recommendations from the Conference of Supervisors of English (Washington, D. C., February 1964).
INSTITUTION	National Council of Teachers of English, Champaign, Ill.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	[65]
NOTE	109p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$C.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS	Administrative Personnel; College Supervisors; Elementary School Supervisors; English Instruction; *English Programs; High School Supervisors; *Inservice Teacher Education; Leadership Training; *School Supervision; State Supervisors; *Supervision; Supervisor Qualifications; Supervisors; Supervisory Activities; *Supervisory Methods; Supervisory Training; Teacher Supervision

ABSTRACT

This volume contains the recommendations for improving English supervision which were formulated at the USOE Conference of Supervisors of English. James R. Squire discusses the present state of supervisory procedures and inservice teacher education, and Helen F. Olson reports the findings of the 1962 National Council of Teachers of English Survey of English Supervisors. The recommendations prepared at the conference are then collected under six headings: (1) Placement of Responsibility for Supervising the English Program, (2) Professional Status, Duties, and Relationships of the English Supervisor, (3) Inservice Education of English Teachers, (4) Procedures for Improving Curriculum and Producing Curriculum Guides, (5) Procedures and Criteria for Selecting Teaching Materials, and (6) Establishment of a Favorable Teaching Environment. The problems of English supervision at the superintendents' level are discussed in papers by J. E. Miller and Robert S. Fleming. Reports on current programs of English supervision in Texas, Florida, Troup County (Georgia), Pittsburgh, and Portland (Oregon) are presented by Dorothy Davidson, Paul H. Jacobs, Bernice Freeman, Lois M. Grose, and Marian Zollinger respectively. Excerpts from the conference discussions are appended. (This document previously announced as ED 023 679.) (LH)

SUPERVISION OF ENGLISH, GRADES K-12: A RESOURCE BOOK FOR STATE AND LOCAL SCHOOL SYSTEMS

Guidelines
Procedures
Models

Reports and Recommendations from the Conference of Supervisors of English, Grades K-12, Sponsored by the U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C., February 1964

Sue M. Brett

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF TEACHERS OF ENGLISH

508 South Sixth Street **Champaign, Illinois 61822**

Although the U.S. Office of Education sponsored the conference at which the following papers were presented and the recommendations were prepared, the conclusions and interpretations are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of this office.

FOREWORD

J. N. Hook

When Project English (now the English Program of the United States Office of Education) began in late 1961 and early 1962, advisers representing many national organizations were called upon for their counsel. These advisers were classroom teachers, professors, administrators, and officers within organizations; they spoke for themselves and for subject-matter organizations, teachers' associations, principals' and superintendents' groups, and librarians. Following their advice, Project English began sponsoring or assisting in curriculum study centers, pure research, applied research, demonstration centers, and conferences on such topics as needed research in the teaching of English, English for the culturally disadvantaged, the teaching of beginning reading, and the role of colleges and universities in the teaching of English and in the preparation of teachers.

In addition, Project English concerned itself with the need for institutes for upgrading and modernizing the preparation of teachers; these institutes have now become a reality because of the 1964 amendments to the National Defense Education Act. The same legislation now affords federal support for state supervisors of English, another of the developments urged by Project English. The Project also dabbled a bit in long-range plans — or dreams — for retrieval of research data, in plans for seminars for college teachers, in development of greatly expanded extension programs, in a "county agent" plan for instructional assistance of the kind proved eminently workable in agriculture, and in a number of other plans that have not even yet progressed to the drawing-board stage.

It was early evident to those of us in Project English, however, that something more was needed. Suppose, we said, that over a period of years teachers of English become considerably better prepared. Suppose further that research answers many of the now unanswered questions about materials, procedures, and the learning process. Suppose that curriculum study centers develop curricular patterns of proved merit that can be adapted by any interested school systems. Suppose that a nationwide system of demonstration centers puts on view many of the best practices and materials, for the enlightenment of the nation's English teachers. What will still be lacking?

The answer is coordination — coordination on the local and the state levels. Regardless of how much we learn about the curriculum and regardless of how well prepared tomorrow's teachers may be, coordination of

local and state programs will still be essential. Without it, the programs will still be unsystematic if not anarchic.

Coordination of programs is a major responsibility of supervisors. Yet in the early 1960's fewer than a third of the states had even one English supervisor attached to the state department of public instruction. Most large cities were a little better off with their one or more English supervisors (usually grossly overworked). But some large cities and most small cities, towns, and counties offered almost no supervisory help in English. The need was — and still is — acute.

In 1962 Dr. Sue Brett joined the staff of the U. S. Office of Education. She brought a rich background of teaching and supervision in English, along with a deep realization of how important effective coordination of an English program can be. She began early the planning of the conference of which this brochure is the outgrowth, and she succeeded in bringing to the conference, from all parts of the nation, many of the leading English supervisors and preeminent figures in English education. The credit for the success of the conference and for the basic common sense of the recommendations in this pamphlet is largely hers.

A conference is not enough, of course, even when followed, as this one will be, by others sponsored by the National Council of Teachers of English and the U. S. Office.

Conferences can provide definitions of function, creative thinking, sharing of ideas and experiences, and recommendations. But state and local authorities have to translate recommendations into reality. This brochure points out the needs and describes ways of meeting them. What happens next in English supervision depends upon the administrators who read this brochure — upon their clarity of vision and their willingness and ability to fill one of the greatest gaps in English instruction in the United States.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

The Conference of Supervisors of English reported in this volume was held at the U. S. Office of Education in February 1964, under the sponsorship of the USOE Cooperative Research Program.

The stated purpose was to bring together a large number of supervisors of English and national leaders in education to make recommendations which might serve as guidelines for state and local school systems in improving English instruction through supervision. Two thirds of the participants were or had recently been practicing supervisors of English, experienced in both English teaching and supervision. The other third were widely known leaders in the field of English instruction and representatives of major professional associations.

The Conference was initiated in recognition of the growing awareness of the need for special English supervision. The impact of the expanded supervisory services in science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages, provided under the National Defense Education Act, was being felt in English also, and a few state, county, and city school systems were adding supervisors in this field without the benefit of federal funds. The consciousness of need was heightened in 1961 when the National Council of Teachers of English published its status study entitled *The National Interest and the Teaching of English.* By 1964, when the Conference was held, the NCTE had gathered dramatic evidence of the urgent need to upgrade the preparation of English teachers. Some of these data were presented in the Conference and later published in full in *The National Interest and the Continuing Education of Teachers of English.*[1]

The Conference, working in two groups under separate chairmen, wrote recommendations on eight major problem areas of English supervision. As a problem was presented for consideration, the previously appointed discussion leader distributed recommendations to open the discussion. Later the editor for that problem revised the paper as amended by the group. Finally the recommendations from the two groups were combined and coordinated in the Office of Education by the Conference chairman.

The completed recommendations, though they may serve the need for guidelines as initially proposed, extend far beyond the broad general statements usually termed "guidelines." With the commentaries, they

[1] NCTE Committee on the National Interest, *The National Interest and the Teaching of English* (Champaign, Ill.: NCTE, 1961), and *The National Interest and the Continuing Education of Teachers of English* (1964). See also the address by James R. Squire, "The Continuing Education of Teachers of English," p. 3, in this volume.

include philosophy, patterns, procedures, and practices which the conferees have found generally successful.

This volume, including a body of resource material in addition to the recommendations, has been prepared for the reference of states and local school districts in establishing effective programs of English supervision.

DEFINITIONS

The definition of "English" as used in this publication is that of the NDEA Title III Regulations:[2]

> "English" means the study of the English language in its spoken and written forms regardless of the primary language of the student, and training and practice in the communication skills of listening, speaking, reading, and writing. It includes speech, grammar, literature, language arts, and linguistics. It also includes journalism, creative writing, public speaking, debate, and dramatic arts if they are taught during the regular hours of the school day in courses for which English credit is given toward graduation.

To conform with this definition the designations "language arts" for elementary school English and "English language arts" for kindergarten through twelfth grade English have been avoided. They appear only in the speeches and other quoted passages.

"Supervision of English," as used in this publication, means the leadership and directorship activities of an official supervisor or director in establishing an English curriculum of high quality and appropriateness and in maintaining excellence of classroom instruction. "Specialized supervision" of English is the leadership or directorship of a supervisor who is a specialist in both the *subject content* of English and the *teaching* of English at the level of his supervisory responsibility — elementary and/or secondary.

S. M. B.

---

[2] *Regulations.* Section 301 through 304 of Title III, National Defense Education Act of 1958, as Amended. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, January 1965.

PRESENT STATE OF ENGLISH TEACHING AND SUPERVISION

The Continuing Education of Teachers of English

James R. Squire

How much help do teachers really receive from supervision? There is reason to believe that something is amiss in current supervisory procedures. In the questionnaire ranking of various inservice education activities in degree of helpfulness, some 7,400 representative high school teachers of English placed conferences with a supervisor fifth in value out of 7 possible choices.[1] This is not surprising in view of the fact that over half of the respondents had never had a conference with a special supervisor of English. Only participation in district workshops and the reading of research reports were considered of less help. College courses were the most helpful form of continuing education, according to these teachers, followed in rank by meeting with fellow teachers of English, professional reading, and the reading of general interest materials. Among elementary teachers, supervision fared slightly better, ranking third after meetings with fellow teachers and college courses. However, elementary teachers claimed to receive more help from conferences with supervisors than they did from district workshops and institutes. Reading, either professional or general, was ranked as least helpful by these elementary teachers.

The higher value placed upon supervision by elementary teachers must be caused by the more frequent contact elementary teachers have with supervisors, but no doubt the low rankings in both elementary and secondary groups result in part from the inappropriateness of some supervisory approaches used today. It seems that part of the ineffectiveness of supervision in the field of English results from the unwillingness of public schools to assume as a major responsibility the organization of programs of continuing education. Concerned as we sometimes have been with the development of curricula, the selection of texts, and the demands of public relations, we neglect the educational needs of those who would teach in English programs. Indeed, in some locales we devote so little time to the inservice education in English of elementary and secondary teachers that we act as if such preparation is of concern only to the colleges.

The *National Interest and the Continuing Education of Teachers of English*, published by the National Council of Teachers of English, surveys

[1]The questionnaire was distributed in 1963 by the National Council of Teachers of English to assess the need for continuing education of English teachers.

current needs.[2] The data were gathered from 7,400 secondary teachers of English and from 3,030 elementary teachers, distributed geographically throughout the country. In order to share some of the findings which have particular relevance to the role of the supervisor, we will discuss in turn each of the findings with respect to college course offerings, district institutes and workshops, and inschool supervisory activities.

COLLEGE COURSES

A teaching credential offers merely the assurance that a beginning teacher has met a minimum standard of preparation, not that he does not yet have much to learn. Programs of teacher education will never prepare teachers with all of the knowledge and skills that they need for a long career. Studies repeatedly reveal that the majority of elementary teachers receive inadequate preservice education in English, especially in language learning and in the teaching of writing, speech, and thinking. The data further reveal that the majority of today's baccalaureate majors planning to teach secondary English—however recommended by our liberal arts colleges — do not meet reasonable standards of preparation in the subject. For example, more than half of the majors still lack any background in modern English grammar and in advanced composition. What is more, there is firm evidence that only 50.6 percent of all secondary English classes nationally are even taught by teachers holding majors in the subject; thus the preparation of English teachers nationally is probably far worse than the profession would like to imagine. One suggestion of the magnitude of the problem comes from the teachers themselves:

90 percent of all secondary teachers of English do not feel well prepared to teach reading
67 percent of all teachers do not feel well prepared in the oral skills
63 percent do not feel well prepared in composition
48 percent do not feel well prepared in literature
47 percent do not feel well prepared in the English language.

And these figures refer not to college preparation alone, but to the total experience in preservice and inservice education of some 7,400 teachers, half of whom have been teaching for a decade.

The NCTE studies reveal that the average secondary teacher of English remains in the classroom for more than 9 years, and that the elementary teacher remains almost as long. Thus, to do nothing about the inadequacies of the present teaching staff of some 900,000 elementary teachers and secondary teachers of English is to accept a decade of deficient

[2] Committee on the National Interest, *The National Interest and the Continuing Education of Teachers of English* (Champaign, Ill.: NCTE, 1964).

instruction in English. Tomorrow's teachers of English ought to be better prepared than those being graduated from teacher education institutions today. In the meantime, the profession must attempt to provide solid programs of inservice education.

Nor can we assume that college and university courses are available to assist teachers in overcoming their deficiencies. Because of lack of ti- and money or lack of opportunities for completing course work, thous of teachers have not enrolled in such programs. Items:

- In more than 9 years of teaching, the high school teacher of English averages only .4 semester hours in composition and .7 semester hours in language, the two areas of greatest deficiency. This is equivalent to saying that only one teacher in seven has taken as much as one 3-hour course in language during the past decade — a decade during which the major advances of linguists have noted the need for continuing education in this discipline. The secondary teacher of English averages only one summer course in every 2 years, or perhaps the equivalent of one full summer session in every 4 or 5 years. This is only the average; half do not do nearly so much.
- The elementary teacher, at least 24 percent of whose time is spent in teaching the English language arts, averages only 8 percent of his total college program in studies of English or in education courses dealing with the teaching of the English language arts. Since certification, the elementary teacher has completed four times as much course work in education as in English, and his unit total during this 9-year period includes an average of only 1.3 semester hours in reading (about half a course), 1.0 semester hours in curriculum or methods in English, 1.4 semester hours in literature, and less than .5 semester hours in English language and composition.

If these facts alone are not enough evidence of the need for leadership in providing continuing education in English, an even more jarring discovery is that 25 to 30 percent of the total teaching force in English has not taken any course work in English *or* in education for the past decade. Moreover, a careful analysis of data reveals that the nonmajor, the teacher of English least well prepared in the subject, is the teacher most likely to avoid course work in English, even though it is his major teaching assignment. This nonmajor is most likely one who fails also to join professional subject associations in English, who seldom engages in professional reading, attends professional meetings, or displays any interest in the subject that he is teaching. Examination of the recent NCTE study

suggests tha' an as one fourth of all English teachers may fall into this category

What can a supervisor do to encourage teachers to enroll in sound programs of extension and summer college courses? He can determine first the special inadequacies of the teachers in his district and work with local colleges to provide courses for teachers at appropriate times. In the NCTE study, for example, the teachers clearly expressed interest in work in certain areas. Of "greatest interest and value" to secondary teachers were advanced or intermediate composition, rated high by 89.9 percent of all teachers; practical methods in English were mentioned by almost as many. Seventy-nine percent of the elementary teachers expressed great interest in further work in reading; 60.5 percent expressed interest in children's literature. Similar surveys might be undertaken in every district. Can course work be made available either through local extension or summer schools? Armed with information about the potential needs and interests of teachers, the supervisor can take the initiative and approach English and education departments concerning possible offerings. He might emphasize the importance of providing courses especially in English during late afternoons or evenings, when teachers are willing to engage in such work. The tradition of extramural courses during these hours has yet to be established in academic departments. Yet faced with a direct request from the schools, most college departments today would carefully consider the idea.

Since a sizable number of teachers are not engaged in course work, appropriate incentives must be offered the teachers to continue education in English. With the exception of salary increments for completion of specified units of college courses, the majority of school districts seem not to encourage elementary and secondary teachers to eliminate deficiencies in their preparations. Even college credits toward salary increments are accepted almost recklessly with few genuine attempts to consider the relationship of completed course work to the teaching assignment of the individual. One result is the abandonment by a substantial proportion of teachers of any attempt to continue formal study. Another is the grasping by numerous teachers of a mass of college credits determined more by availability at the local extension center than by relevance to teaching. Unfortunately, the present study reveals that the nonmajor teaching English classes or the elementary teacher lacking a baccalaureate degree is more likely to complete unrelated courses in education or in fields other than English than is the teacher who is already well prepared.

Clearly the sequence of extension courses completed by teachers needs to be screened for relevance to the teacher's assignment. Such evaluation could possibly be made by a special school committee appointed for this purpose. In some cases, the guidance might come from an adviser at the institution of higher learning, especially when the teacher is engaged in

a program leading to a degree, certificate, or credential. School districts and neighboring institutions of higher education might do well to cooperate in offering such guidance through specially developed programs and thus encourage more intelligent course selection by teachers.

Other forms of incentive are important as well. Only a small percentage of school districts allow sabbatical leave for teachers, despite the fact that such a policy offers an important way to retain outstanding teachers in a district. A few districts provide summer scholarships for teachers, or pay the tuition fees for an important college extension course organized at the district's request.

Offering released time to attend professional meetings dealing with the teaching of English is still another incentive open to alert schools. The ways of encouraging teachers to continue their education in English are so varied as to be limited only by the imagination and boldness of a supervisor.

DISTRICT WORKSHOPS AND INSTITUTES

At a time when basic concepts within our discipline and its teaching are changing rapidly, regular course work remains for teachers an indispensable component of continuing education. But it is not the only component. Of great importance in many school districts is the teacher institute or district-planned workshop, which occurs so regularly that it involves 71 percent of all secondary teachers and almost 82 percent of all elementary teachers. An annual institute is the prevailing pattern, although in some areas such meetings occur even more frequently. To the extent that supervisors are involved in the planning of such meetings, the institutes can offer a valuable avenue for providing inservice education.

Institutes serve several purposes other than continuing education. In districts with widely scattered schools and hundreds of teachers, the institute may offer the one time during the school year when teachers meet to consider problems of common interest or even to meet with their chief administrators. The institute offers an opportunity for beginning teachers to meet their experienced colleagues. And, frequently, it is used as a medium for clarifying administrative procedures.

From information gathered by the National Council of Teachers of English, however, it becomes clear that school institutes do little today to extend the teachers' backgrounds in English and the language arts. At an elementary level, not more than 25 percent of the total institute time is spent in activities specifically concerned with language arts instruction. At the secondary level, teachers report that only 21.4 percent of their institute time is devoted to English. If a guest speaker appears, in all likelihood he is a general curriculum person. Is it not possible that the inadequacy of the institute offerings stems directly from their excessively

generalized character? If anything is clear in the data gathered by NCTE, it is that teachers at *different* levels of experience and with *different* teaching assignments profit most from *different* kinds of educational experiences. As surely as the schools have committed themselves to devise varying programs for different kinds of students, should not recognition of individual variation among teachers lead us to plan programs on specific content areas within the overall institute, rather than, as a dominant pattern, to work consistently at the level of general curriculum? If reliance on the institute continues to be a major way of meeting the inservice needs of teachers, should not a substantial portion of these offerings be concerned with the content and methods involved in teaching reading and literature, language, composition, and related aspects of English? The involvement of specialized elementary and secondary supervisors in English in the direct planning of such institutes should ensure adequate attention to the discipline.

Where district-sponsored offerings in the subject are not at present available, supervisors search for other opportunities for teachers to consider the problems of English instruction. From coast to coast the nearly 200 local and state affiliates of the National Council of Teachers of English organize extensive programs of conferences, meetings, workshops, and publications. By providing a few hours of released time for teachers, token assistance in meeting conference expenses, and support through distribution of program announcements, supervisors may encourage participation in subject-matter groups of this kind.

INSCHOOL ACTIVITIES

Not all of the contributions to the continuing education of teachers of English occur through institutes and workshops, college courses, and professional meetings. Supervisory activities within individual schools are also of major significance.

I visited a distinguished high school for two days as part of the evaluation of outstanding English departments which the National Study of High School English Programs is conducting for NCTE at the University of Illinois. At this school I was impressed by the quality of four beginning teachers of English who were thoroughly prepared in English and education, interested in the profession, enthusiastic about teaching.

As I listened to them talk about the problems of teaching, I felt encouraged and hopeful about the future of English instruction in this country. If we can continue to attract such vital and enthusiastic teachers, I thought, we may ultimately solve our most difficult problems.

And then I visited their classrooms. What did I find in the classes of these young people so impressive in conference? Dull, lifeless teaching directed to the form of English rather than to its essence. Lectures on the history of England as background for the study of English literature —

but at dictation speed so that no student could possibly miss copying the treasured facts. No discussion, no interaction between pupils and teachers, no attempt to engage pupils in the long, difficult, but often rewarding analysis of a literary text, indeed not one iota of excitement about learning on the part of either the pupils or the teachers. These vital young beginning teachers of English who seemed so alive in conference were already beginning to turn their students away from our subject. And no one in the school seemed to be aware of what was happening!

I mention this experience to illustrate how isolated each teacher can become in the profession, and how, also, the promise of many attractive beginners may be lost unless ways can be found to provide appropriate help within the classroom as well as without. Until I visited these classes, I had no conception of the problems of these teachers and others like them. For beginning teachers at least, and perhaps also for the more experienced, some provision for occasional conferences with supervisors based on classroom observation seems an important process in the continuing education of teachers. In large districts, especially in secondary schools, such inclass visiting and conferring may well be conducted by the department head, rather than by the outside supervisor, but it seems important that regular provision for it be made.

Conferences with a specialist on the teaching of English also are valuable in the inservice education of teachers. Yet only 15 percent of all elementary teachers report that such conferences occur "often" and more than 40 percent say they never occur. More frequently the elementary teacher receives help from a general curriculum consultant, yet even this help is "often" available in only 28 percent of the schools. No supervisory help at all is reported by 20 percent of elementary teachers, and 28 percent report that they "never" are able to obtain help from a school or district librarian.

Nor is the picture more favorable in the secondary school. Only one third of the nation's secondary English teachers are "often" able to confer with a librarian or even with fellow teachers of English. Ten percent have never attended a department meeting, and almost 20 percent of them have never met with a librarian. The majority have never had an opportunity to confer with a college professor of English or English education or with a special English supervisor.

A rapid strengthening of school services in supervision of English seems mandatory if important progress is to be made toward improving instruction. Currently available data on the preparation of the present teaching force in English reveal the urgency of the need. The field of English is moving far too rapidly for any partially trained general administrator or supervisor, however admirable and exemplary his personal characteristics, to maintain familiarity with new research and scholarship and with important professional developments as well. Only

if school administrators and supervisors are able to meet regularly with a qualified consultant in English can they possibly be knowledgeable in making crucial decisions concerning instructional matters.

In individual high schools, especially those in districts not served by a general consultant in English, the appointment of a qualified department head is a necessity if English teachers are to receive day-to-day assistance. Such a department head, released from some responsibilities for class instruction, can consult with teachers, supervise classes, develop a coordinated departmental program, assist the principal in interviewing prospective teachers, offer leadership in coordinating the work of the school with that of feeder junior high schools and with beginning college classes. In short, within the limits of the time available, the department chairman can provide continuing leadership to improve the teaching of English in the school.

In elementary schools, the presence of a curriculum specialist with a thorough grasp of the English language arts seems necessary. Districts which employ several general elementary supervisors should attempt to see that at least one supervisor qualifies as a specialist in English. Similarly, at least one of the primary and one of the upper grade teachers in every large elementary school should be appointed to serve in an advisory capacity on the basis of background in English — in language, reading, literature, and speech. And a teacher with such strength should be charged with helping others on the staff.

The continuing education of elementary and secondary teachers is an essential responsibility of supervision and one that has been too long overlooked. Since most of the teaching force in English today is inadequately prepared, the educational needs of teachers must take the highest priority in supervision. At a time when there are developing across this nation a dozen new English programs based on recent scholarship and research in the study and learning of language, literature, and composition, the provision for continuing education in English will largely determine the success or failure of other aspects of the program. Experience in the sciences and mathematics shows the importance of educating teachers to use new content and new methodologies before new programs are introduced. To fail to provide for the reeducation of teachers before asking them to teach content that they do not understand is to foster misunderstanding, confusion, and almost certain defeat of the program. Unless the same professionwide energy now being expended on curriculum reorganization is directed to the task of reeducating teachers who must teach in our revised programs, the full promise of the new English programs will never be achieved.

The NCTE Survey of English Supervision[1]

Helen F. Olson

A survey conducted by the National Council of Teachers of English in 1962 shows great divergence throughout the United States in supervision of English. The questionnaire, sent to the school superintendents of all 50 states and to 57 cities with populations of 200,000 or more, reveals that 14 of the states and 23 of the cities have each assigned someone to leadership responsibility for the English program, this person being titled supervisor, director, or consultant. Conversely, the questionnaire reveals that 36 of the states and 34 of the cities do *not* have assigned leadership for English. One city system reports that the general supervisor, even though he supervises all secondary subjects, is a specialist in English. Some school systems report that the need for specific supervision of English is recognized and that efforts are being made to establish the position of English supervisor. In the other states and cities, English, if it receives any special consideration at all, is just one responsibility of a general supervisor, although assistants may be assigned certain related duties. In some cities, only the secondary schools are supervised by an English specialist; the elementary schools in these systems are supervised by generalists and assistants, some of whom are given special responsibilities for various aspects of the English language arts program. Reading consultants and speech consultants or therapists are more prevalent than are directors of the entire English language arts program in the elementary schools. No school system reported a supervisor of English language arts for the elementary schools only.

The above figures indicate that some efforts are being made to provide direction for teaching and learning in the fields of reading, language, literature, and oral and written composition. Although there are more English supervisors than there were a few years ago, the picture is not quite as favorable as it may appear. Of the fourteen states having English supervisors, only eight have full-time supervisors of English; in the others, the English supervisors have other responsibilities as well. Of the twenty-three city supervisors, twenty give full time to English and three divide their time between English and social studies. Of the fourteen state supervisors, ten are responsible for K-12 programs and four for secondary

[1] Since the NCTE survey of 1962, the provisions for supervision of English in states and large cities have been improved somewhat.

only; of the twenty-three city supervisors, eight are responsible for K-12 programs and fifteen for secondary only.

RESPONSIBILITIES OF SUPERVISORS OF ENGLISH

The responses indicate that almost all supervisors work with principals, department heads, and committees of teachers, and that they are concerned with reading, literature, speaking, written composition, and language skills. In the secondary schools, the areas of supervision generally include also drama, journalism, and debate, and in some systems humanities courses, advanced placement courses, honors programs, remedial programs, reading improvement programs, handwriting courses, and programs utilizing mass media for instruction.

The specific duties expected of them, as listed by the fourteen state supervisors and the twenty-three city supervisors, make clear the need for well trained specialists in these positions. Responsibilities listed by eight or more of the fourteen state supervisors and by fifteen or more of the twenty-three city supervisors include the following:

- Classroom observation
- Organization of the instructional program
- Textbook evaluation
- Experimental or pilot programs
- Articulation of program with colleges and universities
- Inservice training
- Organization of and participation in local and regional meetings
- Interpreting the program to parents and the general public (only 7 state supervisors, but 18 city supervisors, listed this responsibility)
- Curriculum development
- Development, recommendation, and distribution of new materials and equipment
- Research
- Participation in the general curriculum program with other supervisors and administrators
- Citywide, regional, or state meetings of department heads or other liaison persons

Many other specific responsibilities were listed by some of the supervisors. For instance, four of the state supervisors and eleven of the city supervisors include the supervision of citywide, regional, or statewide testing programs in English.

CRITERIA FOR SELECTING SUPERVISORS OF ENGLISH

The responses to the questionnaire indicate general agreement that the supervisors of English should have the following personal qualifications: U. S. citizenship, sound moral character, pleasing personality,

scholarship, leadership, ability to organize, teaching competency, supervising competency, general culture, and keen interest in literary and linguistic activities. Educational qualifications most frequently mentioned are a broad general education, as evidenced by the Bachelor of Arts or Bachelor of Education degree and by the transcript of courses taken; a major in English; a master's degree and at least one additional year of graduate study in English and education; and attainment of the highest certificate available to teachers of English in the geographic area in which the supervisory services will be rendered. Specific courses recommended include English, American, and world literature, both classical and contemporary; basic reading skills; written composition; grammar — both traditional and the "new grammars"; speech; educational psychology and human growth and development; supervision and curriculum development; and educational research. The experience of the person who qualifies as a supervisor of English should include a minimum of five years of successful teaching of all phases of English and at all grade levels that he will supervise; experience in a wide variety of inservice education activities; and active participation in the work of professional organizations.

PROBLEMS OF ENGLISH SUPERVISION

The problems of the supervisor of English highlight the problems confronting English instruction as a whole.

First, there is need for a clear definition of the proper duties of the supervisor. Supervisors report a multiplicity of duties assigned to them, often not closely related to English curriculum and instruction. Defining these duties is a must; and such definition can help further define the English program, which often seems amorphous and confusing to the public and to others not specially trained in this field. Perhaps such a definition may also serve to clear away some traditional chaff still clinging to many English courses.

Second, there is the need to improve the work of the many ill-prepared or uninterested teachers. Colleges should revise their preparation courses to make them more realistic. A teacher who has never had a reading course, or a course in children's literature, or an advanced course in written composition or evaluating written composition presents a major problem for the supervisor, who must seek to remedy the lack through inservice training and conferences. Teachers of other subjects assigned to teach English to fill in gaps in their own schedules present another problem. Often they do not know much about English and are not interested in learning more; they wish to get out of it as soon as possible and teach only the subject for which they are prepared. There is need for clear definition of who should teach English, followed by a strong effort to ensure that only those who should teach English do teach it.

Third, there is need for a clear understanding of the relationship between curriculum and instruction and the relationship of both to administration. Often the English supervisor lacks the means to put into practice in the classrooms a program which has been carefully developed and evaluated by administrators and teacher committees. Among the many contributing factors are failures in communication, multiplicity of persons with whom the supervisors must deal, ill-defined status of the supervisor, lack of administrative understanding and support, small or nonexistent staff, and insufficient funds for materials, secretarial help, and necessary travel expenses. There is no one answer to this problem. One large city has solved it through assigning the English supervisor a large staff — ten full-time assistants, a number of part-time assistants, and an adequate secretarial staff. Another large city has solved the same problem through establishment of a closely knit systemwide organization with clearly defined responsibilities for all divisions and personnel. In this city the supervisor has been assigned a small staff, with a close and clearly understood relationship between the supervisory or curricular position and the instructional and administrative division. The programs developed and the materials selected under the direction of the English supervisor are put into practice in the classrooms through the authority of the administrators and instructional coordinators.

Finally, there is the need to provide for teacher and student creativity and for individual differences within the unity of a sound basic program. What is the difference between creative teaching of English and haphazard teaching? How does one distinguish between liberty and license — in deciding what books shall be read by students at a certain grade level, for instance? To what extent shall teachers, administrators, and members of the community be involved in developing and carrying on a program? How can a program give sound basic education to all and still provide for individual differences? These and similar questions point up the need both of having a specialist as supervisor of English and of defining the supervisor's duties. The English program in any school system is profoundly affected by these four problems.

GUIDELINES FOR IMPROVING INSTRUCTION IN ENGLISH THROUGH SUPERVISION: RECOMMENDATIONS AND COMMENTARIES

I. Placement of Responsibility for Supervising the English Program[1]

RECOMMENDATION: The responsibility for directing the English program at the state level and for directing and supervising the English program at the school district level should be delegated to specialists in English and English instruction.

The general supervisor as a state or district director of English, particularly in the secondary schools, is outmoded. To keep up with the rapid strides of the subject field into the new grammars, the new literature, the new criticism, with new emphases on semantics, rhetoric, critical reading, listening, logical thinking, and writing, the English supervisor must read at top speeds. To provide special attention for the bright, the slow, and the culturally deprived through multiple curriculum tracks, reading programs, and new teaching techniques, he must give maximum effort and time. In addition, he must meet the teacher preparation problems.[2] English teachers must have special inservice education experiences and specialized help in their classrooms. Even if the general supervisor could satisfactorily discharge these obligations to English, he could not also maintain his responsibilities in social studies, science, mathematics, and other subjects. The important function of the general supervisor at the present time appears to be the coordination of instruction in the various subjects.[3]

RECOMMENDATION: At the state level, the department of education should include an English section, with responsibilities for grades K-12, consisting of a director and at least two consultants: one elementary, the other, secondary. The number of consultants should vary according to the size and population of the state, but should be adequate to permit the state to carry on a dynamic program for upgrading English instruction.[4]

---

[1]The terms "director" and "supervisor" were used interchangeably by the conferees, in all their recommendations, to indicate the person who bears immediate responsibility for both curriculum and instruction in English. In some systems this person is called the coordinator or consultant, but according to the research findings available at present, the title "supervisor" is still the most frequently used.

[2]See the address by James R. Squire, "The Continuing Education of Teachers of English," p. 3.

[3]For discussion, see p. 81, sec. 1.

[4]For discussion, see p. 83, sec. 2.

RECOMMENDATION: At the local school district level (county, city, area school systems), the organizational structure for directing and supervising English should follow the pattern either of separate English directorships for grades K-6 and 7-12, or a single directorship for grades K-12. If there are separate directors or supervisors for grades K-6 and 7-12, the two should be charged with joint responsibility, or one should be charged with leadership responsibility, to provide an articulated English program for all grades.

The success of these two structures appears to be influenced by various factors. In preparation for the conference, Verda Evans canvassed 42 cities with a population of 30,000 or more to find their patterns of organization for the supervision of English. She summarized the returns as follows:

SEPARATE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY DIRECTORSHIPS

Of the thirty-one cities responding to the questionnaire, seven employ one English supervisor for Grades K-12, and nineteen employ separate English supervisors for elementary and secondary schools. In eight of the nineteen cities, both elementary and secondary supervisors are English specialists; in eleven, the secondary school supervisors are specialists and the elementary are generalists. Advantages and disadvantages were cited for both separate and single directorships with neither emerging conclusively as the better one.[5]

OTHER SUPERVISORY STRUCTURES

In five of the reporting cities the English programs are directed by curriculum directors, assistant supervisors, general supervisors, or department chairmen in secondary schools and by principals in elementary schools.

One city reported two divisions of supervision—operating and curriculum—in both secondary and elementary schools. Each division is administered by an associate superintendent.

Another system reported a Director of the Language Education department with a staff including one foreign language supervisor, one secondary English supervisor and six elementary supervisors assigned to special areas.[6]

RECOMMENDATION: In systems too small to warrant special subject directors or supervisors, specialists in English at the elementary level and specialists in English and English instruction at the secondary level

[5] For comment, see p. 84, sec. 4.

[6] For notes on patterns of supervision employed in four large school systems, see p. 82, sec. 3.

should be available to serve the directors of elementary and secondary education.

RECOMMENDATION: In every secondary school a department chairman who is highly knowledgeable in the fields of English and English teaching should be appointed, and his work schedule should provide time for leadership activities in the department as needed. Such appointments should properly be the first step in the organization of a systemwide supervisory program. In a system too small to support systemwide English supervision the department chairman should direct the English programs.

RECOMMENDATION: The number of assistants to the director to be employed in a school system should be determined both by the number of teachers to be served and by the needs for supervisory services. A predetermined supervisor-teacher ratio alone is not a satisfactory guide. Such factors as teacher turnover, the nature of the supervisory structure. new demands upon teachers by shifting populations, and the general weaknesses of the established teaching staff must be regarded in any budgeting for supervisory services.[7]

RECOMMENDATION: The director or supervisor of English should have a strong professional background including the study of supervision and administration. His preparation in English and English education should at least equal that of exceptionally well qualified teachers. It should include studies in linguistics, semantics, speech, logic, educational research, audiovisual procedures and techniques, and methods of teaching reading, either as a part of or in addition to the usual liberal arts program of an English major and the general program of the education student. The director also should have had extensive successful experience in teaching English at every level of his supervisory responsibility.

The professional backgrounds of the elementary and secondary directors should be of equal depth but of appropriately varied emphasis.

RECOMMENDATION: In a large school system, the director or supervisor of English must be provided with both professional and secretarial staffs which are adequate in size and quality to make effective supervision possible. He must be provided also with a budget allowance for inservice education materials, consultant services, and travel to regional and national meetings.[8]

RECOMMENDATION: The preparation of the director's professional staff members should be the same as the director's in character and should approximate it in depth and scope. Some members may be specialists in particular areas, such as reading or speech.

---

[7] For comments, see p. 84, sec. 5.
[8] For comments, see p. 85, sec. 6.

II. Professional Status, Duties, and Relationships of the English Supervisor

STATUS

RECOMMENDATION: Supervision should be considered a function of staff rather than of administration. The director or supervisor of English should not, therefore, be placed in the administrative line of command.

Even though his responsibilities are administrative in part, the director or supervisor of English is usually envisioned as a staff officer. His function in relation to the superintendent's line staff is consultation, and in relation to the teaching staff, leadership. As an adviser, he informs the superintendent and administrative staff of advances in the subject field, progress within the system, and new programs needed. His larger responsibility, however, is the quality of the systemwide English curriculum and its instruction. He directs the planning of the English program and its implementation, but when plans involve new budgetary provisions or new school policies he submits them to a line officer, usually an associate or assistant superintendent, for approval.

RECOMMENDATION: Since the official status of the director or supervisor normally reflects the significance of his work, he should be given a status that commands the respect of his professional associates, assured by a salary commensurate with his responsibilities and equal to that of other directors and the principals with whom he works.

The status of the director is important to his success. If he is well qualified, the respect accorded him appears to be tied directly to both the rank of his immediate superior in the administrative hierarchy and his own rank in the salary scale.[1]

DUTIES

RECOMMENDATION: The duties of the director or supervisor of English should extend to all the fields of English: reading, writing, speaking, and listening skills at both elementary and advanced levels; and literature and language study.

RECOMMENDATION: The supervisor should bear the major responsibility for updating the curriculum and adapting it to the needs of students

[1]For discussion, see p. 86, sec. 8.

of various achievement levels. He should direct the preparation and evaluation of curriculum guides and conduct the initial screening of new textbooks and other teaching tools before adoption.

RECOMMENDATION: The supervisor should be responsible for providing inservice education programs for the growth of all teachers. The programs should include opportunities for teachers to exchange ideas, listen to speakers, interact with supervisory and resource persons, participate in curriculum development, attend workshops, and engage in appropriate research and experimentation in English.[2]

RECOMMENDATION: Although the hiring of new teachers is the function of another department, the English supervisor should participate. In some cases he may be present at an interview; in others he may suggest to the personnel department the special qualities and preparation needed for effective English instruction. The supervisor should also participate, either officially or unofficially, in the evaluation of the work of teachers.[3]

RECOMMENDATION: The supervisor should observe the classroom of each first-year and second-year teacher and confer with the teacher to take note of strengths and to resolve problems. The supervisor should also hold meetings of probationary teachers in which they share ideas, discuss their problems, and receive aid.

RECOMMENDATION: The English supervisor should serve as consultant for placement of student teachers with cooperating teachers and should visit the classes being taught by the student teachers.

RECOMMENDATION: The supervisor should take an interest in all worthwhile activities related to English instruction. He should support the work of professional organizations by attending meetings, providing assistance on request, and encouraging teachers to become active members.

RECOMMENDATION: Supervisors of English should participate in the preservice education of English teachers in the following ways:

- inform colleges and state accreditation offices of new developments in curriculum and methods.
- identify areas of weakness which necessitate additional courses, and support the efforts of schools of education to meet the needs indicated.
- cooperate with schools and departments of education and state certification agencies in designing appropriate, adequate, and properly balanced programs of preparation for teachers of English at both the elementary and secondary levels.
- arrange opportunities for college personnel to visit schools in order

[2] For discussion, see p. 86, sec. 9.
[3] For discussion, see p. 86, sec. 10.

to observe English programs in action, and seek opportunities to observe college training programs for teachers.[4]

RECOMMENDATION: State supervisors of English should establish direct and regular contacts with the chairmen of English departments and personnel in charge of English education in the state training institutions.[5]

Supervisors are singularly qualified to serve as consultants on the preservice preparation of English teachers because of their intimate knowledge of the school programs, the pupil needs, and the teachers' strengths and weaknesses. This knowledge incurs a responsibility on supervisors to make their services available to teacher-training institutions and, if necessary, to initiate cooperative relationships with the institutions for improving teacher preparation.

RECOMMENDATIONS: The supervisor of English should be responsible for his own growth in the profession. He should read extensively, attend meetings, participate in workshops, keep up with the results of research, and keep himself generaly informed of progress in the teaching of English and in methods of supervision.[6]

RELATIONSHIPS

RECOMMENDATION: In working with teachers the English supervisor should assume the role of leadership. He should also note and develop leadership qualities in the teachers with whom he works.

RECOMMENDATION: The supervisor of secondary school English, or a member of his staff should work closely and cooperatively with the department heads in the individual secondary schools; the supervisor of elementary school English, with the grade level chairman and/or English specialists.

RECOMMENDATION: The supervisor should work with principals in establishing criteria for evaluating instructional progress and in executing projects or activities related to the English program. When appropriate, principals should be invited to be members on English committees. However, neither the principal nor the supervisor should be in a position to direct the work of the other.[7]

RECOMMENDATION: The director or supervisor should promote good public relations. He should interpret curriculum changes and progress in all aspects of the teaching of English for the school administration and the public; and he should serve as a liaison agent for the public schools with colleges and other cultural agencies wishing to contribute to the educational program in English.

[4] For comment, see p. 87, sec. 11.
[5] For comment, see p. 88, sec. 12.
[6] For comment, see p. 88, sec. 13.
[7] For comment, see p. 88, sec. 14.

III. Inservice Education of English Teachers

PREPARATION NEEDED BY TEACHERS OF ENGLISH: THE FRAME OF REFERENCE FOR PLANNING INSERVICE EDUCATION

RECOMMENDATION: The academic preparation of every teacher of English should include a broad liberal arts background.

RECOMMENDATION: The preparation of secondary school English teachers should include the following studies:

English
- basic and advanced composition, with emphasis on rhetoric
- history and structure of the English language and current usage patterns
- English, American, and world literature
- history of English and American literature
- selected genre courses, fiction and nonfiction
- Shakespeare
- literary criticism
- literature for adolescents

Speech and dramatic arts
- speech and voice culture
- oral reading

Education
- educational psychology
- adolescent psychology
- history and philosophy of education
- testing and evaluation
- teaching exceptional children (superior, below average, culturally disadvantaged)
- methods of teaching English
- methods of teaching speech

RECOMMENDATION: The preparation of an elementary school teacher should include the following studies:
- written and oral composition
- American and English literature
- literature for children

- history, structure, and usage of the English language
- speech and voice culture
- oral reading
- educational psychology
- child psychology
- methods of teaching reading and writing

Some of the academic and professional areas listed may be adequately covered as parts of courses. However, the overall program of teacher preparation should ensure a reasonable degree of competence in each area.[1]

Preparation for teaching literature. — It is generally conceded that courses based upon historical development are not the most appropriate approach to the study of literature in elementary and secondary schools. Inexperienced teachers tend to teach in the manner by which they were taught; therefore, there is some concern about the predominance of survey courses. Grommon reports that seven of the ten most frequently required courses are survey courses — English, American, and world literature and various period courses.[2] It is important that the preparation of an English teacher emphasize less the historical development of literature and emphasize more the depth study of selected works.[3]

Preparation for teaching writing. — The teaching of writing is at once the most difficult pedagogical task in English instruction and the task for which most teacher candidates seem to be least well prepared. There is no guarantee that candidates who have completed required freshman English courses have had extensive writing practice because this course varies from one campus to another. The basic composition course (freshman) should emphasize writing rather than mere sentence analysis or elimination of minor mechanical errors. An additional course in expository writing is needed by teacher candidates for greater competence in the kind of writing emphasized in secondary schools.[4]

The importance of speech training.—Through courses in voice culture, teachers may increase appreciably their classroom effectiveness. Unpleasant voices may be improved, mannerisms may be eliminated, vocal strength and flexibility may be developed, and aural sensitiveness may be increased. The teacher's personality is enriched and his acceptability to his pupils enhanced. Furthermore, as the trainee works for his own improvement, he learns how to help his pupils improve their voices.

Slightly less important to a teacher are the related studies of acting and nonlinguistic communication (kinesics), such as facial expressions, shrugs, postures, gestures. Both vocal and nonvocal communication tech-

---

[1] For comments, see p. 89, sec. 15.

[2] Alfred H. Grommon, *The Education of Teachers of English* (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1963), p. 273.

[3] For comments, see p. 89, sec. 16.

[4] For comment on the study of logic, see p. 89, sec. 17.

niques are considered essential for the stage, the screen, the pulpit, the lecture platform, and the forum — all aiming to engage the minds and emotions of the audience. The teaching station shares this aim; yet seldom is training in speech and oral reading a requirement for an English teacher, and rarely, if ever, is training in acting and kinesics required.

RECOMMENDATION: The preparation for both elementary and secondary teachers should include at least six semester-hours of methods courses and carefully supervised practice teaching. The courses for elementary and secondary teachers should be taught by elementary and secondary English supervisors, or master teachers, employed by the colleges or universities for this service.

Methods courses should include instruction not only on how to teach reading, writing, speaking, and listening, but also instruction as to how to teach oral reading, present dramatic selections, develop logical and critical thinking, and develop appreciation of literature, especially poetry.

The practice teaching schedules should be arranged to provide experience in a variety of teaching environments and levels; to ensure the most profitable practice for the students, the cooperating (or critic) teachers should be selected with the guidance of the appropriate supervisors.[5]

PRACTICES FOR STRENGTHENING THE COMPETENCIES OF TEACHERS

RECOMMENDATION: The supervisor or director should encourage teachers to promote their own growth by taking additional college courses and by engaging in individual reading and study, special interest activities, and the work of professional organizations.

Many secondary English teachers do not have English majors, and a large number of elementary teachers have elected few English courses in college. These teachers urgently need additional background in English, usually in modern literature, advanced writing, structure of the English language, literary criticism, and literature for children and youth. The supervisor should give special attention to having needed courses available.

RECOMMENDATION: The supervisor or director should provide stimulating inservice education programs designed to serve both the special and the general needs of the teaching staff. The programs should make use of such devices as the systemwide conference with special consultants, lectures, panels, and group discussions; the small area or school staff meeting for inspirational, informational, or problem-solving purposes;

[5] For comments, see p. 89, sec. 18.

the workshop; the curriculum project; textbook selection; visits to other classrooms; experimentation; the systemwide group study; demonstration work — live, televised, or filmed; and the supervisory bulletin. It should make special provision to keep teachers informed of research in English instruction.[6]

Exchange visits. — Exchange visits within a school provide growth experiences for both the observers and the observed; they are especially helpful to inexperienced teachers. Visits to classes in other subject areas and to schools at diverse levels give teachers an understanding of their relationship to the total program and strengthen the articulation of grade levels. Visits to other systems provide a fresh approach, broaden understandings, and acquaint teachers with new materials and techniques of instruction.

Experimentation. — Team teaching, programed instruction, and the use of lay theme readers, though not uniformly successful, are experimental practices that are worthy of trial when conditions permit. The teaming of new teachers with experienced teachers and the teaming of less able with superior teachers have been found in some cases to result in the strengthening of all. The employment of lay readers has been highly motivating to both teachers and pupils in many experiments. Teaching special classes for very able students and for slow learners has broadened the knowledge and extended and refined the techniques of the teachers involved.

RECOMMENDATION: The supervisor or director should recognize teachers as individuals, praising them when their work is good, helping them when it is poor. Teachers' performances and achievements must be frequently appraised. For this purpose a supervisory aide must visit classrooms frequently and confer with teachers afterward.[7]

RECOMMENDATION: The supervisor should begin the orientation program for new teachers before school opens and continue scheduled meetings as long as instruction is needed. School time should be allotted through the year for these meetings.

RECOMMENDATION: The major responsibility for inservice education involving individuals or small groups of teachers should be borne by the English department chairmen in the secondary schools and by teachers who are English specialists in the elementary schools.

The need of secondary English teachers for immediate consultation about problems, plans, materials, techniques, evaluation, and new ideas can rarely be met either by the principal or by the systemwide supervisor.

[6] For comments and discussion, see p. 90, sec. 19.
[7] For comments, see p. 93, sec. 20.

Department chairmen with time to supervise have been highly successful with this service and indeed with general inservice education programs within their departments. Their effectiveness is increased when English teachers are scheduled with a common free period in which departmental meetings may be held.[8]

RECOMMENDATION: The supervisor should actively support any effort of the administration to provide teachers with extended leave for professional study.

APPROPRIATE TIME FOR INSERVICE EDUCATION

RECOMMENDATION: Adequate and appropriate time should be provided for inservice education of English teachers. Appropriate time is (1) prearranged time during the regular school hours, and (2) holidays and extended periods of time during the summer vacation, for which teachers receive additional salary.

Because of afternoon fatigue, professional obligations in the evening and personal obligations on weekends, inservice education programs should not be scheduled at any of these times unless light workloads or compensatory time can be arranged for the teachers.[9]

---

[8] For comments, see p. 93, sec. 21.
[9] For discussion, see p. 94, sec. 22.

IV. Procedures for Improving Curriculum and Producing Curriculum Guides

RECOMMENDATION: The first step toward formal development of improved curriculum and curriculum guides should be the establishment of a favorable climate — a positive attitude on the part of the staff toward study and change, clearly identified values and purposes, acceptable ground rules, school board and community support, and the assurance of necessary funds.

RECOMMENDATION: As the work advances, every member of the teaching staff should be involved in one or more phases, such as the study of current literature on curriculum, group discussions of problems, pilot studies, policy making, and production of the resulting curriculum guides.

RECOMMENDATION: When the work has progressed to the writing stage, production committees, composed largely of teachers but including principals and selected community leaders, should be appointed. The committees should work under the general direction of the supervisor or director.

RECOMMENDATION: Time for writing should be provided either by releasing the teachers concerned from their regular school duties or by employing them to work in the summer with additional pay.

RECOMMENDATION: The new curriculum, in tentative written form, should be explained and discussed with teachers, administrators, and others concerned so that all understand it. It should also be tested in pilot classes and subsequently revised.

RECOMMENDATION: The criteria for evaluating the completed curriculum guides should include the following standards: (a) the guides present a program that encourages continuous growth and creativity; (b) the guides are brief and suggestive rather than voluminous and directive; (c) the guides are organized for ease and comfort in handling.

RECOMMENDATION: Curriculum evaluation should be continuous.[1]

[1]For comments on curriculum evaluation and change, see p. 97, sec. 23.

A RECOMMENDED PROCEDURE FOR A MAJOR ENGLISH CURRICULUM REVISION[2]

Step 1: Acquaint administrators, the board of education, and other agencies responsible for providing funds, with the need for continuing study and for production workshops to develop the English curriculum content and design, the course of study bulletins, and illustrative teaching units. Request authorization and funds for making the changes needed.[3]

Step 2: Organize for the development of a curriculum that is sequential, cumulative, and integrated, and that makes provision for students with different levels of academic ability.[4]

Step 3: Involve qualified laymen and the professional staff in a joint appraisal of the present program, the existing course of study bulletins, current classroom practices, and present and future needs in the light of new knowledge in English, trends in the field, and community needs.

The superintendent and his staff, with the approval of the board of education, might select a study group composed of representatives from PTA groups, from the education committees of community service organizations, from graduates of the school system with and without further education, from local college professors of English, education, anthropology, sociology, and psychology, from professional, business, and industrial leaders, and from teachers and principals. A lay person might act as chairman, and the English supervisor as consultant of the study group.

The value of such a joint group lies principally in the good school-public relations which result from it. The study acquaints the public with

---

[2]The procedure described here has been used effectively in the Montgomery County (Maryland) school system. The description of *Steps* in this procedure is an adaptation of a report by Katherine B. Greaney, Supervisor of English, Montgomery County Public Schools.

[3]In a major revision, funds are needed for the following, all of which have bearing upon the quality of the curriculum and its acceptance by school personnel: substitutes to make possible released time for teachers to work on committees; substitutes for teachers who visit other school systems; teacher salaries for four, six, or eight weeks of summer employment; inservice (staff development) summer workshops, before and after production of curriculum bulletins; scholarships for teachers to study at universities in such subject areas as the philosophies of grammar, literature, advanced expository writing, and literary criticism; participation of teachers and supervisors in national workshops (e.g., the NCTE linguistics workshops and NCTE preconvention workshops); attendance of teachers and supervisors at national and regional conferences (e.g., MLA, NCTE, IRA, and ASCD annual conventions and the ASCD Research Institute); employment of consultants in various aspects of the English field (e.g., linguistics, literature, composition, reading) and consultants on the nature of the learner and the learning process; purchase of courses of study from other school systems, and purchase of magazines, journals, and other published materials; facilities for evening study group meetings (place, heat, light, janitor service); facilities for holding summer workshops; and supplies and services needed in production (paper, pencils, ink, mats, typists, secretarial and library help, printing, folders, bindings, etc.).

For comments, see p. 97, sec. 23.

[4]For comment, see p. 98, sec. 24.

the strengths and weaknesses of the present and proposed programs, and evokes community support for needed changes. It also makes available to the schools some of the community's best human resources.

Step 4: Involve the administrative staff, the instructional staff, the special services staff (principals, assistant principals in charge of instruction, school-based supervisors, general supervisors, teachers, counselors), and students at appropriate stages in effecting curriculum change.

Curriculum change is essentially a change in the behavior of teachers and learners in the classroom. All activities related to the curriculum project contribute to change. The following is a suggestive list of activities in which the groups specified may serve.

- serving on a Superintendent's Advisory Committee on English
- reacting to recommendations of the community study group
- directing or participating in (other curriculum-oriented) inservice study or production workshops
- trying out and evaluating units and courses of study developed by others (students are involved in this activity)
- engaging in pilot programs
- developing own illustrative teaching units
- selecting suitable materials of instruction — texts, records, tapes, films, etc. (student reactions may be helpful here)
- planning and developing the curriculum design, or reacting to the planning of others
- planning a scope-sequence chart of skills to be taught, attitudes and concepts to be developed, and principles or generalizations to be derived
- assisting in the writing and/or editing of bulletins
- trying out and evaluating the course of study
- revising the course after evaluation
- developing tests

Step 5: Initiate inservice study, involving all personnel concerned with the instructional program, on the nature of the community being served by the English curriculum. Acquaint teachers in particular with the cultural, ethnic, religious, social, and economic settings, with the values and value conflicts in the community, with parental aspirations for children and parent-child relationships, with population mobility, with community vocational opportunities, adult and advanced education opportunities, cultural needs, and with the community expectations of the school system.

This study adds an important dimension to the teacher's view of the curriculum. He comes to understand the preschool and extracurricular experiences of students, to know the groups with which the school shares responsibility, and to appreciate the pressures under which the learner

operates. With this knowledge he is better able to provide a school environment that will bring students' values into conformity with standard democratic values.

Step 6: Outline the significance of English in the overall philosophy of education and formulate a perspective for the English program at all grade levels involved. Define the general goals of English study in relation to the goals of general education, and define the disciplines of the field of English in order to limit the responsibilities of the subject.

The purpose of this step is to stabilize the place of English in the total school curriculum and to keep within reasonable bounds the responsibilities which English teachers can be expected to meet.

Step 7: Define the specific goals for the pupil's study of English, in terms of behavioral outcomes, in accordance with the philosophy and point of view determined in step six.

Step 8: Initiate an inservice study of research on the nature of the learner and the learning process, stressing concepts on which there is general agreement among theorists. Study the implications of the learning process for English curriculum design and for classroom practices.

Step 9: Develop a curriculum design, identifying the content scope of English, the sequence and balance, the skills to be developed, the interrelationships of the component parts, and the interrelationships of English with other disciplines.

Step 10: Conduct workshops to produce course of study materials and illustrative units and to select or develop appropriate instructional materials.

Step 11: Establish pilot programs in selected schools to test new materials and procedures. Select competent teachers who are willing to experiment.

Step 12: Develop evaluative procedures — diagnostic and achievement tests appropriate to the student population and the materials used. The evaluative procedures should be an integral part of the curriculum.

Step 13: To facilitate implementation of the new program, hold inservice workshops or conferences to orient all teachers and principals to the newly developed programs and materials.

Step 14: Prepare curriculum guides in looseleaf form to facilitate frequent revision.

Step 15: Conduct curriculum studies continually to find ways to improve all aspects of the curriculum.[5]

[5] For comment, see p. 99, sec. 25.

V. Procedures and Criteria for Selecting Teaching Materials[1]

RECOMMENDATION: The English supervisor should cooperate with the administrative staff to ensure that the procedures for adoption of textbooks and other teaching materials are known to all and are followed.

RECOMMENDATION: A committee composed principally of classroom teachers from various grade levels should be appointed on a revolving basis to evaluate new materials. This group should be directed by the English supervisor and include representatives of other interested groups whenever possible. Recommendations for committee membership should be made by supervisors and principals on the basis of knowledge of English and education and understanding of educational policies.

RECOMMENDATION: The evaluation committee should have written criteria and policies to guide its work. The criteria and policies should take into account the specifications of the state and local educational codes, the instructional objectives, the backgrounds and maturity levels of students, and accepted educational practices. The written criteria and policies should be made available to the public.

RECOMMENDATION: As reference for use in the selection of materials, indexes of available teaching materials and other pertinent publications should be provided for the committee. The file might include:

- *Elementary English, English Journal, The Reading Teacher,* and other professional journals in the field of English
- *Textbooks in Print* (New York: R. R. Bowker Co.)
- *A Basic Collection for Junior High Schools* (Chicago: American Library Association)
- Curriculum Coordinating Council. *Guide for Selection of Textbooks* (Tucson, Ariz.: Tucson Public Schools)
- *Guidelines for Textbook Selection,* Report of the Joint Committee of the National Educational Association and the American Textbook Publishers Institute (Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1963)
- Doll, Ronald C. (ed.) *Individualizing Instruction* (Washington,

[1] "Materials" are herein considered to include books, periodicals, films, filmstrips, transparencies and slides, records and tapes, charts and maps, flat pictures, models, programed materials, and NET or other TV series.

D. C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1964)

- Hook, J. N., *The Teaching of High School English* (New York: Ronald Press, 1959)
- Melnik, Amelia. "Some Topics to Consider in Appraising Reading Textbooks." *Arizona Newsletter*, VI, 2 (February 1964)
- National Council of Teachers of English. *The Students' Right to Read* (Champaign, Ill.: The National Council of Teachers of English, 1962)
- Wofford, Azile. *Book Selection for School Libraries* (New York: H. W. Wilson Co., 1962)
- courses of study
- publishers' catalogs
- bibliographies from professional books in the field of English
- reports of studies in which various teaching materials have been used experimentally
- comments of local teachers on their use of specific materials.

RECOMMENDATION: To ensure that teachers and administrators are familiar with teaching materials already available, the committee should encourage the frequent review and reevaluation of materials in current use. Teachers should be encouraged to submit their comments on forms designed for that purpose.

RECOMMENDATION: Materials should always contribute to the learning situation, never determine or control it. The committee should select new materials in terms of the purposes to be served. If the committee is unaware of purposes, unsuitable materials, which may interfere with learning, may be selected.[2]

RECOMMENDATION: Before examining teaching materials, the evaluation committee should review the goals and specific learning sequences for the level under consideration.

RECOMMENDATION: Materials should be selected in sufficient variety to meet a wide range of abilities, interests, and instructional needs of pupils, and to effect the desired sequential development of skills and concepts.

The ultimate test of the usefulness of any material is its worth to the individual. Since there is within every group of pupils a wide range of reading abilities and a multiplicity of interests and needs, a great variety of materials must be selected for each grade level. Evaluative checklists or rating scales should be constructed to facilitate the reviewing of materials.

RECOMMENDATION: Teachers should be encouraged to experiment with materials before their adoption. A sufficient quantity of all materials to be used experimentally should be provided; this might be a few

[2] For comments on teaching materials, see p. 99, sec. 26.

copies for a small group of able students, or class sets for several classes matched in some comparative study. Ample opportunity should be given for teachers using materials experimentally to share their opinions within the school or throughout the district. Teachers should not be held responsible for materials lost during experimentation.

A SUGGESTED PROCEDURE FOR EVALUATING NEW MATERIALS

The members of the committee should receive new material through a central source, study it briefly, then route it to interested persons, either suggesting ways in which it might be used or asking the recipient for his comments on its use. Teachers wishing to use materials experimentally might request the committee to inform the proper persons, who would then supply the materials. Requests from teachers to observe those using materials experimentally might also be scheduled through this committee. Evaluations of materials would be received and correlated by the committee, and the results distributed through announcement sheets, department bulletins, or systemwide newsletters. The committee might also arrange for conferences or workshops to inform teachers and administrators of new or additional materials. The committee should have easy access to the librarian and other personnel familiar with sources of new materials.

RECOMMENDATION: Final adoption of textbooks should be based on the recommendations of the committee that is charged with selecting the books. If the official endorsement differs from the committee's recommendations, the reasons should be made public.

RECOMMENDATION: The committee should indicate to publishers when new types of textbooks are needed and offer constructive criticism of the texts already available.

RECOMMENDATION: When materials needed are not available for purchase, the supervisor should assume the leadership in constructing them or adapting other materials to meet the need.

VI. Establishment of a Favorable Teaching Environment

For English supervision to make the significant contribution of which it is capable, teaching conditions must be favorable. The teaching environment must provide (1) professional help for the teacher when he needs it, (2) a teaching program which permits him to participate in inservice education activities, and (3) modern instructional spaces, materials, and equipment. The teacher with a moderate teaching assignment may attend the supervisor's Saturday morning course in contemporary poetry; but the teacher whose responsibilities are so heavy that he must devote his weekends to his own classes cannot attend. The program is actually not available to him. The supervisor may offer a pre-schoolyear workshop in the use of audiovisual materials; but the teacher whose school has no audiovisual equipment can make no immediate use of his learning. For best results English supervision must be timely and appropriate, the assignments to the teachers must be moderate, and the teaching facilities must be adequate.

SERVICE TO TEACHERS

RECOMMENDATION: Services such as the following should be provided to assist the English teacher:

- an orientation program as he begins his duties
- extra attention during his probationary years
- consultations and help based on observations of the supervisor
- assistance in choosing instructional materials
- assistance in improving daily and long range teaching plans
- help in setting standards for evaluating students' work
- guidance in improving the quality of his teacher-made tests
- guidance in interpreting standard tests and utilizing the information from them
- assistance in evaluating pupil growth
- help in exercising creativity in teaching
- opportunities to try new approaches or procedures
- recognition of his efforts
- counseling on professional problems
- meaningful professional meetings
- opportunities to exchange ideas on curriculum development
- protection from undesirable community pressures

- protection against an unequal weight of teaching and extracurricular responsibilities.

TEACHER ASSIGNMENTS

RECOMMENDATION: A teacher's duties should be assigned with appropriate regard to his special talents, general abilities, and preparation, and with regard to the best interests of both the students and the teacher.[1]

RECOMMENDATION: The maximum number of classes for a secondary English teacher should be four.

RECOMMENDATION: A secondary English teacher should have two preparations a day — no more and no less. A "preparation" is defined as one grade level, one track (or ability level), and one set of textbooks. Any variance in track or text materials must be considered another preparation.

RECOMMENDATION: Teaching assignments in secondary English should be rotated.

RECOMMENDATION: Class size should be scaled according to the ability of the students and, in secondary schools, according to the subject area. Low ability groups should be limited to fifteen. Average or above average classes in elementary schools should be limited to thirty, and in secondary schools to twenty-five. Secondary English classes stressing composition should be smaller than classes stressing literature.

RECOMMENDATION: Nonteaching assignments to English teachers should not exceed a homeroom and/or one extracurricular responsibility.[2]

RECOMMENDATION: Noninstructional personnel should be employed to assume the nonteaching duties of teachers.

TEACHING FACILITIES

The relationships of productivity and physical conditions have been measured and tested in various fields of work, and specialists in improving industrial production have long included in their recommendations the improvement of physical conditions. The physical conditions of a teaching station also affect production; they have been and will continue to be a factor contributing to the success of both students and teachers.

RECOMMENDATION: English specialists designated by state departments of education or local school districts should meet with architects to make specific recommendations on English teaching stations and related facilities.

RECOMMENDATION: English department spaces should be consolidated in one area of the building near the central library or area library,

[1] For comments, see p. 101, sec. 27.
[2] For comments, see p. 102, sec. 28.

audiovisual center, workrooms, conference rooms, and clerical assistance. They should be away from traffic and other street noises if possible.

RECOMMENDATION: The building plan should allow twenty-five or more square feet of floor space for each student in an English classroom. It should also provide space for a conference room (preferably glass-paneled) adjoining each classroom, and spaces within or adjoining each room for filing cases, for storage of books, magazines, maps, charts, and other teaching materials not in immediate use, and for a teacher's coat closet.

RECOMMENDATION: Every English classroom should be equipped with:

- adequate lighting, with control of glare from outside, and darkening facilities for optimum use of audiovisual aids
- air conditioning and heating, with thermostat control in the classroom
- acoustical treatment
- well spaced electrical outlets for audiovisual equipment
- an intercommunication unit
- built-in open bookshelves for classroom library and supplementary textbooks
- slate chalkboard of good quality
- walls and woodwork finished in light colors.

RECOMMENDATION: Every English classroom should be furnished with the following:

- wall-to-wall carpet
- movable furniture for students: tables, preferably with formica or some other type of surface not easily marred; chairs, preferably with book space beside or below the seat.
- teacher's desk with drawer files, and desk chair
- filing cases for student-prepared materials, especially for folders containing examples of written work and information about selections read; and vertical files for illustrative materials used in various instructional units
- bulletin boards and slanted display racks or tables for magazines and paperbacks
- dictionary stand with an unabridged dictionary
- attractive pictures and art work relating to literary themes, characters, or incidents
- a television unit for both closed and open circuit viewing.

Other equipment should be available when needed: projectors, screens, tape recorders, record players, radios, maps, charts, other audiovisual aids, and easily portable platforms for classroom plays and speeches.

RECOMMENDATION: Additional spaces for English instruction and study should also be provided:

- a publication center for the production of the newspaper, yearbook, and literary magazine
- a speech room
- a little theatre
- speaking and listening laboratories with aural-oral equipment
- special rooms for remedial instruction for small groups
- writing booths or rooms
- a relatively secluded area where students can do independent reading
- at least one large room for a large group instruction in team teaching programs
- small rooms, formed by movable panels or partitions, for use in small group instruction
- area libraries at various places within a school building for reference books and other library materials for particular units under study
- a major library stocked and serviced as recommended by the American Library Association
- an audiovisual library of films, tapes, filmstrips, slides, disc recordings, radios, television sets, record players, opaque projectors, overhead projectors, and film and slide projectors.

RECOMMENDATION: In every secondary school an English department office should be maintained. It should provide a workroom for teachers, with an up-to-date professional library, a file of sample copies of all textbooks and other materials adopted for use in the school, a collection of new materials to be considered for adoption, facilities for viewing audiovisual materials, and a television set for both closed circuit and open circuit viewing.

THE PROBLEMS OF ENGLISH SUPERVISION AT THE SUPERINTENDENT'S LEVEL

The Administrator's Problems in Establishing an Adequate Program of English Supervision, I

J. E. Miller

Being an administrator and not a supervisor of the English language arts, and desiring to bring at least one contribution to our discussions, I thought it might be appropriate to ask some high school seniors to recall their twelve years of experience and advise me on how to improve instruction in English. Their answers are worthy of thought.

First of all, they said, "If you want to improve English in the public schools you should decide where grammar should be taught and eliminate the year after year repetition. The elementary schools teach it and when we get into the junior and senior high schools they teach it again. Let's omit grammar somewhere so we won't wear it out."

Second, they said, "If you want to improve English instruction eliminate all beginning teachers. They teach us as they were taught in college, and that type of instruction is not appropriate."

Third, they said, "Allow time in the day for us to read and to browse in the library, which is the center and the heart of our school. You have so structured our curriculum and so filled up our day that we have little time left to use the library."

Fourth, they said, "Bear down on speaking and writing!" But they had an admonition on the writing: "We do not desire to be conformists. We have our own ideas about good writing." These four thoughts came from high school seniors in a rather distinguished high school.

As we talk of the administrator's problems in establishing an adequate program in English supervision, we must first define the supervisor's (or consultant's) role. You have said that you want him to do many, many things. Recall the jobs assigned the supervisor:

- Developing curriculum bulletins and guides at the state level and courses of study at the local level, evaluating and recommending methods of working with children and youth, evaluating and recommending books and other instructional media, recommending patterns of organization and scheduling conducive to good classroom instruction.
- Influencing patterns of teacher education, preservice and inservice, for school and college personnel.
- Participating in research which is well conceived and well organ-

ized, disseminating the findings of good research, vending good classroom practices.

- Encouraging experimental programs which have been carefully constructed.
- Keeping informed about national trends and movements, affiliating with good organizations of a professional character.
- Reporting to the staff on developments in English and making recommendations for improvement in English.
- Writing, and publicizing what is occurring in the field of English throughout the state.
- Meeting with groups of teachers and administrators; advising school planners, architects, librarians, and counselors.
- Relating elementary education with the junior high, the junior high with the senior high, and the senior high with the college.

For these jobs we need a person who is able to speak well, to write well, and to work with others; a person who has knowledge of the total school program, the place of English in it and through it; a person who is knowledgeable in the developmental levels of learning and the growth of children.

Now what are the administrator's problems in establishing an adequate program in English supervision? Maybe the following are alibis rather than problems, but the first has now become obvious. There are few people qualified to perform all the duties which you have assigned to this position. And to the best of my knowledge there isn't a college or university in the entire country which offers, or even pretends to offer, any instruction on how to provide supervision, either administrative or consultative, at the state level. You cannot find in any college catalogue in the country any course designed specifically to train people to work at the state level. I am not recommending or advocating such, but I simply say that, as an alibi for not getting a state program of supervision on the way, one might cite the fact that few people are qualified to perform all of these jobs.

The second problem or alibi is related to the first. The area of English is not well defined. Perhaps this is good. It is in a state of transition and expansion. As I have listened to you I have heard you speak in one sentence about "English and language arts"; in the next about "reading, English, and language arts"; again about "the English language arts." I have heard you refer to studying "American English and contemporary literature." (I wonder if that is not a little restrictive.) You have also spoken about "linguistics."

We who administer a staff at the state or local level would be hesitant to employ a person to perform all the duties encompassed in this assignment, not being quite sure of the area to be supervised. I would remind you that as you broaden the area of English to be supervised, you are likewise lengthening the period of training and making recruitment increasingly difficult. I would remind you also that as you broaden your supervisory

responsibilities, you are forcing state superintendents to arbitrate the alternatives, because someone at the administrative level must ultimately say yes or no.

A third problem, or alibi, is structuring the service within the organizational framework of the staff. Having wrestled with the problems of the broad program and the dearth of people qualified in all these areas, the administrator then must determine the place of the person within the staff. He must determine where and how such a person fits in. To whom will he be responsible? What will be his relationship with the supervisors of reading already established in many departments at the state and local levels, and with supervisors of writing, materials, libraries, television, and what not, who also are already established? All of these people must move over just a little bit to make way for the new supervisor of English.

And there is a fourth problem — achieving and maintaining balance in staff services and public acceptance. We in state departments always like to believe that we can show the teachers and the public in general that we do not overemphasize certain areas of the curriculum and that we do not believe one area is more important than another. In our state we try to maintain balance, and for this purpose we make sure when we set up a state committee that every curriculum area is represented. But we do have, infrequently, some assistance from federal funds, and this assistance tends to encourage imbalance. Maybe some financial assistance in the area of the English language arts would be helpful, giving us the push or incentive to start building this subject up to the level of others. I long for the time when all our federal funds will come in one envelope to the State Board of Education, and the State Board of Education will be given the opportunity to develop the program which it believes to be in balance and in the interest of *all* the children of the state!

There is a fifth problem, and that is the problem of organizing all of the supervisory services that are available to teachers and principals, in order that teachers and principals may be protected from too many specialists. You know the teacher's prayer, "Oh, God, save me from my friends!" There are so many people today going out from the state level and from the district level offering services to teachers and principals and local schools that we in our department are trying to emphasize the team approach. We don't want an individual appearing in the schools to emphasize health and physical education tomorrow, a consultant in foreign languages the next day, and the day after that we wonder who. From our office we are trying to get our local schools to insist upon the team approach.

Finally, the greatest problem, or alibi, I suppose, is sensing the need for English supervision and going ahead and providing it. That is really about the only problem. The matter simply hasn't been sufficiently called to our attention. We have recently employed a state consultant for English.

We had the money a long time ago. We needed a little push, and that I suspect is true of most state departments and local boards of education.

EXPERIMENTS SPONSORED BY THE NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

At the invitation of the chairman, may I speak a moment now about what is going on in North Carolina? Some very exciting things are happening. Since Christmas, some 60,000 students in 60 high schools have seen a Shakespearean play by professional actors from New York, with the entire cost paid by the State Board of Education. This is the second year we have offered this series. Beginning on Monday, March 9, students in sixty more high schools will see *The World of Carl Sandburg*, performed by professional actors paid by the State Board of Education. We think we might mix a little contemporary drama with Shakespeare, and since Sandburg lives in our state, our students are delighted with this opportunity.

We have also launched a statewide project involving 400 elementary schools in which we are emphasizing improved instruction in reading. In this project we are using the team teaching approach in a multigraded organization with a variety of instructional materials.

A third project is the exciting and dramatic Governor's School, an eight week residential summer school for 400 gifted high school juniors and seniors, without any expense whatever to the youngsters. They are being brought to a college campus, not heretofore used in the summer, and given a program entirely different from that experienced during the regular school year. There are no grades and no traditional courses. With the 400 students we place 30 "old philosophers" — really good, solid teachers. We say to the students, "Start studying, and whenever you want to talk with anybody, go talk with one of the old sages on the campus." We think this is one of the most dramatic experiments in the country, and we hear with pride that two other states will be starting governor's schools this summer.

A fourth project is an Advancement School. Beginning in September, this will be an "educational hospital," a residential institution where we shall have a staff of doctors, educators, psychologists, teachers, and clinicians. If a child of normal intelligence develops a little difficulty in reading, for example, we'll send him to the "hospital," where he will be diagnosed, treated, and returned home. This is new; we don't know whether it will work, but we are going to try it. After all, if a person gets physically ill he goes to the hospital and has his disability corrected. If one gets educationally ill, why not go to an educational hospital for treatment and correction? We are enthusiastic about this adventure.

And we are starting the Learning Institute of North Carolina, where we shall bring together the best people in the country to help us discover

the nature of learning. There will be some experimentation, demonstration, and some testing of materials, but primarily this is a center for basic research in elementary, secondary, higher, and adult education. We shall be concerned with learning how to help people learn.

The Administrator's Problems in Establishing an Adequate Program of English Supervision, II

Robert S. Fleming

There are many problems to consider in establishing a program of supervision in English. The administrator must deal with these problems within the context of the total educational program, keeping in mind the concept of balance in the curriculum.

The first problem, or responsibility, is that administrators must work with leadership in a manner which keeps the program focused on children and youth. In New Jersey we have just finished a series of important studies dealing with children and youth. I would like to call your attention to two or three of them.

We have completed a major study on dropouts and we find that there are far, far too many. As we studied thousands of these young people, interviewing many of them, we found out that the reasons they gave for dropping out of school often differed from those the principals had reported. The reasons most frequently given by the dropouts themselves had to do with the dullness and drabness of the work of the schools.

We have also completed a study dealing with forty-one suicides of high school youths over a period of two years. The psychiatrists tell us that for every actual suicide there is quite a large number of young people who have attempted it and an even larger number who have contemplated it. The forty-one successful suicides, then, indicate many times that number who have been concerned about it. We made an intensive case study of each of these young people, revealing four very significant factors. First, we found that they had high IQ's — they were very bright youngsters. Second, we found that they were nonparticipants in school affairs. They were not in dramatics, they were not on the school paper staff, they were not in athletics, they were not in the band, and they were not in the glee club; they were lonely. Third, we found no evidence of any positive identification with an adult. They had no friend that they could go to and pour out their concerns, problems and anxieties. And fourth, we found that there were documents in which these young people had told teachers what they were going to do. Unfortunately, some of our English teachers had been so busy looking for split infinitives and dangling participles that they had neglected the content of what these young people were writing.

We *do* have a great deal of time in the English language arts curriculum, and we dare not become so concerned with the rigidity of the content to be covered that we fail to focus on the young people with whom we are working. The administrator is concerned about this because teachers or supervisors can either intensify the difficulties or help to alleviate them. The pressures on children and youth — the pressure for standards, the pressure for quality, the pressure for advanced placement, the pressure for higher marks, the pressure for getting into the right colleges — these are the concerns of many administrators. Administrators must make sure that the program in English language arts is not performed in a vacuum but is focused to meet the needs of the boys and girls in our schools.

Problem number two could be stated something like this: administrators must help supervisors to keep in mind the multiple competencies involved in the job. Modern conceptions of supervision have emerged slowly out of many demonstrations, out of many kinds of research, out of many kinds of experience. Knowledge of English content is but one component of competency. Others involve skill in working with groups, selection and use of audiovisual materials, furthering child and youth development, and evaluation broadly conceived. Systemwide evaluation — a technique we started in the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools some years ago — has great potential for new conceptions of evaluation.

Competencies are needed also in action research, which helps people learn more about the particular community and the particular young people in a particular class. What are they like? What are their interests? their values? their work habits? their concerns? What are their backgrounds? And competencies are needed in the area of new developments in communication and in educational psychology. Though we have much to discover about learning, we do have great understanding of it, particularly of the participation of young people in the learning episode. Supervision and the preparation programs for supervisors or directors of English must not be conceived in a manner that ignores these multiple fields.

A third problem of administrators is to facilitate the work of the total staff. With the employment of specialists in various fields as supervisors, problems of coordination and consistency emerge. In our state, for example, an increasing number of reading supervisors tend to work in isolation from the supervisors of other areas. The administrator must provide opportunities for English supervisors to learn more about vocational areas, more about science, more about the arts, and reciprocally for supervisors in other areas to learn more about English; he must keep his entire staff working with an overall consistency of purpose.

A fourth problem and responsibility of administrators is to make it possible for supervisors to work in many ways. The English language arts

supervisor must not be thought of merely as the "answer man." Tasks of supervision cannot be limited to classroom visits, to developing courses of study, or to protecting the domain of English language arts in the curriculum. The task of supervision involves such other tasks as the clarification of purpose, the design of many kinds of studies, the analysis of learning problems and blocks to learning of given individuals, and the development of broad evaluation techniques. These tasks require both time and facilities.

The fifth problem has to do with the preparation program for the English supervisor. Administrators have difficulty in locating supervisors who have major strength in the content field, skill in creative teaching, and great sensitivity to youth. I would not for a minute want to minimize the importance of scholarship in English. Neither would I want to minimize the importance of the many other fields that contribute to the preparation of these supervisors. The choice must not be one or the other; it must be both. I have heard it suggested that we could take much of the work in education and condense it into a few courses. That may be true. I think that as professors of education we might work more effectively; but I also think that a professor of Chaucer might well do the same. It is time for both of us — the professor of education and the professor of English — to examine our own competencies and ways of working and to focus on those appropriate to the job rather than on the fulfillment of a given set of academic courses. Perhaps one of the greatest hazards to the quality of education is our credit-hour system. I would certainly like to see other approaches used to summarize a student's work. I would like to see a situation created in which we could look more realistically at marks of progress. One person might need fifteen hours of work in English to develop a given competency and someone else might need thirty. I am not sure that we can say that eighteen or twenty-four or thirty semester hours of work is the criterion of effectiveness. The emphasis should be on competencies rather than on hours of academic work.

Finally a brief word on funds. Certainly we need money to finance education. But we would get better results if local school boards would budget for the materials and the services they need, and would stop looking for Santa Claus to bring a package to make them possible.

CURRENT PROGRAMS OF ENGLISH SUPERVISION

The Texas Program

By Dorothy Davidson

This letter came to us just before Christmas.

> Gentlemen:
> For my senior project I am writing every state to find out if the English language has been important to them. . . .
> (Signed) Mary Ellen . .

Yes, Mary Ellen, the English language has been important to us in Texas. It *is* important.

Over 6,000 teachers teach English, speech, drama, and journalism in the Texas public schools. And over 50,000 elementary school teachers in Texas spend 30 to 50 percent of the school day teaching English in its subdivisions of speaking, reading, writing, and spelling.

English is so important that $15,500,000 is now invested by the state in elementary school textbooks in English language arts, 48 percent of a $32,000,000 investment. An additional $9,000,000 is invested in high school books, 30 percent has been used for English books — almost twice the amount in social studies and more than that of science and mathematics combined. With a Commissioner of Education who taught English (and is an English major), you can be sure that the program of English supervision is important in the work of the Texas Education Agency.

English supervision centers in the Division of Program Development, which has two full-time English consultants. Two consultants in elementary education, assigned to the Division of School Accreditation, have part-time responsibilities in English language arts. These four staff members work under the same director. Two consultants assigned to other divisions (both English majors) have English supervisory roles in special projects of their divisions: the Small School Project in Administrative Services, and the Transparency Project in Instructional Media. These six staff members act as a "task force" for English supervisory assignments.

Is supervision at the state level a significant factor in improving instructional programs? For those who are skeptical, we can confirm that it is. One proving ground already exists: vocational education. With supervisor-teacher ratios in Texas of 1 to 110 in homemaking, 1 to 70 in agriculture, 1 to 36 in trades and industries, and 1 to 24 in distributive education, these programs are dynamic and flexible. Better communication, made possible by these favorable ratios, has significantly contributed to quality programs.

A contrast in the staff for supervision is seen in these figures for 1960-61:

Secondary Teachers	*Subject Area*	*State Specialists**
5,988	English	1½ (now 2)
3,900	Mathematics	2
2,892	Science	2½
3,524	Social Studies	0 (now 1)
794	Foreign Language	2
1,140	Agriculture	16
1,767	Homemaking	16
147	Distributive Education	6
290	Trades and Industries	8

* The numbers in this column are the full-time equivalents of the full-time and part-time specialists, considered together.

Although in many respects the programs of vocational education and English do not parallel each other, the need for good communication is common to both. In English, we could improve communication among teachers if a ratio more favorable than the present 1 state supervisor to 3,000 teachers were established.

Similarly, in NDEA-assisted programs of mathematics, foreign language, and science, we can confirm the extent to which supervision, institutes, materials, equipment, and inservice projects have contributed to improved instruction. Of course, expenditures in these programs have benefited English. State and local funds which would have gone to these areas have been redirected to English. But if these programs are better because of increased financial support, English must be given the same opportunity to improve.

The English supervisory program of the agency attempts to provide leadership in *print* and in *person*. Sometimes the agency takes the initiative; sometimes it follows the leadership of others. Most successful have been those cooperative activities which used the ready-made forums provided by the many state and regional meetings of supervisors, principals, and classroom teachers.

In a second project the English staff has assisted in the development of teaching guides for use in pilot schools for children of migrant workers. Five Rio Grande Valley school districts are operating special programs for pupils at their home base. The purpose is to judge the effectiveness of several administrative and instructional adjustments including a lengthened schoolday, a six-month school year, audiolingual methods of teaching English as a second language, and differentiation of carefully defined reading levels — a valley version of "ungrading."

Another special project has included English — the development of

guides for colleges approved for the preparation of teachers. Action by the State Board of Education in 1961 cut by six semester hours the professional education requirement for certification, and increased by six semester hours the requirement in areas of specialization. The beginning English teacher now must have twenty-four semester hours of English. The guide developed by the Texas English Commission describes the academic competencies which this twenty-four hour block should provide.

Special projects in English are frequently undertaken in cooperation with professional groups in the state. An example is a publication to be distributed in April, *Freshman English Course Descriptions.* This two hundred page bulletin has been developed cooperatively with the Commission on School and College Relations of the Association of Texas Colleges and Universities. It describes entrance procedures, organization, content, and standards of the freshman English courses.

CONSULTATION

Ten years ago, the pattern of direct service to schools was largely one of informal visits, on invitation, with the English faculty at conference periods and after school. The emerging pattern today is consultation, in person, with large groups, perhaps from several schools, and by mail or tape recording. Requests are many; the staff limits visits to a few, and these must be well planned for specific purposes, such as development of guides, program evaluation, or inservice study in composition or another area. This spring, four schools have arranged for staff members to make two-day or three-day visits to evaluate their English programs. In another kind of consultation, first drafts of curriculum guides are mailed to the office for staff suggestions.

SPECIAL PROJECTS

English is important in special projects of the agency, four of which are noteworthy. The first is an outgrowth of a two-year program to disseminate information regarding new educational media through demonstration conferences. One medium — the overhead projector — stimulated such enthusiasm that the agency undertook a project to test the feasibility of having transparencies designed by a team of teachers, for use by other teachers.

Transparency sequences are now being designed in 5 subject areas for 10 courses. For English, grades 8 and 11, 5 teachers from public schools and universities are preparing 275 masters for lessons appropriate to the junior-senior high school in generative grammar, intonation, spelling patterns, dialect, and usage. After being tested and revised, the master's will be made available to other state departments of education through the U. S. Office of Education.

TEXTBOOK SELECTION

The State Textbook Committee, an autonomous group of fifteen teachers, administrators, and supervisors, is appointed yearly by the State Board of Education to examine publishers' offerings in specified categories and to recommend a multiple list (usually five books) for adoption in each category. The committee uses subject matter advisers in their home areas. The commissioner submits the committee's list to the State Board of Education for adoption. Local schools then make selections from the state-adopted list and requisition books during the contract period.

The staff advises the commissioner in this process. In English, for example, fifteen supplementary readers have just been adopted for grades 4, 5, and 6. The English staff wrote a justification for adopting new materials, recommended persons for appointment to the committee, prepared materials for the Textbook Proclamation, and published a monograph on the readers which were adopted for local committees and teachers.

Almost every year some categories of textbooks in English language arts must be studied intensively and reports prepared for the commissioner. Such examinations require firsthand knowledge of English teachers and classroom needs; it means watching national curriculum and publishing trends.

Five basic elements contribute to the state leadership function in English:

PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

During the last six years, a twelve-grade English curriculum framework has been established. It is not revolutionary or spectacular; it describes the sequences of skills in reading and composition as complementary processes. As in any curriculum development, the study, involving hundreds of English teachers, from first grade through college, has sparked change in local programs. The effect of this involvement is seen in guides; selection of textbooks; organization of time, students, and content; and improvement of teaching.

SCHOOL ACCREDITATION

The curriculum study has led to revisions of standards for accrediting schools and to interpretation of the revisions to agency staff and schools. Texas accreditation involves continuous evaluation by local school staff and periodic evaluation by agency staff teams. The school district's total program — administration, financial structure, community and board relations, curriculum, staff, and physical plant — is appraised. Small teams, made up of agency specialists, assume generalists' roles to collect and report information on how well the district is meeting standards. The

English consultants serve on accreditation teams; they provide all agency teams with guidelines and interpretations of standards for English programs.

In 1962-63, we sought to focus upon the college preparatory English program. In five Classroom Teachers Advisory Conferences, teachers who had attended the College Entrance Examination Board English Institute at the University of Texas brought their reactions and ideas to teachers in sectional meetings. Four major area conferences were organized by institute participants themselves and attracted about 800 English teachers. Three of the 13 workshops of the Texas Joint English Committee had programs by institute members. Agency supervisory staff encouraged this effort by working closely with the sponsoring groups.

Yes, Texas recognizes English as important. In sight in the 1960's are several other leadership activities. We are drawing up plans now for an agency-sponsored short course in language, similar to inservice courses already established in mathematics, science, and foreign languages. Six to eight centers will offer an eighteen-hour "Introduction to Linguistics" in the fall of 1964.

A state project directed toward retaining the potential dropout has begun, and the English staff will be involved in suggesting curriculum and materials needed to hold, motivate, and educate disadvantaged youth. Similar efforts are planned for the gifted, with English specialists contributing their part.

A "super vision" of what the Texas English program should become has caught the enthusiasm of many of us. To be involved in designing and implementing this program is exciting.

The Florida Program

Paul H. Jacobs

All of my services are rendered in the hope that improvement of instruction in the English language arts will be the end result. This statement has become my motto. Perhaps that sounds trite or redundant, or even ridiculous. If so, that's all right. But to me, a supervisor attempting to be of some service to the school systems all over Florida, I find it reassuring. Often getting to my place of service necessitates driving for six, eight, ten, or even twelve hours. So without my motto — or philosophy, if you prefer to call it that — I fear that I would be tempted to give up and say, "It simply isn't worth all this trouble."

Coming only four years ago from the classroom into supervision, I have found it necessary to convince myself that helping other supervisors, principals, and teachers is virtually the same as helping the children themselves. In order to be an effective supervisor, it is essential that one believe this.

The Florida Public School System consists of 67 independent public *county* school systems (the Sunshine State has no city or district systems), almost all of which are headed by superintendents elected to their positions. The sizes of the systems vary greatly, ranging from 193,674 students in Dade to 696 in Lafayette, and giving a total of 1,143,582 boys and girls in Florida public schools.[1]

Always on the superintendent's staff is at least one person whose primary responsibility is the overall supervision of instruction in that system. I make a special point of mentioning that person because, except in the larger school systems which have language arts supervisors, he is the one through whom I invariably work. He is the key figure in my service to the majority of our school systems.

A longstanding policy of our staff is to serve by invitation only (unless, of course, a program involves special state funds and supervision) and that the invitation must come from the central office of the system, not from individual schools. This policy does not preclude work with individual faculties, departments or grade level groups, but it does guarantee that the district officials are aware of our presence. Another feature of this policy is that it encourages the school systems to plan and coordinate better in preparation for our visits and, whenever possible, to organize larger meetings or workshops to reach the maximum number of persons. I might add that our policy has obvious disadvantages, of which we are fully cognizant.

[1] Based on enrollments, October 1963.

Now I wish to give you a number of brief glimpses of my responsibilities as state consultant in language arts. A large percentage of time is spent helping supervisors and groups of teachers to develop curriculum guides, courses of study, and course outlines. Usually, I work with groups developing curricula for one or two days at a time in a series of sessions extended over several months. In two instances, I have been working with the same groups for almost two and a half years. Throughout the time that I am assisting curriculum committees, we maintain very close contact. As soon as the committee completes a new chapter or section, they send it to me; I note my reactions to it, and send it back immediately. I also maintain a rather comprehensive library of printed materials for lending to the committees.

The requests for assistance in curriculum development have been so numerous in recent months that I have found it necessary to begin directing them to other qualified men for advice on curriculum. In fact, in a recent series of meetings with the supervisor and teachers involved, we discussed philosophy of English teaching, current research, trends, innovations, processes of curriculum development, and other pertinent subjects. After this introduction, I recommended that they secure the services of one of our outstanding English education professors to guide them in the writing of their curriculum.

My responsibility for the development of state language arts curriculum guides is an entirely different matter. At this time the Florida State Department of Education has approximately thirty committees — each of which is composed of four to twelve teachers, principals, supervisors, and university professors from various parts of the state — writing guides on subjects ranging from dental health to guidance to civil defense. Among these thirty committees are three that are now preparing guides which will provide assistance to the teachers of the English language arts all over our state.

The first of these committees — the same one, for the most part that prepared our recently published high school English guide — is completing work on our elementary English guide. A working draft of this bulletin was evaluated at a statewide meeting of 350 educators. The completed guide should be published in the fall of 1965. A second committee has written a working draft on reading in our junior and senior high schools. This should also be available in the fall, 1965. The third and final committee is in the beginning stages of work. This group is writing a guide for the teaching of speech and dramatics in our junior and senior high schools. Incidentally, each of our committees meets twice a year. The state pays all travel expenses, and a per diem rate of $14.00.

The philosophy upon which the state-level guides are structured does not allow the dictation of curricula to the local school systems. The major objective is to set forth broad guidelines, based upon the most reli-

able and most recent research available, which can be followed by local systems in the writing of their guides and courses of study. We do, however, provide many specific suggestions for the teacher. Still, our job, as we see it, should not be that of writing syllabi or courses of study.

Once we get a new guide off the press, we immediately begin working in every conceivable way to assure its use. After the publishing of the high school English guide, the chairman, another member of the committee, and I conducted a series of one-day and two-day workshops in which we acquainted teachers in approximately fifteen systems with the contents of the guide and instructed them in ways of using it. Somewhat similar meetings were conducted for several groups of principals. Even though this particular guide is now a year and a half old, there is evidence that it is widely used. When the guides now in production have been published, we shall follow a similar course of action in order to guarantee that teachers and principals all over the state learn about them and discover what they have to offer. It is obvious that a curriculum guide on a closet shelf is a waste of effort and money.

Before I leave the subject of curriculum development at the state level, let me emphasize a few points. I do not write the guides. I recommend to the superintendent persons who serve on the committees. Throughout the writing process, I read and make suggestions on all materials prepared, I serve in a consultative role, write brief sections when necessary and, of course, help with the editing. But the guides which eventually come off the press are the work of the entire committee charged with writing them.

Although we spend thousands of hours and dollars annually to prepare curriculum guides, we all recognize that, for many of our teachers, the textbook is the sole determiner of what and how to teach. In Florida all textbooks purchased with state funds must be on the state-adopted list, and before any book can be adopted, there are several specific steps which must be taken. When there are cancellations of textbooks or when I, with the advice of supervisors and teachers all over the state, decide that additional books should be adopted, I must first prepare, in writing, a statement of need for the books and a list of criteria for the selection of them, and then present these to the State Courses of Study Committee. If the committee agrees that the books are needed, it recommends that the State Board of Education call for an adoption. Once an adoption is called for, the State Language Arts Textbook Selection Committee (for high school books only) or the State Elementary Textbook Selection Committee (for all elementary books) then comes into action. Usually, the persons I recommend are asked to serve on these committees. But when the members have been recommended, appointed by the state superintendent, and given copies of the criteria for the areas in which books are to be selected, I have almost no further contact with them. The committee selects its

chairman, has interviews with representatives of the publishing companies, receives and considers the recommendations of the textbook committees in each of the sixty-seven local school systems, and, after days of deliberation, makes a formal report to the State Board of Education.

For many summers, every local school system in Florida has been allowed to hire with state funds one teacher or administrator for every eight teachers employed during the regular school year to conduct a "summer enrichment and recreation program." In 1960, the local school systems were informed that they could use up to 35 percent of their summer instructional units for the teaching of remedial reading and academic subjects for credit. Immediately, many of the systems took full advantage of this special provision, and some even went further and established enrichment or developmental reading programs at their own expense. In 1963, 29 systems conducted remedial programs, and 22 conducted developmental programs. Student participation in these programs was as follows: elementary remedial, 22,137 students; elementary developmental, 4,790; secondary remedial, 1,880; and secondary developmental, 1,513. Student participation in the summer reading program is entirely voluntary but some of the teachers and principals do use certain "persuasive" techniques.

Inasmuch as the remedial programs are supported by special state funds, the plans for them must be approved in my office and, whenever possible, I, along with other members of our staff, must visit the programs. For the first time this spring, we held a special workshop for directors of the programs.

Related to our reading instruction is a proposal for a research study which we have submitted to the U. S. Office of Education. We propose to make a longitudinal reading-readiness study in thirty-two first grade classrooms in four different school systems. Similar classrooms in four other school systems, will serve as controls.[2]

Through a provision of our Minimum Foundation Program, all teachers in Florida are employed for ten months, nine for instructional duties and one for noninstructional duties. All the systems in the state require their teachers to be on duty during the two weeks immediately preceding the opening of school and the one week immediately following the closing of school. One of the remaining five noninstructional days is usually scheduled to follow each of the grading periods. During these twenty noninstructional days members of our staff are extremely busy. Everywhere one looks there are workshops and teachers' meetings of all descriptions and with all kinds of objectives. Although no school system schedules systemwide inservice programs on even two thirds of these days, there are far more invitations for service on each of the days than our state staff can possibly accept.

In August 1955 the first supervisor of the English language arts to

[2] The proposal was approved by the U.S. Office of Education.

serve a Florida school system was employed. In 1959 three more school systems appointed English supervisors, and one of them appointed a consultant in reading. Since that time the annual increase of language arts supervisors has been most encouraging. Now eleven of our school systems, serving slightly more than 69 percent of our high school students, have at least one supervisor whose principal responsibility is the teaching of the English language arts. Four of these eleven systems also have a supervisor of reading; one has two reading supervisors. Three of the language arts supervisors serve all the grades, 1-12; one serves only the elementary schools. It is the pleasant responsibility of the state supervisor to work with these local supervisors.

Another of my responsibilities is to serve in a consultative capacity on various subcommittees of the Florida Teachers Education Advisory Council. Through the influence of this council, Florida teachers will soon be able to become certified in reading.

Two years ago, the Florida Institute for Continuing University Studies was established. FICUS, as it is called, is a university with the whole state of Florida as its campus. Although it has several divisions with different objectives, the one that is providing the greatest assistance to the public schools is the Division of Advanced Studies, whose primary stated objective is that of making more "content" courses available to teachers while on duty in the schools. Through FICUS we are offering courses in structural linguistics this year to teachers in six school systems, and many other courses to teachers in other systems.

Through the cooperative efforts of the Florida State University and the State Department of Education, an institute for teachers of English, based on those of the Commission on English,[3] will be conducted this summer. The state superintendent has asked the local superintendents and school boards to pay a minimum of $250 toward the expenses of each teacher who wishes to participate. At this point, it appears that registration will far exceed the number of teachers who can be accommodated.

Throughout my career I have felt that there is an extremely close relationship between teachers' professional growth and development and their active participation in professional organizations related to the subjects they teach. Therefore, I do everything within reason to encourage participation in local and state affiliates of the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE), the International Reading Association (IRA), and the Speech Association of America (SAA). In addition to three state-level affiliates of these organizations, Florida has twenty-one local English councils, fifteen local chapters of the IRA, and approximately nine local chapters of the SAA.

Last fall, the Florida Council of Teachers of English, the Florida Reading Association, and the Florida Speech Association held their con-

[3] The Commission on English of the College Entrance Examination Board.

ferences in Sarasota on the same dates, enabling teachers to attend some of the sessions of all three organizations. Next October the three groups will hold a joint conference in Fort Lauderdale. These professional groups have no desire to merge, but they do believe that meeting together once each year will result in a unity of purpose and direction sorely needed by all of us who strive to bring order to this unwieldy phenomenon called "the English language arts."

The Troup County (Georgia) Program

Bernice Freeman

The instructional supervisor for English language arts in the Troup County Schools is a consultant and helper only. It is her responsibility to provide assistance and guidance when there is a readiness to receive them. Because of this philosophy of supervision, inservice programs and changes in the English language arts, as in other areas, grow out of needs realized by the staff itself. Of course, the supervisor should also be instrumental in creating the incentive to improve. In some cases, studies are planned and coordinated by systemwide committees, with the supervisor serving as consultant. Several times we have seen that interests developed in one school or in a field laboratory course do at times expand until they involve the system as a whole.

The current emphasis on the language arts in the Troup County System began as a part of the system's affiliation, in 1957-58, with the Cooperative Study of Elementary Education of the Southern Association of Schools and Colleges. One requirement for such affiliation is that cooperating schools develop and put into operation each year a plan for school improvement.

As the Troup County Schools at the end of the first year of affiliation evaluated the individual school improvement programs, a consensus evolved that there should be countywide program of self-study, evaluation, and improvement. Soon the Troup County Elementary Schools were serving as a pilot study for the Southern Association in the development of procedures for self-study for elementary schools. This pilot study resulted in the Troup County Elementary Schools' being one of the first four in Georgia, and of the first twenty-seven in the region, to be accredited by this regional accrediting association. The Southern Association of Schools and Colleges was the first regional agency in the nation to accredit entire school systems from grade 1 through 12.

LANGUAGE ARTS IN THE PILOT STUDY

One of the systemwide undertakings in this pilot study was improving the basic skills program in the elementary schools. In this project, special attention was given to systemwide teaching of reading, writing, speaking. and listening. In addition, some schools examined their teaching of certain phases of the language arts: creative writing, supplementary reading, spelling, dramatic play, and literature.

CORRELATING THE LANGUAGE ARTS

During 1959-60, one school began an experimental study in the correlation of the language arts. Later that year, this study was expanded under the leadership of the systemwide committee on curriculum to include at least one teacher from each elementary school. The next year it increased still more, and all the elementary schools made it a part of their plan for school improvement. Activities, which varied among the schools, included the setting up of a block of time as the language arts period; stressing self-expression in writing; keeping individual spelling lists; examining pupil writing to determine needs in sentence sense, capitalization, and punctuation; correlating the basic reading program with other language arts activities; participating in a countywide study of curriculum and teaching designed to employ the problem-solving approach; and using a reading consultant in staff groups and individually with many teachers.

LANGUAGE ARTS AND THE PROBLEM-SOLVING APPROACH

During the spring of 1961, a number of the Troup County teachers engaged in a field laboratory course from Auburn University on curriculum and teaching. Those teachers began to progress from the textbook-centered curriculum, which predominated in Troup County, toward the experience-centered curriculum. As a step in that direction, the group reexamined the skills, understandings, and outcomes desired in each of seven teaching areas, one of which was the language arts. The aims of teaching in each area were identified and stated in terms of problems. Within each problem a small and manageable topic was selected, and plans for developing it were made. Such plans were made for the teaching of a specific topic in the language arts at the primary, the upper elementary, and the secondary levels of instruction.

So successful was this experience in giving the participating group greater understanding of the problem-solving approach to teaching, greater confidence in its effectiveness with children, and greater security in attempting it that the Troup County committee on curriculum recommended that the entire staff participate in such an experience. This recommendation was accepted and carried out in a one and one-half day post school workshop. The program of preparation for this postschool workshop included orientation of each staff to the study made in the field laboratory course, individual study of the report of the field laboratory course, faculty discussion of the report of the study, and the establishment of subject area and grade level committees.

Teachers working in the language arts during this postschool workshop did the following things:

- listed the general aims of teaching the English language arts, grades 1-12

- listed the skills, understandings, and outcomes desired for each of the three levels—primary, upper elementary, and secondary
- listed problems, the solution of which would provide the desired skills, understandings, and outcomes
- agreed on a problem common to all three levels to be developed during this workshop
- divided into three groups — primary, upper elementary, and secondary — to develop a selected topic.

The development included listing the desired outcomes, indicating ways and means of gathering information, indicating how the information could be organized and shared, planning for the evaluation of the process and of achievements, and listing other topics which could be developed within this problem.

THE SCHOOL SURVEY AND THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

In 1961-62, the plans for school improvement were coordinated around a countywide survey of education needs. One feature of this survey included the evaluation of the program of instruction both by the staff and by recent graduates.

Weaknesses concerning the English language arts revealed in the survey included too little opportunity for pupil self-expression in either oral or written form, too little research by teachers and administrators, and too little use of available reports of research carried on by others. During the postschool week that year, the instructional supervisor met with individual school staffs to discuss ways to strengthen the teaching of the English language arts.

ACHIEVEMENT LEVELS IN THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

Problems of grouping, grading, and reporting to parents were of central concern in the 1962-63 plan for school improvement. This year's study resulted in the adoption of the policy of placing boys and girls in classrooms according to their chronological and social age, teaching them within the classrooms according to their level of achievement, and reporting to parents on both their effort and their achievement on their instructional level. This involved indicating the grade level of boys and girls in the English language arts. To assist teachers who lacked confidence, the committee on curriculum asked that for a period of six weeks two members of each elementary staff give brief reports on current professional articles on the English language arts at each weekly faculty meeting. The committee scheduled an interim evaluation of the progress of this study, and set one day for considering further the evaluation of pupil's work in language. Also, representatives of the system attending the state elementary work-

shop participated in the groups on written expression and children's literature.

The keynote address for the postschool workshop was "Teaching the Language Arts Creati[illegible]" This was followed by the exploration of the language concepts, learnings, and experiences that children should have at the primary and upper elementary levels. Each observed a demonstration of children responding to a brief literary selection. Each group, after examining the cumulative records of the children observed, evaluating a paragraph written by each child, and listening to the children's oral discussion of the literary selection, attempted to arrive at a grade level of achievement.

But many teachers felt insecure in assigning grade levels of achievements in the language arts. For this reason, the Troup County Schools decided to center their plans for school improvement for the 1963-64 school year around a more intensive study of the English language arts.

THE 1963-64 STUDY OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

As part of the 1963 preschool week, a panel presented to the entire Troup County staff the *Second Report: Composition*, just issued by the Georgia English Curriculum Guide Committee. The panel members named six concepts as basic to the development of skill in speaking and writing and suggested some ways in which these concepts might be developed. These concepts are

1. Composing involves having something to say.
2. Composing involves purpose.
3. Composing involves the expansion or condensation of an idea.
4. Composing involves arranging selected material into recognizable order.
5. Composing is usually done within recognizable patterns.
6. Composing involves manner of expression.

After the panel discussion, the group decided how the study of the English language arts would be carried on during the 1963-64 school year. These plans included

1. Grade level and departmental meetings to consider the teaching of the English language arts and to arrive at sequences of emphases.
2. Individual faculty study to discuss classroom activities through which these learnings may be developed, to provide experiences in determining grade levels in various English language arts areas, and to plan a schoolwide attack on language weaknesses.
3. Short periods of intensive individual reading in selected areas of language instruction to be followed by a pooling of ideas gained from reading.

4. A demonstration of developing a writing readiness in children. The Troup County committee on curriculum officially approved these plans.

At the first round of grade level meetings, held in October and November, the teachers identified their purposes in meeting; examined carefully the *First* and *Second* reports of the Georgia English Language Arts Curriculum Guide, which represent the concept approach to teaching literature, language, and composition; agreed upon certain nonstandard language forms for systemwide attack; and examined the lists "Possible Expectancies of the Primary Child" and "Possible Expectancies of the Elementary Child," for aid in determining sequences and emphases at different levels.

In the second round of grade level meetings, members of the group reviewed the following articles:

> Wesley, Frank, and Mary Rose. "Why Ivan Can Read," *Elementary English*, XXXIX (March 1962).
> Malone, John R. "The Larger Aspects of Spelling Reform," *Elementary English*, XXXIX (May 1962).
> Strickland, Ruth. "Implications for Research in Linguistics for Elementary Teaching." *Elementary English*, XL (February 1963).
> "Reading All of a Sudden," *Life*, November 1, 1963.

At each of these meetings, two teachers reviewed a book from Arbuthnot, Clark, and Long's *Children's Books Too Good to Miss*.[1] Copies of Rosalind Mosier's list of "Books to Read Aloud" were distributed, and additional nonstandard language forms were selected for systemwide attack.

The first departmental meetings were held in February. At these, Calvin Tomkin's article "The Last Skill Acquired," which appeared in *The New Yorker*, September 14, 1963, and James Squire's "Teaching of Writing and Composition in Today's Schools," in the January 1964 *Elementary English*, were reviewed. A demonstration related to the NCTE film *Teaching the Concept, 'Point of View'* was given.

The group gave further consideration to emphases by grades and agreed that the teachers would bring to the next departmental meeting samples of pupil work which they would call "above grade level," "on grade level," and "below grade level."

The weeks of February 24 and March 3 are scheduled for intensive individual reading in the language arts. Each teacher is encouraged to read at least one article or chapter from current professional literature each day. A bibliography has been provided by members of the committee on curriculum. Individual schools' professional libraries have been supplemented by books and journals from the central office and from regional and state libraries. The regular faculty meetings following each of these weeks

[1]Cleveland: Western Reserve University Press, 1963.

will be devoted to pooling of ideas gained from reading. Subsequent faculty meetings will provide opportunities for sharing samples of pupil work on various levels of achievement and for establishing schoolwide goals in the language arts.

The second round of departmental meetings, scheduled for March, will bring further progress in the development of a sequential list of emphases in the language arts. This meeting and others, which may be scheduled later, will provide opportunity to discuss classroom activities through which these learnings may be developed.

The demonstration of the development of writing readiness in boys and girls is yet to be scheduled. During the postschool week, the language arts study for 1963-64 will be summarized and the next steps will be blocked out.

There have been major problems in this study of the English language arts. Without doubt, the staff is just average. Some teachers are very good and some are poor. Some have much experience; others have very little. There is a high rate of teacher turnover, with the result that much time is spent orienting new staff members to the level of thinking of the continuing group. There is also resistance from local administrators, who often fear that pressing teachers into intensive inservice programs will cause them to seek jobs in other systems which do very little inservice training and have a higher salary schedule than Troup County.

Despite these problems, there have been significant accomplishments. Many of our schools now do the following:

1. Teach English, spelling, literature, and reading in large blocks of time in which all of the language arts are emphasized.
2. Use the problem-solving approach.
3. Put less emphasis on formal grammar.
4. Place more emphasis on the expression of pupil thought in writing and in speaking.
5. Conduct individual and group work in spelling, based on achievement.
6. Place increased emphasis on individual reading.
7. Have greater consciousness of the part literature can play in the entire elementary school program.
8. Have greater familiarity with children's literature.
9. Know more of professional literature on the teaching of the English language arts.

These achievements are indeed gratifying; yet there remains much to be accomplished. For example, we would like to see

1. The English language arts teacher recognized as the crucial and important teacher he is.
2. The English language arts teacher paid a premium salary comparable to that of other teachers in the areas of music, industrial

arts, vocational programs, mathematics, science, and physical education.

3. Capable, qualified, enthusiastic persons instructing boys and girls in the language arts program — the area which is the basis of all their progress.
4. Less teacher turnover so that a new beginning would not have to be made year after year in helping new teachers to be effective language arts teachers.
5. A curriculum specialist in the language arts program employed in the Troup County Schools to devote full time to improving the language arts program and ensuring vertical and horizontal balance in that program.
6. A planned and financed program for relieving teachers for inservice training, for freeing them on a released time basis for individual preparation and appropriate attention to pupils' written work, and for providing adequate teaching materials and aids.
7. A well planned and coordinated program of language experiences supervised by qualified teachers, who would employ their special skills in directing particular parts of the language arts programs in classes varying in size from large groups for appreciation of literature to small groups permitting individualized help in critical thinking, writing experience, and oral expression.

As we continue to strive toward these goals, we shall take advantage of the opportunities and resources available to us in improving our language arts program. Our constant purpose is to make all students competent and secure in language arts, happy and successful in communication skills, and adequately prepared to live in peace, harmony, understanding, and cooperation with their fellow man in a rapidly changing and highly complex society.

The Pittsburgh Program

Lois M. Grose

Supervisors of English in a large city school system face many problems: an unusually wide range of student ability and achievement, the need to provide compensatory education for pupils from culturally disadvantaged areas, high teacher turnover, and limited budgets. We are all looking for solutions to these and other problems. This conference has offered welcome opportunity for sharing experiences and discovering supervisory practices which we can adapt to our own situation.

My responsibilities lie in the secondary schools only; the supervision of our elementary schools is under the direction of Dr. Elizabeth Graf. Though the members of her staff of eleven supervisors are generalists who work with all academic subject areas, two primary and two intermediate supervisors assume particular responsibility for the language arts. These four supervisors keep the rest of the group informed concerning new developments in the field of English, direct inservice training sessions in the language arts; they also serve on English curriculum committees. Dr. Graf and her assistants have developed particularly effective patterns for inservice training of teachers. In one plan they bring together a group of teachers from one geographical area of the city either to observe a demonstration lesson or to view a presentation on WQED, our educational TV station, and later to discuss the lesson or presentation. A second pattern is the midyear workshop, scheduled for the two days between semesters when our students do not report to school. This year Helen Robinson, nationally recognized authority in reading, addressed two different groups on "New Trends in the Teaching of Reading." Supervisors led the small group discussions which followed, and teachers related the ideas presented by Dr. Robinson to their own classroom problems.

The elementary and secondary supervisory programs in Pittsburgh are articulated in that both are under the direction of an Associate Superintendent in Charge of Instruction. Certain programs are joint efforts; the series of demonstration lessons currently being carried on in the schools involved in our team teaching program is one example. Half of the demonstration lessons in this series are being given in elementary schools, with junior high school personnel as observers. The roles are to be reversed for the second half of the series.

In our secondary school division Helen Gorman and I share the supervision of more than two hundred teachers in twenty-five junior and senior high schools. Our division of schools is neither by level nor by geographical area; each of us supervises some junior high, some senior high, and some

vocational schools. We work together so closely that we both know all English teachers and confer constantly on specific school situations.

As is the case, I imagine, in all large city school systems, each year brings a large group of new English teachers into our schools. We plan very carefully for a preschool orientation conference in which we introduce these new teachers to our three-track program, our curriculum guides, and our particular approaches to the teaching of language, literature, and composition. New teachers seem to particularly appreciate a suggested plan for the first week's work with accompanying materials, which we provide for those who wish it.

During their two year probationary period we devote extra supervisory time to these beginning teachers. We try to make the first visit an informal conference during a free period to stress the idea that our major role is to be of help to them. In addition to unannounced visits we arrange each year for one scheduled observation in which the teacher has an opportunity to display the best teaching techniques he can command. This scheduled observation is followed by a conference based partly on the lesson observed and partly on other problems the beginning teacher faces.

In the Pittsburgh system, supervisors have responsibilities in the areas of curriculum development and selection of teachers. The Division of Curriculum Study and Research asks supervisors to indicate curriculum needs, to suggest personnel for curriculum committees, to direct the work of the committees, and to present the curriculum to teachers when it has been completed. In recent summers Miss Gorman and I have worked with committees to develop a sequential guide for written composition, a curriculum supplement for the teaching of grammar, and an outline for three courses in reading. Our department of personnel asks supervisors to recruit new teachers, serve on interviewing committees, evaluate credentials and to rate all teachers in our field.

We attempt to improve instruction in English through individual conferences, department meetings in individual schools, general meetings, and special programs. Meetings in individual schools are quite effective, especially when the meeting focuses on a particular problem affecting that school. For example, a recent theme reading session brought good results in a school in which the teaching of composition was not consistent among teachers. The group discussed duplicated copies of papers they had themselves submitted, considering points of excellence, weaknesses, and the sort of marginal and summary comment which would be most helpful to a student. The teachers then used specific criteria to grade eight or ten papers. The recorded grades demonstrated the usual wide range, but the ensuing discussion did much to bring teachers to an agreement on what constitutes good writing.

Sometimes our supervisory efforts may concentrate on one phase of our program to strengthen an area in which we are not satisfied with pupil

achievement. For the last few years in Pittsburgh for example, we have worked intensively to improve the teaching of composition. In addition to the curriculum guide for a sequential program in composition mentioned earlier, we have four high schools working on a program of weekly writing. This is made possible in two schools by the addition of nine teachers to each staff, thus reducing the load of each English teacher to one hundred students, and in two more schools by the employment of contract readers. In schools where no assistance is given, we ask teachers to plan work in written composition approximately every two weeks.

In connection with this major emphasis on writing, we have tried certain supervisory techniques. Teachers in the schools having reduced teaching loads meet in grade level committees to plan their sequence of themes. Teachers in team teaching schools have done the same thing in their team meetings. To make orientation sessions possible for contract readers, substitutes were provided for all English teachers in each school for one day. During that day teachers and readers talked together concerning basic principles of composition, techniques for making evaluation of teaching process, and common standards for evaluation.

As another method for inservice training in composition, last year our local English association and the Pittsburgh Schools jointly sponsored a unique workshop. An English professor from Carnegie Institute of Technology appeared in four television broadcasts on our local educational TV station WQED. In the weeks between the broadcasts the professor met with teachers in a workshop session for a follow-up discussion of the principles presented in the telecasts. Teachers turned out for the workshop sessions in such numbers that two sessions instead of one had to be scheduled.

A very different sort of supervisory activity was tried out last year; we went to each school and asked teachers to select representative student composition folders for us to read. Such a reading was very enlightening as to quantity of composition work being done, quality of teacher evaluation, and actual pupil improvement in writing skills. After such a reading we attempted to write comments to teachers giving credit for excellent work and suggesting areas for possible improvement.

One of the most effective means of coordinating our English program is through meetings of department heads. Only our six largest schools have department heads who are paid for supervisory services; other schools elect chairmen to represent the department in matters relating to teaching English, but they receive no time compensation or extra pay. The six department heads meet with us regularly to coordinate the city English program, to plan new activities, and to provide the stimulation which comes from comparing teaching techniques and department procedures. Committees from this group are now working on recommendations for final exams, recommendations for new recordings and filmstrips to be bought

from the English budget, and plans for uniform work for the first week of the school year.

A strong stimulus toward improvement in instruction in Pittsburgh has come from several cooperative programs in which we have been engaged with two local colleges. Our advanced placement program and the eleventh grade course designed to precede it were developed in cooperation with the Carnegie Institute of Technology. Summer seminars which were a part of this program did much to improve the scholarship of those teachers who attended them. The influence of these seminars has gone far beyond the advanced placement classes; it has "rubbed off" on other classes and other teachers. With the University of Pittsburgh we have developed a demonstration program in continuum education that aims to articulate elementary, secondary, and college education in English into one sequential program. Teachers who have worked on committees preparing this curriculum have profited greatly, receiving new and wider insights into the teaching of English. Considering the benefits that have accrued from these expenditures, we think longingly of all that might be accomplished in teacher education, curriculum development, and research in English if English were to receive the financial support now accorded to mathematics, science, and foreign languages.[1]

In addition to these cooperative programs with colleges, we have a number of special programs developed with outside groups which our teachers feel have great value for students. An example of these is the Vanguard Theatre — a group of professional players who go into the schools for two performances each year. The plays are presented to auditorium groups, but the players also go into classrooms for poetry readings, presentation of the Lincoln-Douglas debates (to history classes), and readings from plays. This project has brought drama to many students who have never seen live theatre before. A second project is financed by the National Gallery of Art in Washington, D. C. Art and English teachers work together in the preparation of topics for a month's study for participating students. The study begins with painting, but it also involves literature and music. The month of study culminates in an essay written without notes, under supervision. The writers of the papers judged best in each school make up a group which spends a weekend in Washington each spring as guests of the National Gallery.

The last aspect of supervision I should like to mention is in some ways the simplest and yet the most satisfying of the supervisory techniques I know. That is to discover the creative, enthusiastic teachers who can be found in every school system, give the materials to do their most effective work, and stimulate them to try new ideas, new approaches. Enthusiasm is

---

[1] The National Defense Education Act was amended to include English in October 1964.

contagious; one interested, creative teacher can often spark an entire English department to a new attitude and new approaches to the teaching of English. It is situations like these that make supervision worthwhile.

The Portland (Oregon) Program

Marian Zollinger

Supervision in the Portland Public Schools involves the efforts of many persons, including both generalists and subject matter specialists. In the schools, the principal does the day-by-day supervising. In larger elementary schools he has the assistance of a full-time teacher consultant, and in all high schools one of the vice principals is assigned to curriculum and supervision. These supervise in all areas. In the line and staff organization, the principal answers to the directors, they answer to the assistant superintendents, and they to the superintendent. The place of the subject supervisors is outside the line and staff. Their responsibilities are citywide in the field of their specialization, and more advisory than administrative. The subject supervisor develops programs, sees that guides and other curriculum publications are prepared, visits schools and teachers, participates in faculty meetings, heads committee work, teaches inservice classes, initiates experimental programs, or tries to keep up with those that others have initiated. His work is spelled out by what the district expects, what the job demands, and what the individual supervisor sees as immediate and long range needs.

The citywide supervision of English from grades K-12 is directed by a supervisor and an assistant supervisor. They frequently work with others in the central office whose assignments overlap or supplement their own, including, for example, a supervisor of elementary education, much of whose time is given to primary reading and language; an assistant supervisor who works on a program for children of superior ability; a consultant for remedial reading; supervisors of testing and guidance; and directors of research, curriculum, and instructional materials.

When a new citywide program is to be launched or an old one revised or renewed, one of the keys to any degree of success lies in the understanding and approval of the leaders in the individual schools. While a principal's supervision is of a general nature, the subject matter supervisors help him to keep up-to-date on matters related to subject fields; he can always call upon the special knowledge of a teacher on his staff who is well informed about the program and the subject. The high schools have an English chairman for this purpose; the elementary schools may appoint a language arts coordinator from the staff. These people attend monthly meetings with the supervisors and can carry the torch for any special English project if they have the support of their principals.

The supervisors work with many groups, getting and giving information and ideas, developing plans, and enlisting help where needed. Some-

times it seems to them that life is a continual rush from one meeting to another.

Supervision represents both general education and specific subject interest and involves both citywide and individual school leadership. Above all, supervision is a cooperative venture.

The goal of supervision is always the improvement of instruction. Toward that end, our school system has certain main concerns of which I shall name six. Education for teachers is the matter of first concern. In our desire for well qualified teachers, we are now cooperating with two Portland colleges in intern programs for people who already have B.A. degrees in English or other subjects. The programs lead to an M.A. in teaching and train the beginning teacher under the constant guidance of an experienced teacher.

Experienced teachers also need and desire further education. Continued educational opportunities for teachers can enable them to restudy the subjects that have changed greatly since their days in school (such as the conception of the nature of the English language) or study anew the subjects they did not then have time to pursue adequately.

Our regular procedure is to offer inservice classes taught by supervisors or teachers, without tuition; to give some publicity to classes offered in local colleges; and occasionally to arrange for a series of lectures by English professors from local colleges. In the last five years, we have had a sample of opportunities that are possible only when ample funds are available. With the financial assistance of a foundation for a five-year High School Curriculum Improvement Program, we arranged for six-week summer institutes for high school English teachers, running for two consecutive summers. Classes in Shakespeare, Chaucer, poetry, composition, language structure and history, and speech, all at the graduate level, were offered, and a certain number of teachers from every high school were awarded scholarships. Their tuition was paid, books provided, and generous stipends equal to those given by the National Science Foundation supplied.

This experience was probably the most exhilarating thing that ever happened to our group of high school English teachers. They saw new possibilities for instruction; they examined new teaching materials; they talked shop with each other with new excitement; and they had time to think and plan for the coming school year. It put back into every school teachers of leadership quality who were eager to share the results of summer work with their classes and their fellow teachers. If we could continue this plan, as mathematics and science have done under NSF and foreign languages to some extent under NDEA, we could revitalize every English classroom.

Our second concern in supervision is the selection of instructional materials. A six-year cycle for major textbook adoptions or renewals keeps

us studying what is available, what we need, and what we have that we want to keep. So many kinds of textbooks are required in developing the language arts that the textbook committees have heavy assignments. We have reduced the size of the task a little by writing and publishing our own spelling books and by selecting literature largely in books other than textbook anthologies. A textbook committee designed a new literature plan for grades 1-8 with more than 100 packets of books from which teachers may choose. The work of the textbook committees ties in closely with curriculum development, since the purposes of the courses must be defined before criteria can be established for the selection of books. This committee work provides a good deal of teacher education.

Curriculum development is a third concern of supervision. It implies not only an analysis and evaluation of what we *are* doing, but the exercise of imagination and creativity in planning what *might* be done to meet instructional needs. This is not a job for tired teachers who come to a meeting once a month at 4:00 p.m. after a full day. It requires teachers who are their most alert, working with continuity over a period of time so that they can study problems, formulate thoughts, and exchange ideas with each other and with outstanding leaders on the topics under consideration.

During the period when we had foundation funds for the improvement of English instruction, we had two periods daily of released time for six high school teachers to act as our steering committee. For the full working committee of fourteen we had eight days of released time for one year with substitutes, plus eight Saturdays with pay. Occasionally on those days we brought to the meetings college professors whose special knowledge and advice we wanted. Then, by summer, when we had the outline of our plan and had received the comments of all the high school English teachers on it, we had a six-week writing session, running concurrently with the institute, in which four professors and nine high school teachers wrote Volume I of our *Guide for High School English.* Volume II was written by six high school teachers who had served on the committee during the preceding two year planning period. As a result, we now have a four-year developmental sequence in high school language, literature, written composition, and speech that makes better sense than any we have been able to develop before.

Elementary English curriculum development has proceeded, if not as dramatically, at least steadily and with thoughtful attention to the planned full thirteen-year sequence from kindergarten through grade 12. We have produced an *Elementary Reading Guide, K-8* and a new literature program, mentioned above; and we have continued our work on composition. In the preparation of the many curriculum publications on language arts, we use our K-12 English Scope-and-Sequence Chart as a guide to articulation from grade to grade and from elementary to secondary schools.

A fourth concern of supervision is experimentation and evaluation.

Evaluation is so much a part of experimentation that it seems odd to list it separately except for the sake of emphasis. Every experiment needs a built-in plan for evaluating results, whether it be on new materials or experiences in the curriculum, new instructional aids for the teacher, or the introduction of the so-called flexible schedule and team teaching. We don't always live up to our hopes in this respect, for it seems to English teachers that progress toward *some* of our goals is not measurable objectively.

Types of evaluation differ. They include standardized, citywide tests to show children's achievement, and other special tests desired by the English department of a school; and they include informal evaluations by teachers, on questionnaires or in reports of discussions held in departmental meetings. They also include action research undertaken by teachers and formal research, with control groups, planned cooperatively with the research division.

A fifth concern relates to the participation of English teachers in some of the general educational projects of the school district, projects that cut across several subject fields. These include efforts to provide educational experiences for the gifted and for the slow learner, guidance for children of widely varied interests, abilities, and needs into suitable programs, orientation of new teachers, and communication of accurate information about English instruction to teachers of other grades and subjects and to individuals and groups outside the schools.

I have left for last the supervisor's concern about good teaching conditions. That is a term almost as general as *et cetera*. It includes adequate pay, good equipment, reasonable class loads, teaching assignments that fit each teacher's preparation, and considerable freedom from nonteaching assignments. It also includes a professional atmosphere in which a teacher can take pride in his own successes and show respect for the contributions made by his fellow workers.

Let it be remembered that one of the important functions a supervisor can perform is to let teachers know that their work is deemed important, that the difficulties they face are at least understood if they cannot be removed, and that whatever can be done to make the teacher's work more effective will be done.

This is an educational era in which mathematics and science are zooming ahead at jet speed while English tags along with one propeller. Such an unfavorable comparison does not imply that English teachers and supervisors are less eager or their goals less desirable. Certainly nothing in education can be considered more important than man's ability to learn by reading or to communicate his thoughts in speech and writing. And English, as a subject for study, has its unique contribution to make in man's education in the humanistic study of language and literature. In a scientific age mankind may well remember that the young must still be taught to weigh human values.

We know that the race in space has caught the imagination of the American people and mere dollars will not stand in the way. Now, as we prepare for a future of untold wonders in science, education calls for the ideals, the vision, the reasoning, and communication skills that English teachers teach. Whatever help they are given will clearly be in the national interest.

In conclusion, here are some of our dreams for the improvement of English, which may be speeded through financial aid such as NDEA provides.

1. We hope to provide many, if not all, of our teachers, periodically, with tuition and stipends for attending summer institutes to help them catch up on recent scholarship and renew or extend the learning they gained in college.
2. We hope to secure the services of traveling specialists, who will come to the district during the school year and in a short series of meetings (like the NCTE institutes on language and linguistics held last spring and to be repeated this April) start an avalanche of ideas about classroom teaching and materials.
3. We hope to carry out a long range program for school and college English teachers to work together toward an articulated curriculum, combining their scholarship in the various fields of English with classroom know-how and knowledge of children.
4. We hope to acquire, or possibly create, a larger collection of films, tapes, and other instructional materials for the improvement of English teaching.
5. We hope to conduct research that will help us to know what to teach and how to do it more effectively, as for example, in the field of beginning reading.

If these are dreams rather than reality, it is because our basic problems need more than incidental attention. They cannot be solved by those tired teachers who, at the end of a day, spend an hour with a committee and ponder. If we give those same teachers the time they need, place resources at hand in libraries and college conference rooms, let them experiment in classrooms and test results, and give them pay commensurate with their services, they will rise to the task and produce what is needed to thrust English instruction into the space age.

APPENDIX

EXCERPTS FROM THE CONFERENCE DISCUSSION

SECTION 1: Supervision of Elementary School English

Evans: Several cities responding to a questionnaire recommended that elementary schools have special language arts supervisors rather than general supervisors.

Squire: It is important that the schools make certain they really do have people who are adequately trained in reading, language development, composition, and other aspects of language arts to supervise the language arts program. Unfortunately at the present time, that kind of person is very difficult to find at the elementary level.

Melby: I think it is imperative that an elementary consultant or director be a generalist. A language arts specialist who is not a generalist cannot possibly realize or appreciate all the pressures that bear upon the elementary teacher. However, there might well be resource persons with language arts as a subject specialty to work directly with teachers, but they should be under the direction of a generalist.

Winn: I agree that elementary schools need general supervisors to prevent the classroom teacher from being torn in too many ways. I am deeply concerned, however, about the amount of time spent on the teaching of listening, speaking, and writing in some of our schools. There is enough time allotted in the instructional program for the teaching of the language arts, but because of other pressures the time is often used otherwise. In our schools we are accenting reading because of substandard achievement in this area. If someone were assigned a special responsibility for language arts, I believe we would have better teaching.

Wilson: I do not believe that a generalist is any longer adequate for the supervision of elementary schools. Nationally there have been tremendous developments at the elementary level in mathematics, science, and reading with the new linguistics approach. It would be difficult to see how any one person could possibly know all these fields in depth. In Philadelphia we have a large scale retraining program in elementary mathematics, another in reading, and another in science. A generalist to coordinate programs is necessary, but I hope we will not fail to recommend elementary supervisors with strong language

arts backgrounds to give a great deal of thought and time just to that phase of the elementary program.

Squire: It is important to remember that at the elementary level we are facing the problem in this country that 80 percent of the teachers, by any kind of reasonable standard one can apply, simply are not well prepared in language learning, in literature, in teaching language arts, or in children's literature. This means that the supervisor must have strength in this area. I think the suggestion that the supervisor must also see the picture of the total elementary curriculum is important, but if we are to help the 80 percent of the elementary teachers to teach language arts, we must have people in supervision who have the background in literature, in reading, and in the psychology of language learning that elementary teachers are not obtaining right now in their preservice training.

Gill: We can agree with the philosophy that elementary supervision should have a generalist at the head of the program. Most large school systems do have either a director of elementary education or an assistant superintendent in charge of elementary education, a person who coordinates the overall elementary program. Within the individual buildings, the principals coordinate the program. Surely in a school system there should be someone to whose title the words "with special responsibilities for language arts" could be attached. Special supervisors should work under the general director or coordinator.

Sisk: In Baltimore County the eight elementary school supervisors have made a point of specializing in subject areas—two in English, two in social studies, two in science, and two in mathematics. Each one is assigned as a generalist to a certain geographical area, but they serve as consultants to other areas in their special subjects.

Grose: Pittsburgh has eleven elementary supervisors called generalists, but of that group four are specifically assigned language arts responsibilities, two for the primary grades and two for intermediate. They serve on English curriculum committees and keep the whole group informed on developments in language arts.

Melby: If they are responsible to a generalist that's all right.

Grose: They are responsible to a generalist.

Evans: In Cleveland we have no general supervisors. All elementary and secondary supervisors are subject matter specialists. Supervisors work with a director of elementary schools and a director of secondary schools. The Division of English and Language Arts is responsible to the assistant superintendent of instruction and the assistant superintendent in charge of research and development.

SECTION 2: Statewide Supervision of English

Squire: I think we ought to go on record as supporting the appointment of a director to exert statewide leadership in English and language arts in every state. We might suggest that the way in which the state supervisor works will vary considerably, depending on the size of the state. In small states and states with only a few districts, where the supervisors can move around with ease, the state supervisors would function somewhat like the supervisors in county systems. In large states, Texas for example, the organization may have to be entirely different. But every state should have a competent specialist in English to give leadership in English.

Dallam: I do not think "supervisor" is the best title for the director of English at the state level. A supervisor deals directly with the teachers. A state officer cannot do that. His duties are to help supervisors in establishing a basic rationale for curriculum and in solving problems that they cannot handle alone. The state officer should be called "advisor" or "consultant."

Kincaid: I have the title of consultant at the state level and it seems to me to have advantages in building up a rapport with supervisors and teachers out in the field. They feel that I am not there to tell them what to do; I am there to work with them and help them develop. It makes a difference. The people in our department who formerly were called supervisors were looked upon as people coming in to inspect, to criticize, and even to condemn.

SECTION 3: Patterns of Supervision

Seattle: The director of English language arts, grades K-12, is directly responsible to the assistant superintendent for curriculum, but works closely, in a consultative relationship, also with the assistant superintendent for elementary schools, with the assistant superintendent for secondary schools, and with the two elementary school coordinators and the two secondary school coordinators.

Cleveland: The division of English and language arts, K-12, consists of a directing supervisor of English and language arts, one supervisor of English (secondary schools), and two supervisors of language arts (elementary schools). The directing supervisor assists in the secondary school program. The directing supervisor is responsible to the assistant superintendent in charge of instruction and the assistant superintendent in charge of research and development.

Pittsburgh: Each supervisor is responsible to the director of instructional services, elementary schools, or to the director of instructional services, secondary schools, depending on the level of

supervisory responsibility. The directors in turn are responsible to the assistant superintendent in charge of instruction.

Baltimore County, Maryland: The county school system makes separate provisions for supervision of English at the secondary and elementary levels.

SECTION 4: Separate Directors for Elementary and Secondary School English

Wachner: I would definitely like to see a recommendation from this conference recognizing the fact that there is a division of responsibility between the supervisor of English at the secondary level and the supervisor of English at the elementary level. The two supervisors should certainly work together to achieve program continuity, but the elementary program in which we teach all the elements within the self-contained classroom is very different from the departmentalized secondary program. Each program needs its own supervisor, two persons who can work along side by side.

This I know to be true: when a K-12 supervisor is appointed, in many cases either a secondary person is sent to supervise elementary teachers, and to get his head cut off, or an elementary person is sent to supervise secondary teachers and to get his head cut off. It happens time after time. I have seen good elementary people go to the secondary schools, where the teachers said, "Look, you don't know what this thing is like"; and good secondary people go to the elementary schools, where the teachers said, "You don't know what this thing is like." And it's true; they don't. Very few specialists at one level know what the other level is like, and for this reason teachers of one level do not have confidence in supervisors from the other. Each level should have its own supervisor especially trained for that level, and the two should work closely together.

SECTION 5: Determining the Number of English Supervisors Needed

Dallam: Pennsylvania loses about 20 percent of its English teachers each year; this means that 20 percent each year will be new teachers. The state knows also that the average new teacher stays only three years in the same system. It seems clear that if a three-year English teacher is to be effective at all, he must be given a strong inservice education program in his first year. The Commonwealth must have a sufficient number of people who are prepared to give these inservice programs on a continuing basis. The average number of new teachers must be considered in determining the number of supervisors needed.

Kell: A system like ours in Baltimore needs a supervisory staff with specialists in all areas of English. We now have in every secondary school a department head who is specially trained and specially chosen by definite criteria which would qualify a supervisor.

SECTION 6: Good Results of Adequate Supervision

Kincaid: We have a good illustration of what results can be obtained when the supervisor-teacher ratio is favorable. In one school system a full-time coordinator was appointed for three elementary buildings which had an average of two classes per grade level and in all about thirty teachers, including kindergarten. Through the efforts of this supervisor this school system has accomplished more in the past four years than any other that I know about in the state of Minnesota.

Mersand: The science program in our school system illustrates this point. We have a director of science with three assistants—one for senior high schools, one for junior high schools, and one for elementary schools. Each senior high school has a science chairman or department head. The director meets with the department heads as needed. He also assumes the responsibility for all the syllabi—there were no recent syllabi in science before the director was appointed. Soon after he was appointed the syllabi began to appear, and tremendous funds began to pour into science from the board of education and other agencies. Because of this director and his numerous assistants the entire science program in New York City has improved. I can see similar advantages for the English field.

Understaffed Supervision

Pumphrey: I keep thinking about classes of 25 pupils for teachers and classes of 100 or more teachers that the supervisor is trying to work with under more difficult conditions. The supervisor's classes are not even gathered together in the same room. The inservice education job is tremendous, and it's growing.

SECTION 7: The Problem of Distances

Greaney: When the school system covers a wide geographical range, as ours does, there are distance problems. A good organization is to have a director who plans the overall program and delegates responsibilities, not to more and more supervisors at the central office, but to assistants or resource people in the various geographical areas. In this way teachers are always close to help and can get it faster and oftener. Of course a hierarchy is established, which is some-

times handicapping, but at least teachers have a chance of getting help more quickly when they need it.

SECTION 8: Status of the English Supervisor

Conferee 1: The position of the English supervisor should rank high enough that his recommendations receive the respect and consideration of others on the staff. His status should be equal to that of any other director. He should rank below the assistant superintendent of instruction, as principals rank below the assistant superintendent of administration. Although in his work with teachers the supervisor of English will probably never need to rely on official status, in his relationships with other staff members and the administration, his rank and his salary give his work significance.

Conferee 2: In our system the supervisors found some time ago that we had to work harder with the principals to effect improvement in the schools than with the teachers. The principals were not willing to listen to a supervisor until he had a salary equal to the principals' salary. Then they would listen. It is very important that the status of the English director or supervisor be dignified by a salary equal to that of the principals with whom he works.

Conferee 3: There should not be too many channels for the English director to go through in order to influence policy or determine a course of action. The next person above the English director should be a superintendent, not another coordinator or consultant.

SECTION 9: Inservice Education

Reeves: The supervisor should provide situations from time to time that strengthen the concept that no teacher is an island. By structured dicussions or by worthwhile group activities, teachers of like interests who are creative and dedicated should be brought together for mutual benefit. They stimulate one another.

However, because English teachers are exceptionally busy and because meetings without a purpose are impossibly dull, the supervisor should wait until a real purpose for such a meeting occurs and then prepare for it with extreme care. Such meetings should be infrequent and they should be challenging to those involved, either with new information or a vital problem to be solved. Their value to the teachers lies both in feeling that they have made a contribution and in seeing their own work in a new perspective.

SECTION 10: Selection and Evaluation of Teachers

White: A supervisor should not be asked or required to rate a teacher. We cannot improve instruction by rating people. The principals are the rating personnel.

Winn: I feel that I am of more service to teachers and have a better rapport with them because I am not a rating official. I am called in from time to time when help is needed, but it is the principal's responsibility to rate.

Grose: But there must be someone to evaluate a teacher's competency in English as well as in teaching. The principal is not always equipped to do this.

Reeves: I rated teachers for two or three years; then the administration decided to save the supervisors' time by relieving us of this responsibility. Now the principals do the rating. I don't think the teachers see any difference. We had no change in rapport at all.

Squire: I hope this conference will advocate that supervisors who have the responsibility for the English program share with the personnel department the responsibility for selecting and assigning the teachers who will teach that program. How they share may vary, but if they do not share at all, let's try to change the system. We take too many risks when the people who teach the programs we are trying to strengthen are selected by personnel specialists and assigned by generalists in education. The English supervisors may not be able to interview all the candidates, but they could let the personnel department know what the needs are and give advice on candidates from time to time.

Bowman: Supervisors could aid in setting up the criteria for employment of teachers of English.

Tangeman: Candidates that seem acceptable to the personnel department may be sent to the supervisor for interview before they are employed. The person who would supervise the teacher in service should be the one to interview him. It is not possible, however, for the supervisor to participate in selection when the personnel director goes to the colleges to find candidates. In such cases the director may have the teacher candidate confer with the supervisor at a later time.

SECTION 11: Improvement of Preservice Education of Teachers

Sisk: It would be a good thing for college teachers to come in and look at the schools they are preparing people to teach in. Supervisors especially need to talk to the professors who teach the college methods courses and tell them the kinds of experience those teachers need to prepare them for a classroom — for instance, what kinds of writing the teachers need training in and what kinds of pupils they must prepare for. And on the other hand I need to have an idea of the kinds of experience the teachers are getting so I can plan my inservice program to supplement the college courses.

Squire: I would like to suggest that one of the reasons why college and university personnel don't visit the high schools very often is that they aren't invited. Perhaps one of the responsibilities of the English supervisor is to see that they are invited at times when people really want them to come and there might be something people want them to do. Professors feel that they really aren't wanted in the high schools and don't want to go wandering in uninvited.

SECTION 12: Cooperation of State Supervisors with Colleges

Squire: At the state level, it seems to me that the supervisor of English ought to have a rather direct and cooperative relationship with the chairman of college English departments and with the English education people. The supervisor or director of the state English program for public schools ought to have at least one meeting a year with the chairmen of all the university and college English departments and English education professors. The meeting should be called by the state supervisor. I am sure this doesn't happen very often, but I think it should.

SECTION 13: Preparation of Supervisors

Squire: The supervisor must continue his education just as the teacher does.

Gill: He certainly must. The supervisor should have an educational background in every respect equal to that of the teacher, and preferably more than that of the teacher. Something must be done to help the supervisors continually upgrade themselves. They must be *enabled* to keep their growth up with the growth of teachers. The image of the supervisor in some places is already much in need of change. A survey made recently attempted to find out what the superintendents and other administrators thought the supervisors did. They thought the supervisors did nothing except write reports.

Another matter that requires attention is the preparation of new English supervisors. We cannot simply take a good teacher and expect him to be a good supervisor. Although a good supervisor must be a good teacher, he must also have the right kind of leadership qualities. The present supervisors should identify these teachers who seem to have potential for leadership as early as possible.

SECTION 14: Principals on Curriculum Committees

Sisk: It is very important that principals serve on curriculum committees. Some systems regard the principal as the key person in the supervision of his school. English is a highly specialized subject.

If a principal is not a specialist in English himself he has little basis upon which to evaluate the English work. Experience on the curriculum committee would help him in supervising English.

SECTION 15: Background Needed by Elementary Teachers

Olson: Should we recommend what proportion of the elementary teacher's preparation should be in the English language arts? Twenty-four percent of the teaching time is devoted to language arts, but only 8 percent of preparation time.

Tuttle: A formula would be difficult because some college courses are not directed particularly to any specific end. There are many courses that cut across all areas.

Bennett: Should the elementary teacher have a major?

Dyer: Every elementary teacher should have the general background recommended by this conference whether or not he has a major. Majors would, however, afford the elementary schools a spread of specialists whose consultant services would be valuable.

SECTION 16: Survey Courses in Literature

Joll: Teachers must have knowledge of American and English literature, but I have a low opinion of survey courses. To me a survey course means sending the student jet-propelled through the whole literature so that he doesn't even get to see what it really looks like.

SECTION 17: Study of Logic

Zollinger: The study of logic seems to be an important part of teacher education. We have found in our school system within the last two or three years that introducing work on speech analysis, taught by speech teachers, has done wonders for expository composition as well as for speech. The secret of the success seems to be that the teachers introduce the nature of proof. Some logic is included in rhetoric courses.

SECTION 18: Practice Teaching

Joll: Practice teaching should be more effective than it is. Critic teachers should be more carefully selected, and there should be time for more of the old-fashioned demonstration work. The teacher should prepare a lesson and teach it while the practice teachers watch. Then teacher and practice teachers should go over the plan and the performance step by step and discuss what was done and why. Practice teachers must see approaches and techniques in operation to appreciate them.

Wachner: I am becoming increasingly concerned that some universities are limiting the student's practice teaching experience to ten weeks. We feel that a secondary English teacher should have one period of teaching in the junior high school and another in the senior high. Furthermore they should have experience in teaching students from more than one socioeconomic level.

Grose: Practice teaching is often of such a brief period that the teacher may get experience sometimes in teaching only one aspect of the English program, perhaps literature. It should be extended or arranged to offer opportunity for practice in all aspects of English.

SECTION 19: Continuing Education

Thomas: Some of the best education a teacher gets is from association with his colleagues—principals, other teachers, and supervisors.

Owens: Our inservice education has some interesting features. We have our own TV station, which has been useful. When we bring an outstanding scholar to the city, it is too cumbersome to get all the teachers together to hear him. He speaks to them by TV.

We have too an unusual visiting program. Through the auspices of the state university we have set up an exchange between university teachers of freshman English and twelfth grade teachers who prepare students for the universities. This plan has been in operation for several semesters and some of our teachers have visited all the state universities and colleges and a few out-of-state institutions.

Knappenberger: One of the most successful things that we do is to hold a two-week conference at the close of school every other year. Attendance is voluntary.

Surveys taken early in the year determine the areas in which teachers are interested. Then leaders who are authorities in their fields are brought in to conduct sessions resembling seminars in those areas. In addition to working with a leader in one field, participants have an opportunity to hear all the leaders speak in assemblies that are held daily. Teachers pay an enrollment fee of $25. By arrangement with the University of Tulsa they can earn two hours of graduate credit.

Teachers' Manuals

Wachner: It seems incongruous that we are getting teachers who have had four years of university training but who ask for teachers' editions of textbooks with questions printed in red and answers in black. I wonder if we have provided too many crutches for teachers.

Joll: I have no quarrel with teachers' editions and manuals that go along with textbooks. I think, however, that we must help some teachers understand that everything suggested in the teacher's manual does not have to be done. For instance, some manuals suggest individualized reading programs for students. I believe in individualized reading programs for students, but only in the hands of seasoned and superior teachers. Most teachers in their early years are not able to handle such projects. They need some aids to lean on. Our inservice programs should help them outgrow this need.

Freeman: We must remember also that a beginning teacher must do a great deal of developing before he becomes the professional person which he is expected to be, and he cannot accomplish this development all at once. He must have help.

Discussion Meetings

Reeves: Although most of the beginning teachers have had instruction in techniques in college classes as well as in practice teaching, there is value for them in meeting to discuss techniques or to hear them discussed after they have worked independently in the classroom. However, if no time except the after-school hours is provided for these meetings, there should be very few of them.

Experimentation

Hook: I think experimentation in schools should be encouraged. We should point up the salutary effect of even informal projects.

Pumphrey: And supervisors should be given a budget to provide for such experimentation. They are usually forced to meet the general needs for materials first and then if any money is left, provide extra materials for experimentation. We do have a budget for extra materials, and it has stimulated a great deal of experimentation—one successful project encouraging other teachers to try out new ideas. These efforts have led teachers to request workshops.

Reeves: Experimentation has a vitalizing effect on the total English program. Although to the teacher English has perennial glamor, to the student it may at times pale before the marvels of modern science and the esoteric vocabulary of the new mathematics. New significance may be added to English if the student becomes involved in the study in a new way.

Hogan: One problem in getting research started is finding a sophisticated person to serve as adviser. We should stimulate experimentation, but we should also provide guidance in designing the research project and in evaluating the results.

Fleming: One of the important duties of the supervisor is to help teachers who wish to engage in action research to discover what research has been done in the areas of their interests. The supervisor should also help work out the research designs, methods of record keeping, and reports of findings.

Hook: I am apprehensive about the feeling that action research in the classroom costs money and about the necessity to set up rigid requirements for the undertaking. If teachers have to read nineteen books before they start an experiment, they won't start.

Kincaid: There are ways to evaluate experimentation other than formal tests or statistical methods. Just observing and recording changes in student behavior can be a valid way to assess an experiment.

Courses for Salary Increases

Grose: I suggest that we recommend here that inservice courses taken for salary increases be taken in the teacher's teaching field. Before we made such a specification in our system, our English teachers took counseling, administration, and whatever. Now they take English.

Olson: Would you say also that a secondary English teacher whose minor is English should take English courses to build his background?

Squire: The minor in English should move over into his major field to teach, unless he is willing to prepare himself in English. Twenty-five percent of the people currently teaching English are majors in other subjects. They are teaching out of their major fields. There is something wrong with a teacher who doesn't prepare himself in the subject which he teaches—who stays in English yet when he goes back to the university takes his courses in some other field.

Olson: Should we not recommend that a person who has not prepared to teach English and is not able to evaluate themes, teach poetry, and understand literature cannot qualify for a salary increment unless he takes English courses that qualify him in respect to his needs? English is the only field that has not taken such a stand.

Inservice Education Problems

Owens: A problem of inservice education which I think does not generally receive enough attention is special services to the people who teach the basic track, or bottom stratum. They need a great deal of help, and it isn't often available to them.

Brooks: Another baffling problem for both teachers and supervisors is how to teach standard speech patterns to children from other

cultures who have learned substandard English. We need help in adapting the techniques of teaching English as a foreign language for use with these children. To some of them English is a foreign language.

SECTION 20: Teachers' Need for Encouragement

Reeves: Teaching can be a lonely work in a professional sense if no peer of the teacher cares whether his work is well done or not. Even adults need at times to feel that they can say, "Look, Ma, no hands!"

SECTION 21: English Department Chairmen

Jacobs: One of my major concerns as a state supervisor of English is the small degree of responsibility delegated to elementary school grade level chairmen and secondary school department chairmen. Some schools seem reluctant to give chairmen any responsibility. In one system, however, we have made progress. We have helped the board of education to determine duties and methods of selection of high school English department chairmen and to determine the supplements to their salaries. We hope to extend these guides to include elementary school grade level chairmen.

Mersand: Our department heads or department chairmen conduct two very valuable inscrvice education activities. One of them is the monthly department conference, and the other is the department head's visits to classes.

The monthly conference is not a monologue. It has detailed agenda which usually include some problem to be discussed by members of the department. The agenda are distributed in advance so that preparation can be made for the discussion. The conference has proved a very good way to bring important matters to the attention of the department.

The department head is required by the board of education to visit every substitute and every teacher on temporary license three times a year, every probationary teacher once a semester, and every permanently appointed teacher once a year. The visit must be a full period in length, and must be followed by a full-period private conference. If the teacher objects to the judgment of the head concerning the first visit, a second visit may be made and a second conference held. Reports on all visits and conferences are written in detail. I believe that teachers are helped by these visits, and by the availability of the head when he is needed. Departments heads teach only one class and have six periods for their supervisory duties.

J. Wilson: I hope that this conference will recommend that the department heads with the individual schools be chosen carefully enough

and be given time and recognition enough that they will be capable of performing the duties that Dr. Mersand describes. If the department head is not given time for supervision, of course these functions are impossible for him.

I hope too that we will recommend released time, or summer pay, for teachers to work on committees. We do not have enough teachers involved in curriculum development because of lack of time.

SECTION 22: Time for Inservice Education

Mersand: Tired teachers do not teach and tired teachers do not learn to teach better. The best time for inservice education is when the teachers are not engaged in the teaching process.

Freeman: Georgia has a ten-month contract for teachers. Since the enactment of the first Minimum Foundation Law in 1948 this has included 180 days in the classroom with boys and girls, 10 days for inservice training, and 10 days of paid vacation. Generally, one week was spent in a preplanning program and one week in postplanning. Some systems used part of these 10 days of inservice education as institutes held during the school year. At these times the pupils stayed home and teachers worked, with the assistance of consultants, on problems which the teachers themselves selected. In 1964 the legislature enacted a New Minimum Foundation Program of Education Act, which specifies that services rendered by teachers be not less than 200 working days. This was interpreted by the Georgia State Board of Education to require not less than 180 days of teaching and 20 days of inservice. The use that is being made of these additional 10 days varies from system to system. In some cases, a two-week workshop is held in the summer and all teachers not attending summer school are required to attend. In other instances the additional days are established as institute days during the school year. Any use of the 20 days of inservice which is approved by the State Department of Education is permissible.

Jacobs: Florida teachers are employed for ten months, one month for noninstructional duties. Two weeks prior to school opening, all teachers report for inservice education. The secondary teachers study English every year; the elementary teachers study different subjects in different years. During the school year, following each grading period, one day is reserved for inservice education, and after the close of school a full week is devoted to educational programs. This practice has been most helpful.

Joll: Most of our towns in Connecticut allow four professional days a year for inservice education. Our state council is attempting to

locate schools with promising practices and interesting programs so that teachers may plan visits to some of them. Our towns also make available at least four half-days a year when supervisors and teachers work together designing inservice programs for the following year. This plan results in strong teacher support for the programs.

Zollinger: Our six-week summer workshops in 1961 and 1962 for high school teachers, with pay, has had a tremendous impact for the improvement of English teaching in Portland.

Felder: In our system that first week before school is used for planned departmental workshops. These have been very successful.

In the English workshop in 1962 the three visiting consultants included the president of NCTE and two past presidents, each of the three representing a major area of the high school English program. It was indeed a challenging experience. The consultants gave prepared talks at the large sessions and worked informally with smaller discussion groups. The teachers showed great enthusiasm for the program of the four-day workshop.

Kincaid: I am recommending a four-day teaching week for secondary English teachers in Minnesota, all teachers free on the same day so that at least half of that day can be used each week for inservice education and cross-fertilization of ideas. English teachers should meet their students four days each week, and on the fifth day the students should be placed in reading rooms, study rooms, or the library for independent study — to do some learning on their own. If we fully recognize the importance, the complexity, and the immensity of the job of inservice education before an English staff can begin to work effectively on curriculum development, we should realize that a common free period once a week would be insufficient to do more than scratch the surface. About all we could say for that amount of time for inservice education is that it might reduce the rate at which the teachers fall behind.

Also I am recommending an eleven-month contract so that the summer can be spent on depth research. If summers are used for intensive inservice education without interruption by classes and day-to-day preparation, then the one-half day each week could be used as a follow-up on the summer program. English teachers could use the half-day sessions for evaluating the progress they are making in the application of concepts developed during the summer. They could share with each other week by week what they are learning about what works in what ways at different levels. Also, they would be gaining insights into what they would need to concentrate on during the following summer.

J. Wilson: Teachers in California have twelve-month contracts.

Hogan: In advocating a twelve-month contract for teachers we should make it clear that we are not thinking of simply dividing the pay for nine and one half months' work into twelve installments; we mean additional pay for the additional months of service. And we should make it clear also that this kind of contract does not constitute a salary raise; it pays teachers only for extra time required of them in lieu of income many would be receiving from other sources during summer months.

School time can be made available for inservice education. I visited a school recently in which the principal does not begin to plan the master teaching schedule until he knows not only what the instructional program will be but also what the inservice education program will be. He then schedules the teachers so that those engaged in the same inservice program have the same free period in the day. The day is six periods long and English teachers have four classes of thirty pupils each. When I was there the common free period that all English teachers shared was being used for a series of twelve meetings on the teaching of reading, for which competent consultants were employed. This is one way in which school time can be made available for inservice education.

Haven: I taught for several years in an elementary school in the Chicago Northshore area on a twelve-month contract with a four-week vacation. For a six-week period every summer we had four alternatives: (1) to work in the inservice education program of the public schools, (2) to travel and enjoy opportunities not available during the school year, (3) to attend summer school for college credits, and (4) to teach needed classes for children. During the regular school year on Tuesday afternoons all children were dismissed at 2 o'clock. Parents were encouraged to use this time to take children for dental appointments, music and dancing lessons, scout meetings, etc. Teachers used this time for planning or for various types of inservice education. This arrangement worked most satisfactorily. It could be adapted to other situations.

Rinker: I quite agree that the teacher on tenure should be employed on a twelve-month basis with one month of vacation. But I think it is useless to devote so much time to supervision or articulation between the levels in the schools if in so doing we rob the individual teacher of time to refill his own reservoirs. The English teacher cannot be handled as one would handle a technician. He must have time to refresh himself, and he doen't do this by working a longer school day and giving all his weekends to educational conferences. He must have time to invite his own soul. This he may do in an art gallery, in a concert hall, or in a library. At this time the greatest fault in English

teaching in this country lies in the fact that the people who are doing the teaching of English are not themselves having any learning experiences that are challenging or in any way comparable with the experiences their students are having. Sometimes as I stand before conferences of English teachers I have an impulse to ask. "Have you this year read anything as difficult, as challenging, as exacting for you as what you are giving your students who for the first time are encountering the sonnet or a Shakespeare play?" And as I look at their faces I know that in almost every case they are not. They are teaching the things that they were taught in high school, but they are not reading. This is the crux of our problem. Teachers must have time to further their own education.

Jewett: Teachers must have time to enjoy a little freedom along intellectual lines. One of the ironies of our society today is that the laboring person has more and more free time and the intellectual has less and less. Some school systems are granting sabbatical leave for a year to teachers who have taught five or more years. The sabbatical affords them an opportunity to extend their teaching backgrounds.

SECTION 23: Curriculum Evaluation and Change

Grose: An overall English curriculum committee to be responsible for the continuing study of curriculum trends is helpful. Though we do not write a new guide every year, we do revise our curriculum frequently, and we need a committee to be alert to what is going on in the field.

Sisk: There is some danger in changing the curriculum too frequently; the teachers feel insecure. And sometimes a long period of preparation is needed before a change can be made. We cannot go ahead of the teachers' ability to become involved. For instance, it takes a long period of preparation to introduce the new grammars into the general curriculum. In our system we have been working toward this goal for several years, but this year for the first time we have a curriculum committee on structural linguistics.

Woolf: Implementation of new curriculums should include inservice education of teachers in accepting and using the guides. The real implementation, however, is in the classroom after the door is shut.

Olson: One effect of a curriculum which we hope for is that it promotes diversity within unity. A good curriculum provides general or basic restrictions, and within these limits frees the teacher to be creative.

Gaining Support of the Board of Education for Curriculum Change

Joll: I have been the chairman of a board of education for many

years. Every month I have made a point of inviting representatives from some subject field to come in and inform the board of what is going on in the field and what the needs are. English is one of the areas the board has seen no reason to cut back. In fact, it has wanted to make additions; it knows what the English program is and approves it. When school boards are elected, we cannot count on getting new members who already understand the teaching problems. The board must be kept informed. Step 1[1] is terrific.

Greaney: In Montgomery County the supervisors always make an annual report to the board and sometimes make other reports. There is a superintendent's advisory committee on English that also makes a report. We have found it very helpful to keep the board informed. Since it has always known what we were doing, the board has been very generous in providing for our needs.

Mersand: This is an excellent recommendation.[2] The Department of Education in New York is now in the process of revising the statewide course of study. Their first step was to invite, not specialists in English, but a dramatist, a TV commentator, and a public relations consultant — people who are concerned with the spoken and written word — to give their concepts of what a good English program should be. The second round of consultations was with a group of educators brought in from over the nation. The third round was with members of the State Education Department. This recommendation — namely, that many people should be brought in to give advice on the best kind of course of study in English — is suitable for state, county, and city school systems.

SECTION 24: Varying Procedures in Curriculum Development

Hook: When the curriculum guides have different purposes the procedures are sometimes different. May I describe briefly two different procedures in curriculum development? One I think would be applicable to almost any school system; the other is one that we have used recently at the state level in Illinois.

The first is the procedure in the Nebraska Curriculum Development Center. The project in this center encompasses grades K-13. Two and a half years ago teachers from grades one, four, seven, and ten met in separate groups and with the university sponsors worked on programs that they thought would be particularly appropriate for those grade levels. Those programs were tested during the following school year. The same group was brought back a year later to evaluate

[1] "Step 1" refers to "A Recommended Procedure for a Major English Curriculum Revision," p. 29.

[2] The reference is to "Step 1," p. 29.

the results and make the necessary revisions. In the second summer, teachers from grades two, five, eight, and eleven met and worked on their grade curriculums. Of course there were tie-ins so the grades would not go in different directions. The next summer another group of grades followed the same procedures. Every summer there is action, and in this manner a coherent and consistent program is being developed at the Nebraska Center. While some parts are being tested, others are being retested. I think this same procedure could be worked out in an individual school system. This is one way to keep a certain amount of cohesion in the program. The teachers are paid for their summer work.

The second procedure I wish to describe resulted a few months ago in one of a number of curriculum guides which Illinois has recently produced. This procedure was quite different from the Nebraska plan because the philosophy was different. We felt in Illinois that the function of the state guide was primarily to educate and reeducate. It was to bring to the attention of teachers who perhaps had not been in a college classrooom for a number of years the developments that had recently appeared in the profession; it was to give the new teacher information about current trends, emphases, and activities; it was to acquaint all teachers with some of the far outreaches of our profession —the experimental programs that are now going on. It is not concerned with what one does specifically in grade three or grade five, but rather with guidelines and information that should be useful to all those teachers. I mention both these programs to illustrate the point that what we do with curriculum development must be in terms of our particular needs. The Nebraska guides and our state of Illinois guides are quite different in organization and in results, because they differ in purpose.

SECTION 25: Elementary-school Curriculum

Dyer: Specialists in the various elementary subjects should get together with colleges and take a hard look at the entire elementary curriculum. It is critically overcrowded.

SECTION 26: Selection of Instructional Materials

Greaney: Inservice education must precede selection of materials; otherwise the teachers on the committee may reject good new materials in favor of what they are accustomed to.

Mersand: When a course of study is developed, the committees must have in mind materials that are available to implement it, else they cannot teach it. But the course of study is not built upon the materials themselves. It is built and then selections are made from the various materials available for it.

Rinker: I urge that we look at instructional materials with the idea that we want only the best and that we will approach the great books in different and appropriate ways at different teaching levels. I am a little annoyed that so many college teachers bewail the fact that schools have ruined certain books and that they can't teach them because we have already taught them in the high school. High schools make the same complaint against the junior high and elementary schools. There is something wrong with our teaching if, no matter what the grade and ability level, we must always teach a novel or a Shakespearean play in one particular fashion.

Experimentation with Textbooks

Greaney: You never know whether a textbook is going to be a good tool until it has been tried out in the classroom.

Repetitiveness of Textbooks

Grose: Should we not voice a protest against the repetitive nature of language textbooks? Every language textbook from grade 7 though 12 has practically the same material.

Reeves: I've been told that this repetition will continue until teachers begin to complain. Publishers, of course, don't want to omit anything that someone will want; they have to sell books.

McNeely: It is the teachers who demand that every book in the series contain everything. I have seen teachers on adoption committees condemn books and prevent their adoption because some item was omitted that they wanted to teach. Publishing houses are business concerns. They have to sell books to exist.

Mulvaney: Do you think the teachers are demanding this kind of book because it is what they are used to? Maybe we haven't done enough to try to set up a sequential program which would stress attention to fewer items within a given year. Admittedly, this is a somewhat artificial arrangement, but it might mean that by narrowing the range we could apply what is taught in communication situations which would seem more real to the students. Do you think if teachers had more help with using varied materials, or assistance in concentrating on a limited body of content that there would be less tendency to want *everything* in *every book* of a series?

McNeely: No, I think the situation grows out of a feeling of responsibility that teachers have: "If I don't teach this whole body of knowledge, the child will never get it."

New Teaching Materials

Hook: It would be helpful to set up a curriculum center where

samples of materials are housed and made available for review by committees and other teachers. It would also be helpful to give one teacher in a school a released period to keep up with those materials as they become available and to keep the other teachers informed about them.

Rinker: It is important that teachers have the benefit of new inservice education materials, and someone should have the responsibility for knowing what is available. Perhaps there should be a teacher research assistant in every school. If the normal teaching load is four classes, the research teacher could have three classes and use the extra time to keep abreast of what is being published and to make it accessible to the teachers concerned. This would be a good investment of money, and it would certainly improve the efficiency of the English Department.

The Commission on English has been putting money into kinescopes—30-minute films addressed to particular problems, for instance Walker Gibson on the "speaking voice." We have 10 films in current use, and they are shown in almost 500 meetings a month. There are schools as far away as Honolulu and Alaska that schedule one kinescope each month. In time the 50 prints of each kine may have to be increased to 100. Some of the larger school systems have bought copies. We don't offer them for sale, but are willing to sell copies. Several cities have used the series over educational TV.[1]

We plan to add other kinescopes to this series during the current school year.

Greaney: We show these films in various areas of the county. Teachers attend on a voluntary basis, and attendance usually runs to about 100. We liked Walker Gibson's lecture so much we tried it with twelfth grade students and were pleased with their reaction.

SECTION 27: Teaching Assignments

Hook: A young teacher came to me and said, "I'm resigning."

I asked why.

"Because I have been teaching five classes of slow students."

It is very important that schools do not assume that slow students should be assigned to the new teachers and bright college-bound students to the experienced teachers.

Thomas: There is reasonable doubt that new teachers should be assigned to exceptional classes at either end of the ability scale. Unless a beginning teacher comes with special training for teaching slow

[1] For information write to Commission on English, CEEB, 687 Boylston Street, Boston, Mass.

learners or students of superior ability, it seems better to assign him to classes in the regular program.

SECTION 28: Compensation for Extra Duties

Conferee 1: We should make a special recommendation about such assignments as the school paper, the yearbook, and the school play. They are usually considered by administrators to be the special province of the English department, and often they are extracurricular activities. They take much more time than some other activities and ought to be counted in the teaching load. They should be compensated for in the teacher's program.

Conferee 2: In some of our towns athletic coaches are paid extra. Producing the yearbook or the senior play requires as much time as coaching basketball, and sometimes more.

Conferee 3: Some schools give athletic coaches, and also English teachers who have these heavy extracurricular responsibilities, a compensatory period. That seems to be more satisfactory than extra pay.

Conferee 4: The teacher's day is already too full before the yearbook is added. Something must give; time must be taken from the classwork to give to the yearbook. Extra pay for doing the yearbook is very helpful to the teacher personally, but it doesn't compensate the reduced time the teacher has for them. If the English teacher must do the yearbook, the classes fare better if he is given compensatory time rather than extra pay.

THE CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS[1]

ERIC R. BABER
Assistant Commissioner, Division of Elementary and Secondary Education
U.S. Office of Education
Washington, D.C.

ROBERT A. BENNETT
Specialist in Language Arts
San Diego City Schools
San Diego, Calif.

WAYNE S. BOWMAN
Supervisor of English
State Board of Education
Richmond, Va.

SUE M. BRETT
Specialist in English
U.S. Office of Education
Washington, D.C.

CHARLOTTE BROOKS
Supervising Director of English
Public Schools of the District of Columbia
Washington, D.C.

MARTHA J. COTTRELL
Supervisor of Instruction
Kanawha County Schools
Charleston, W. Va.

WILLIAM MORGAN DALLAM
Adviser in English
State Department of Public Instruction
Harrisburg, Pa.

DOROTHY DAVIDSON
Chief Consultant in English
State Education Agency
Austin, Tex.

HORTENSIA DYER
Director, Elementary Education
Columbus Public Schools
Columbus, Ohio

VERDA EVANS
Directing Supervisor of English and Language Arts
Cleveland Public Schools
Cleveland, Ohio

MIRIAM T. FELDER
Consultant in Language Arts
Fulton County Board of Education
Atlanta, Ga.

JOHN HURT FISHER
Executive Secretary, Modern Language Association of America
New York, N.Y.

ROBERT S. FLEMING
Assistant Commissioner of Education
State Department of Education
Trenton, N.J.

JANE H. FRANSETH
Specialist in Rural Education
U.S. Office of Education
Washington, D.C.

BERNICE FREEMAN
Instructional Supervisor
Troup County Board of Education
La Grange, Ga.

MARGARET GILL
Executive Secretary, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (NEA)
Washington, D.C.

ELIZABETH GRAF
Director Elementary Education
Pittsburgh Public Schools
Pittsburgh, Pa.

KATHERINE B. GREANEY
Supervisor of English
Montgomery County Public Schools
Rockville, Md.

[1]Positions and titles given are those held at the time of the conference.

LOIS M. GROSE
Senior Supervisor of English
Pittsburgh Public Schools
Pittsburgh, Pa.

DORIS V. GUNDERSON
Research Coordinator, Project English
U.S. Office of Education
Washington, D.C.

JULIA M. HAVEN
Specialist in Language Arts
U.S. Office of Education
Washington, D.C.

ROBERT F. HOGAN
Associate Executive Secretary
National Council of Teachers of English
Champaign, Ill.

J. N. HOOK
Professor of English
University of Illinois
Urbana, Ill.

MILDRED HOYLE
Supervisor of Elementary Education
Board of Education of Prince George's County
Upper Marlboro, Md.

J. DAN HULL
Director, Instructional Programs Branch
U.S. Office of Education
Washington, D.C.

PAUL H. JACOBS
Consultant in Language Arts
State Department of Education
Tallahassee, Fla.

ARNO J. JEWETT
Specialist in English
U.S. Office of Education
Washington, D.C.

LEONARD W. JOLL
Chairman, Department of Elementary Education
University of Hartford
Hartford, Conn.

DOROTHY KELL
Principal, Western High School
Baltimore, Md.

FRANCIS KEPPEL
U.S. Commissioner of Education
U.S. Office of Education
Washington, D.C.

GERALD L. KINCAID
Consultant, Language Arts
State Department of Education
St. Paul, Minn.

DOROTHY KNAPPENBERGER
Supervisor, Secondary English
Tulsa Public Schools
Tulsa, Okla.

REVEREND C. ALBERT KOOB, O. PRAEM.
Associate Secretary, Secondary Schools Department
The National Catholic Educational Association
Washington, D.C.

JOHN F. KOURMADAS
Director of Editorial Services
National Association of Secondary-School Principals
Washington, D.C.

HELEN K. MACKINTOSH
Chief, Elementary Schools Section
U.S. Office of Education
Washington, D.C.

LAVINIA M. McNEELY
Supervisor, English and Language Arts
State Department of Education
Baton Rouge, La.

MABLE O. MELBY
Consultant in Curriculum
Minneapolis Public Schools
Minneapolis, Minn.

JOSEPH MERSAND
Chairman, English Department
Jamaica High School
Jamaica, N.Y.

J. E. MILLER
Assistant Superintendent
State Department of Public Instruction
Raleigh, N.C.

IRIS MULVANEY
Coordinator, Language Arts
Tucson Public Schools
Tucson, Ariz.

JOAN PIERCE NEWMAN
Supervisor of English
State Department of Public Instruction
Raleigh, N.C.

HELEN F. OLSON
Director of English Language Arts
Seattle School District #1
Seattle, Wash.

JACK OWENS
Supervisor of Language Arts
Des Moines Public Schools
Des Moines, Iowa

OVID F. PARODY
Chief, Secondary Schools Section
U.S. Office of Education
Washington, D.C.

EVA PUMPHREY
Director of Curriculum
Anne Arundel County Board of Education
Annapolis, Md.

RUTH REEVES
Supervisor of English
Houston Independent School District
Houston Tex,

SISTER MARY RICHARDINE, B.V.M.
Associate Secretary, Elementary Schools Department
The National Catholic Educational Association
Washington, D.C.

FLOYD RINKER
Executive Secretary
Commission on English, CEEB
Boston, Mass.

JEAN SISK
Supervisor, Senior High School English
Board of Education of Baltimore County
Towson, Md.

MARY S. SNOUFFER
Supervisor of English
Board of Education of Prince George's County
Upper Marlboro, Md.

JAMES R. SQUIRE
Executive Secretary, National Council of Teachers of English
Champaign, Ill.

ERWIN R. STEINBERG
Coordinator, Project English
U.S. Office of Education.
Washington, D.C.

HELEN TANGEMAN
Supervisor, Secondary English
Cincinnati Public Schools
Cincinnati, Ohio

HAZEL THOMAS
Coordinator, Language Art-
Milwaukee Public S
Milwaukee, Wis.

DONALD R. TUTTLE
Specialist for College English
U.S. Office of Education
Washington, D.C.

CLARENCE W. WACHNER
Divisional Director
Department of Language Education
Detroit Public Schools
Detroit, Mich.

ELIZABETH S. WHITE
Supervisor of Language Arts
Dade County Public Schools
Miami, Fla.

JEAN A. WILSON
Supervisor, Language Arts, Secondary Schools
Oakland Public Schools
Oakland, Calif.

ROSEMARY G. WILSON
Assistant Director of Curriculum
School District of Philadelphia
Philadelphia, Pa.

JUANITA WINN
Supervising Director, Elementary Education
Public Schools of the District of Columbia
Washington, D.C.

LEONARD WOOLF
Supervisor of English
Anne Arundel County Board of Education
Annapolis, Md.

SARA YUDLSON
Elementary Supervisor
Baltimore Public Schools
Baltimore, Md.

MARIAN ZOLLINGER
Supervisor of Language Arts
Portland Public Schools
Portland, Ore.

Chairmen of Conference Discussion Groups:
Joseph A. Bennett; Clarence W. Wachner

Discussion Leaders:
William M. Dallam; Hortensia Dyer; Verda Evans; Katherine B. Greaney; Leonard W. Joll; Gerald L. Kincaid; Lavinia M. McNeely; Joseph Mersand; Iris Mulvaney; Ruth Reeves; Jean Sisk; Mary S. Snouffer; Helen Tangeman; Hazel Thomas; Elizabeth S. White; Jean A. Wilson

Discussion Editors:
Wayne S. Bowman; Charlotte Brooks; Martha J. Cottrell; Miriam T. Felder; Elizabeth Graf; Mildred Hoyle; Dorothy Kell; Dorothy Knappenberger; Mabel O. Melby; Joan P. Newman; Jack Owens; Eva Pumphrey; Rosemary G. Wilson; Juanita Winn; Leonard Woolf; Sara Yudlson