DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 105 468 CS 201 992

TITLE The Teaching of English in the Seventies; A Report on the Annual Conference (3rd, Athens, Ga., July 25-26, 1974).

INSTITUTION Georgia Council of Teachers of English, Rome.; Georgia Univ., Athens. Georgia Center for Continuing Education.

PUB DATE Jul 74

NOTE 69p.; Best Copy Available

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$3.32 PLUS POSTAGE

DESCRIPTORS *Annual Reports; *Conference Reports; Educational Accountability; English Education; *English Instruction; Group Discussion; Language Arts; Political Attitudes; *Teaching

ABSTRACT

The four primary purposes of the Annual Conference for the Teaching of English in Georgia are to bring together a broad spectrum of teachers and administrators concerned with the teaching of reading, English, and the language arts; to provide opportunities for teachers to talk to other teachers in order to share their problems and their successes; to bring to the conference qualified persons for a discussion of the political and social pressures that affect teachers and teaching in general; and to encourage the exchange of ideas through small group sessions and the exploration of available resources. This document contains a speech by Stephen Judy entitled "Teaching English in the 70's: Prospects and Priorities"; an excerpt from a discussion on accountability, competency-based education, and politics; reports from the group sessions; a shorter speech by Judy; and comments and suggestions from the conference participants. (TS)

ERIC

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED105468

A Report of The Third
Annual Conference on

THE TEACHING OF ENGLISH IN THE SEVENTIES

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

July 25-26, 1974 · The University of Georgia Center for Continuing Education, Athens

CS 201 992

ED105468

A REPORT OF

THE [illegible] ANNUAL CONFERENCE

ON

THE TEACHING OF ENGLISH

Sponsored by

The Georgia Council of Teachers of English

The Language Education Department
College of Education
University of Georgia

Center for Continuing Education
University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia
July 25, 26, 1974

CONFERENCE COMMITTEES

[illegible] Officers, Georgia Council of Teachers of English

James Brewbaker - President
Valerie Lockett - Vice-President
Ruth Parnell - Secretary
William Clark - Treasurer
Robert [illegible]outhit - NCTE Liaison Office

Advisory Planning Committee

Juanita Abernathy
Jackie Carmichael
Mattie Eley
Annie Givens
Mary Ann [illegible]inely
Carol [illegible]aman
Luetta Milledge
Moses Norman
Huey Owens
Tom Shoemate
Eunice Sims
Ralph Spillman
Mary Barbara Tate
Ramon Veal

Mary J. Tingle - Coordinating Chairman
[illegible]an Flowers - Hospitality Chairman
Alvin Bailey - Exhibits Chairman
Valerie Lockett and Emily Gregory
Program Co-chairman

CONTENTS

Preface -- v

Acknowledgements ---vii

Teaching English in the 70's: Prospects and Priorities
by Stephen Judy -- 1

Accountability, Competency-Based Education, and Politics
Excerpts from Panel Discussion ------------------------------ 13

Group Session Reports
Specific Topic : #1 -- #15 ----------------------------------- 25

General Topics: #16 -- #25 ----------------------------------- 43

Second Thoughts from the Keynoter, Stephen Judy ------------------ 57

Comments and Suggestions from Conference Participants ------------ 60

Announcement of the 1975 Conference ------------------------------ 62

A Note from the President of GCTE, James M. Brewbaker ------------ 63

Application Form for GCTE Membership ----------------------------- 63

PREFACE

As this report of the Third Annual Conference for the Teaching of English in Georgia comes to you, plans for the 1975 Conference are already well underway. Indeed plans for next summer's conference began with the suggestions and comments given by those of you who attended the 1974 Conference.

Perhaps at this point it is appropriate to remind you of the purpose and nature of this particular conference. The idea of an annual conference in Georgia came from leaders in the Georgia Council of Teachers of English during the annual National Council convention in Atlanta in 1970. The Language Education Department of the College of Education, University of Georgia, agreed to joint sponsorship and appropriate committees were named. The First Annual Conference convened in July of 1972. Whatever success the conference has had -- and it has been successful beyond the expectations of those who initiated it -- is a result of the active, sincere involvement of the participants. And this involvement has affirmed the rightness of the rationale that has guided planning for the conferences thus far.

First, the conference should bring together a broad spectrum of teachers and administrators concerned with the teaching of reading, English, and the language arts. Thus, some sessions should deal with issues, principles, and theories pertinent to all levels -- pre-school, elementary, secondary, and post-secondary. Through the years this effort to promote discussion among participants whose points of view and day-to-day tasks vary widely should make it a positive force for improving articulation in English curricula throughout the state.

Second, because the majority of those attending the conference are classroom teachers, its program should provide opportunities for teachers to talk to teachers, to share their problems and their successes. Small group sessions in which teachers demonstrate or present innovative materials or practices and then participate in the ensuing discussion is one way of meeting this need to exchange and extend promising ideas.

Third, for at least one session, the conference should bring in "outsiders" qualified to discuss the political and social pressures that affect the context in which we teach. We are doomed to futile discussion, to talking to ourselves only, unless we actively seek to deepen our own understanding of societal pressures and to make "outsiders" more knowledgeable about our concerns.

Fourth, since a major purpose of the conference is to encourage the exchanging of ideas among participants, the program will not follow the speaker-who-lectures-to-attenders model. General sessions will be limited, leaving much time for small group sessions and for exploring available resources. Moreover, the key speaker will be asked to observe and participate in the program throughout the conference and in the final session give a brief evaluative summary of his observations and impressions.

These then are the broad guidelines that have shaped the conferences thus far. It seems to us important that you understand them and evaluate this report in light of them and that as we work and plan together for another year you decide what modifications need to be made. Your involvement indicates that you regard this as your conference. It is important that you continue to make it serve your needs, for as long as it does, it will remain a viable, stimulating experience for those who attend.

Mary J. Tingle
Coordinating Chairman

Emily B. Gregory
Program Co-Chairman

ERIC Full Text Provided by ERIC

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Credit for the success of the Third Annual Conference for the Teaching of English goes to

- The participants who came with significant questions to discuss and with ideas and interests to share
- The leadership teams that directed and contributed much to the group sessions -- the moderators and consultants, the presenters and recorders whose reports made this publication possible, and the hosts and hostesses
- Stephen Judy, the keynote speaker, whose formal and informal participation in the conference was invaluable
- The panelists who discussed issues of statewide interest in the Second General Session: Carl Hodges, Executive Secretary of GAE; Joel Formby, Chatham County Schools; Lester Solomon, Georgia Department of Education; Moses Norman, Superintendent of Area V, Atlanta Schools; Alva Sanks, Muscogee County Schools; Edmund Martin, Georgia Educational Improvement Council; Ramon Veal, Language Education Department, University of Georgia, Moderator
- The publishing companies whose displays of excellent materials were an integral part of the conference
- Boards of Education and school principals who, through financial aid, increment credit, and other forms of recognition, encouraged their teachers to attend
- The State Department of Education for its support through the participation of James E. Bottoms and Lester Solomon
- The chairmen of the conference committees -- Mary J. Tingle, Coordinating Chairman; Nan Flowers, Hospitality; Alvin Railey, Exhibits; Emily B. Gregory and Valerie Lockett, Program -- and those who assisted them
- May Jessup, other graduate students, and secretaries in Language Education who filled in wherever they were needed
- Angelia Moore who organized and handled all preconference and University student registration for the group sessions
- The Advisory Planning Committee that determined the organization of the conference and offered suggestions to the various conference committees
- The National Council of Teachers of English for helping provide a consultant for the conference, Stephen Judy
- Paul Hea, Coordinator of conferences sponsored by the College of Education in the Center for Continuing Education
- The Language Education Department of the College of Education, University of Georgia, and the Georgia Council of Teachers of English for for sponsoring the conference and giving it the support necessary for its success.

James M. Brewbaker, President GCTE
Emily B. Gregory, Program Co-Chairman

TEACHING ENGLISH IN THE 70'S: PROSPECTS AND PRIORITIES

DR. STEPHEN JUDY, Editor, English Journal; Representative,
National Council of Teachers of English

The title, "English in the 70's: Prospects and Priorities," is one that I picked several months ago. When I sat down and began to work on the notes for this talk a few weeks ago, I began to get rather edgy about it, because it is in many respects dangerous indeed to talk about "prospects and priorities" in this turbulent year of 1974. However, I did get a start on the topic from the title of a panel in which I participated in recently: "How Do You Know Where You Are Going If You Don't Know Where You've Been?" This was a discussion of the role of historical background in the preparation of PhD candidates. Taking my cue from that, I would like to spend a little time this afternoon sharing some thoughts about where we've been in the teaching of English, particularly in the past ten years, before going on to the riskier topic of "prospects and priorities."

Our teaching subject, English, is relatively new in the schools. It has only been an established school subject for approximately one hundred years, but it has been a subject that has undergone quite a few "revolutions" during its history. Each of these revolutions has been punctuated by a major committee report, a weighty document for English teachers to study. In 1893 we had the Report of the Committee of Ten of the National Education Association, a report that was concerned with college preparation and the articulation between the secondary schools and the colleges. In 1917, James Fleming Hosic headed a joint committee of NEA and NCTE which issued Reorganization of English in Secondary Schools, a report concerned with democratizing English, particularly in the language preparation of children of immigrants. In 1935 we had the so-called "Experience Curriculum," which was progressive education's contribution to the teaching of English; 1958 saw the Basic Issues Conference concerned with Sputnik, and structure, sequence, the spiral curriculum, and so on. And most recently we had the Dartmouth Conference.

It is rather difficult to assess the impact of each of these conferences and revolutions on the schools. I'm afraid that all too often the revolutions took place at upper levels: documents were issued; a few people read the documents; and not very much happened in the schools as a result. For example, the Hosic Report argued that for too long the colleges had been prescribing books like Julius Caesar and Silas Marner as required reading for secondary school students. Hosic pointed out that these were not especially appropriate books, at least for all high school students, and recommended that more liberalized literature curricula be introduced. Yet the net effect of the Hosic Report (as you know) was that Julius Caesar and Silas Marner and the classical canon continued to dominate for at least fifty more years. Similarly, the Experience Curriculum made some interesting recommendations about the so-called "social applications" of English, arguing that English was not solely concerned with academic matters, with college preparation, that the teaching of English should be related to "life," as well as to academic preparation. But about all that

remains of the Experience Curriculum these days is an occasional note in grammar books on "how to answer the telephone."

I'm convinced, however, that the revolution that we have experienced in the past ten years is significant and fundamentally different. I think that we have been through a period in which there have been radical, productive changes in the teaching of English in the schools, and I don't think that the revolution that we've been through is going to be easily reversed. To emphasize that, let me ask you to play the fashionable nostalgia game for a bit to think back to 1964, just a decade ago, and some of the practices that were common in the schools. Think back to 1964 when Silas Marner was still required reading for all the students in 75 percent of the nation's high schools. Think back to 1964 when the only electives offered to kids were courses like "Journalism" or "Yearbook" or a choice between "Business" and "College-Prep" English. Think back to 1964 when the paperback revolution was just beginning. There were several "critical" questions concerning paperbacks in 1964. Would paperback books hold up as well as hardbound books in the classroom? Could the kids cope with the lurid covers of paperbacks? (If the kids could cope, could principals?) 1964 was the year that Daniel Fader was beginning to take big cartons of paperback books up to the W. J. Maxey School for Boys near Ann Arbor, Michigan, with the thought that perhaps you could hook kids on books by giving them free access to large quantities of paperbacks. In 1964 the few people who were bold enough to teach from paperbacks were using a book by J. D. Salinger called Catcher in the Rye, and, of course, parents were objecting vigorously to the "foul" and "obscene" language in that book. In 1964 the role of traditional grammar was first being questioned, and a good many of us were going to summer school to learn how to understand the complexities and intricacies of transformational grammar, which, we were told, would provide the answer to our language teaching problems. Think back to 1964 when the only films being shown in English classes were grainy black and white commercial preparations with titles like Using Lively Adverbs or The Life of Stephen Vincent Benet.

Obviously things have changed, and again I want to emphasize that I think they have changed very much for the better. To illustrate this, let me share a recent experience. About two weeks ago, two teachers from a central city high school in Lansing, Michigan, came to my office selling a book of poetry. This was a book that had been put together by the ninth graders in their general English class, kids at average or below-average ability, kids not highly motivated. The teachers had started a poetry unit using Kenneth Koch's book, Wishes, Lies, and Dreams, and had found that it had caught on. The class had become excited about poetry, and the poems that the students wrote were, I thought, extremely good ones -- sensitive, powerful poems, coming from the kids themselves. The students had gotten so excited about writing poetry that they had pooled their funds, raised $90, and had the poetry run off at Insty-Print; now they were engaging in a little free enterprise, getting their money back by selling the book around the city. I thought that was very impressive, especially coming from "supposedly" non-motivated kids who supposedly had "reading handicaps," and it made me think back to my own teaching in Chicago, approximately ten years ago, and my own futile attempts to get kids to write poetry. The best I could do was to get kids to write contrived stuff, laden with "vivid" adjectives -- lots of talk about the "golden autumn sun," the "rich green grass." The poetry was inevitably rhymed and was really quite maudlin stuff with very dim echoes of Wordsworth, nature poetry -- the kinds of things teachers force young people to write.

There is more evidence that English is being well-taught in 1974. I keep running into teachers who, despite the concerns that we have for the status

of print in our society, say that it is really not all that difficult to get the kids to read these days. Students may not read as much as we would like them to, but in paperback-based programs and in elective programs, kids are in fact reading a good deal more than they used to when they were involved in the hardbound anthology.

And the impact of the media almost goes without saying: Our classrooms have gained enormously by the introduction of films, videotapes, slides, tapes and the like. There is, in 1974, a kind of general expertise that didn't exist a decade ago. Indeed the program of this conference provides evidence of our -- your -- professional expertise. Classroom teachers are doing the bulk of presentations. This is a conference not dominated by college and university people, as is too often the case, but by classroom teachers who know how to do things and are willing to share that expertise with others.

To illustrate further my confidence in English teachers in 1974, I would like to tell you about a conference we had in Michigan about three months ago -- The Gull Lake English Festival -- which Michigan State conducts for junior and senior high school teachers each year. One of my colleagues, Justin Kestenbaum of the history department, came to the conference to see what English teachers were up to. He was very much interested in what happened at the conference and wrote a long report of his observations for our publication of proceedings. I think what Justin Kestenbaum had to say about English teachers applies not only to the people at that conference but to English teachers across the country today. He began: "I had heard of the new English before I attended the recent Gull Lake English Festival, but twenty years in history-social studies made me skeptical. Too often the new merely re-packaged the old, and revolutions failed to revolutionize. But it seems to me that English is in fact being renewed and that the new English is indeed new since it reflects a creative synthesis of the best thinking about learners, learning, language, English, and communication. Curiously, revolutions in history and social studies tend to be less broadly based, focusing more on arcane scholarly ideas, less on learners and their needs. The keepers of the new flame in English are asking tough questions of their traditionally minded colleagues, for the new English is concerned not merely with the genteel cultural heritage but with the whole universe of human discourse. If English is taught in the schools to promote communication skills, they ask, why not reflect in the classroom all of the ways in which people communicate, verbal and even non-verbal? Is it productive in the light of our understanding of language behavior to place the traditional stress on formal grammar? Why not, in the light of our understanding of humanistic or Gestalt psychology, promote self-actualization among learners by giving them genuine choices? And why not in the education of teachers, supplement courses on Chaucer with adolescent literature? And why not oppose proposals for accountability which define learning goals so narrowly and traditionally as to diminish the curriculum and those who teach it? Why not broaden the curriculum by including learning activities not measurable by traditional behavioral criteria? In short, why not enrich the English curriculum? I see signs of a new history faintly on the horizon, but the English people are five years ahead of us."

I think that is an important statement for a number of reasons, not the least of which is that the schools have been under enormous attack in recent years with the result that many of our accomplishments have been masked. We clearly haven't solved all the problems of teaching English in 1974, but I think we are also faced with several "counter-revolutionary" forces that will have to be confronted in coming months and years.

For example, at the present time, it seems to me that the traditional

public ambivalence toward literacy is causing us more problems than ever before. About the only thing that has not changed since 1964 is that the parents are still upset by the "filth" in Catcher in the Rye. We are in a society that talks very proudly of its interest in reading. Elaine Konigsburg, a writer of children's books, has remarked: "In America reading has become a canonized activity. We believe in clean underwear, fresh whole milk, and reading, in that order, starting at infancy." And she describes two mothers in a supermarket debating which of their daughters was reading the more sophisticated "high school level" books in grade six. We're proud of our interest in reading and literacy. We have launched with much fanfare an admirable but perhaps unworkable program -- the national right to read effort with the goal of producing functional literacy in 99 percent of our adult population by 1980. But at the same time, censorship cases are on the rise -- it's not just Catcher in the Rye but anything on the teacher's bookshelf that is now fair game for the censors. There is that continued parental distrust of books and reading; they want us to teach their kids to read, yet at the same time, they don't want their kids to be put completely in touch with all that reading offers. Similarly, the public is very concerned about holding us accountable for the quality of education that we are giving the children; at the same time, that public is increasingly reluctant to fund programs at quality levels.

There are other problems. In this evening's session we will be hearing about accountability, assessment, and behavioral objectives, so I don't want to rehash the old arguments -- or for that matter anticipate any of the arguments and discussion we will be hearing tonight. However, it seems to me that the whole accountability/assessment movement has been a distinctly conservative force in this country, perhaps as much because of the ways in which accountability systems have been implemented as with the basic concept of accountability itself. That is, I think most of us are perfectly willing to be held "accountable" for the quality of education that we are offering, but the kinds of systems that have been imposed on teachers in state after state, county after county, have been those which focus almost invariably on minimal skills, the so-called "basics" of English.

In Michigan, for instance, our State Department frequently points out that there is nothing in an accountability model that prevents people from writing and pursuing so-called "humanistic" objectives. Teachers, we are told, do not have to feel limited to teaching nothing but correct spelling and standard English usage. However, that same State Department has prepared a detailed set of performance objectives in the basics, and has conducted state-wide assessment in basics for five years. We have yet to see a move by the State Department toward producing the so-called humanistic objectives that it claims are possible under an accountability system. In short, the basic thrust of accountability has been to reverse our English revolution by driving us back into teaching practices that most teachers abandoned during the past decade.

Closely linked to the accountability/assessment/basic skills problem is career education. The idea of career education is a bit like motherhood and apple pie. Who could be opposed to having kids leave the secondary schools capable of getting a job? However, there is, once again, a problem of implementation. Career education programs have consistently talked about minimal skills and the filling out of application blanks, rather than the broadly based kind of literacy that is truly necessary if a person is to function successfully in either a job or society.

Many of these trends became focused for me recently through the action of one organization: College Entrance Examination Board. The CEEB has made a series of decisions and announcements that will be of major concern

to English teachers. First, in December, 1973, the CEEB spontaneously issued a report which indicated that the scores on the Scholastic Aptitude Test in this country have declined steadily over the past ten years. I believe the total decline in verbal scores has been about forty points. Math scores went through a similar decline. The College Board said it wasn't prepared to offer any explanation for this decline and suggested that there were many possible reasons for it. The report attracted a good deal of public attention, and it seems to me that the CEEB acted in a most irresponsible fashion in releasing this kind of information. First, there are many reasons why the SAT scores in this country might have declined. In the first place, the interest of young people in going to college has declined in the past ten years. Some of you may have noticed in a recent issue of Time magazine an article which indicated that a number of positions in American colleges and universities will be unfilled this year. There will be fewer freshmen than there are places in college. A lot of the kids coming through schools today have had big brothers and sisters who attended four years of college, earned the coveted BA, and did not find employment as has always been promised the holder of a college degree. Can anyone blame the younger students for not being as competitive about their Board scores?

Most of us would agree that the Scholastic Aptitude Test was a bad test in 1964: It was an inadequate test of kids' verbal ability, for, at best, the SAT has shown about a .6 correlation with success in college. The test is not a terribly good indicator of what it purports to do -- telling whether or not students have aptitude for college. The SAT has not changed significantly between 1964 and 1974; the same inadequate test that was being administered to kids in 1964 is still being given young people today. It seems to me the College Board would have acted much more responsibly if, instead of issuing its report to the public, it had returned to its drawing baords to try to develop a test that accurately assesses what we know students can do in English classrooms in 1974.

Yet the greatest danger in the College Board's action is that dramatic announcements of this sort provide a kind of cheap and easy ammunition for a public that is already down on the schools.

Shortly after the announcement I wrote a letter to the Lansing State Journal, a paper in our area that has not exactly been friendly to public education, pointing out some things I have just mentioned. I suggested that teachers certainly cannot be held accountable on the basis of a test like the SAT, especially when the test makers themselves -- the people in Princeton -- can't explain the results that they are releasing to the public. I thought that perhaps by having that letter published I could provide a little support for local teachers, who, I suspected, would be under attack as soon as word of the report circulated. I fear that I was naive, for within a week the following editorial ran in the same newspaper: "SAT TESTS A WARNING TO SCHOOLS. The news from the Educational Testing Service of Princeton, N.J., is that for the past ten years the scores of high school students taking the Scholastic Aptitude Test have been in steady decline. In the words of at least one reporter, Gene Maeroff of the New York Times, the decline 'puzzles educators who thought students had been getting smarter.' Yet the puzzling thing is that any educator should be puzzled. For too many years, too many elementary and secondary educators have been concentrating with dubious results on the social adjustment of children in their charge at the expense of rigorous intellectual exercise. So we have 'social promotions' of children who cannot add and of children who cannot read. Such promotions are based on the theory that to hold a child back because of inadequate classroom work will brand him as a failure, thereby reinforcing his negative self-image. But contrary to doing a child a favor, social promo-

tions are based on deception which will lead the child to greater problems later, problems he will understand when he discovers that he cannot obtain or hold a job because he is illiterate . . . It is not puzzling that SAT scores are in decline, but the wonder is that in view of the evidence the public is willing to underwrite an ever more generous funding of public education. If after having poured as much money for as many years into, say, the highway program, our nation's highways were in as miserable shape as our system of public education, the public would be demanding a reappraisal of the method of planning and building roads." I find that last paragraph especially amusing. It's the old teacher-as-cement-mixer metaphor, which assumes that educating kids is roughly analogous to pouring concrete.

But as if that were not enough, the CEEB has made a second announcement, that beginning in September, 1974, the verbal and mathematical aptitude test in the college boards will be shortened by fifteen minutes each to include room for a new test in standard English. "It is pitched particularly to the student who would likely need more specialized attention in English composition," said William Angoff, Executive Director of College Board programs. "Our hope is that it will be used for placement of students in freshman English courses, not for selection of students for admission." So this thirty-minute test on standard English, scores for which will be reported along with the SAT scores, is to be used by the colleges for "placement," not for "selection" of students. However, the interesting thing about this test is that it will be scored on a range of 20 to 80 points: I wonder if that sounds familiar? The SAT scores themselves are presented on a scale of 200 to 800, and the pre-SAT is scored on 20 to 80. Of all the ways of talking about ways of presenting standard English scores, it seems a remarkable coincidence that once again the College Board has settled on the 20 to 80 spread. And I think it is predictable that college admissions officers will look at a score of 30 on the standard English test and equate it instantly with 300 on the verbal aptitude test. In short, it is almost inevitable that this test will be used as a way of screening out applicants who do not possess standard English.

The justification for this, according to Angoff, is based on a full understanding and appreciation of dialect studies. "The new test," he explains, "stresses the principles of the kind of English used in most newspapers, textbooks, and the like, rather than varieties of the language such as so-called "Black English." He adds, "This is the kind of English that people will simply have to cope with in their education . . . . That is not to say that there shouldn't be other kinds of English." In short, the College Board pays lip service to the notion of dialect differences and then proceeds to tell non-standard speakers they will "simply have to cope." If you are a speaker of non-standard, you must speak White, middle-class standard to succeed in college. And the test will be there to enforce it.

The dangers presented by this new test are, it seems to me, even greater than the announcement of the SAT score decline, because the feedback to teachers from parents will be swift. If students score on the lower part of the scale in the standard English test, there will be immediate community pressure to return to the teaching of grammar, hard drill in basics, and intensive teaching of standard English.

"Why not," one might say, "be concerned about basic skills?" Of course the public has a right to be concerned about "basics" and about the quality of education that its youngsters are being given. But at the same time, an overwhelming, inarticulate cry for "a return to basics," can do some very harmful things to us in coming years.

First of all, if we are forced to go back to basic skills instruction -- and by that I mean drill in grammar usage, vocabulary, and spelling -- we

will simply learn by 1980 or 1984 that the return to basics didn't work, The basic skills approach really has been given a fair trial -- basic skills have been taught regularly, faithfully, religiously in the schools since 1875 -- and the direct teaching of skills has never produced significant changes in kids' language behavior. Even if we return to basics the way College Board and parents would like us to, we won't produce any significant changes in how kids use language.

More important, I think, is the effect this kind of thrust is having on teachers. Two years ago, we seemed to be at a high point in our profession. There was a great deal of excitement, animation, and vigor at our professional meetings. Today there is a change in tone. Things are much quieter; there is less enthusiasm, less willingness to talk about experimentation and new directions. And this is a result, in part, of the kinds of pressures that are being put on teachers. Generally speaking, teachers are coping quite well with these pressures. If they are told to write behavioral objectives, they comply: they sit down and write a batch of minimum skill objectives, and then continue to teach in broader, more humanistic ways. But this is a drain on time and energy. You have a difficult time developing new elective courses if you must spend your summer preparing lists of communications skills objectives that must be turned in to the administration. (A middle school in East Lansing, Michigan, recently put in a carefully designed proposal to the school administration. It wanted to redo the entire curriculum, starting from the ground up and including some accountability measures. The teachers were told that there was no money in the school budget for this kind of curriculum revision. However, within two weeks they were given -- unannounced and unasked for -- a mandate from the board of education to prepare a minimum communications skills objectives, and the sum of $3.000 was made available to them for summer time to work on this project.)

I also find that the pressure to cover skills is forcing teachers into a kind of shallow ecclecticism, a "hand-to-mouth" teaching which involves widely divergent principles. One of our babysitters, a junior high student, recently described a creative writing assignment she received, an assignment that represents a collection of mixed values that at best can be described as destructive. First, the teacher told the students that it was important for them to learn to write the short story. An assignment was made for Wednesday: Everyone will write a rough draft of a short story. Good; we need creative writing in the schools. But the teacher added that the rough draft was to be a minimum of 1500 words in length -- I suppose with the thought being that the kids wouldn't write long enough stories without being coerced. The drafts were collected and two days later were returned to the students, red-penciled for matters of punctuation, spelling and grammar, but only on the first page; the students were to go through the remainder of the draft and discover their own errors. On alternate days, while the students were revising, the teacher gave vocabulary and standard English drills. I think the basic motives behind that creative writing assignment were good, but the teacher was being so pressured by the talk "basics" that she had drifted into dangerous inconsistencies.

I think it is very important that in 1974 we try to regain the kind of momentum that we have had in the past decade, and it is critical that we establish some clear priorities for ourselves and work toward them with the same kind of vigor that we demonstrated in the past decade.

In thinking along these lines I have been helped personally by the writing of Alfred North Whitehead whose book, The Aims of Education (1929), offers I think a very unique and intersting view of the learning process. Whitehead talks about three stages of intellectual growth: first, a stage

of romance; second, a stage of precision or discipline; and third, a stage of generalization. He says that when we first start learning about something, we pursue it with a kind of romance: We are excited about a field; we frolic in it; we enjoy thinking about it; we read about it freely, actively, widely. But, he suggests, for most people this romance is not entirely satisfactory. Sooner or later, we decide that we need to know about the topic in more disciplined ways, and we begin to read and study in systematic and conscious ways to build up our background knowledge. And it is this discipline, Whitehead argues, that ultimately frees us to a greater romance, because we develop an information base that offers us a kind of "informed freedom."

To make that more concrete: You've probably seen cases of this process operating quite naturally when students are first given super-8 movie cameras in English class. The first thing they do is to go out and simply shoot film. They don't know much about the camera; hopefully they haven't received a great deal of instruction on the "grammar" of film, the structure of film, cinematic techniques, and so on. They frolic with the camera -- they take some pictures; and they do a silent movie parody; they experiment with trick photography; and they produce some cute and lively films. But for most kids this is not enough, and very soon after that first film comes back, they start asking questions; they want to know more about the camera, more about the technology of filmmaking. Pretty soon they begin to ask for a film editor, if there's one available, because they have a large blank strip or errors in the film, and they don't like it, they want to get rid of it. In short, the kids automatically discipline themselves to do highly intricate work. There are many instances of kids who are "non-readers," "non-writers," kids who are behavior problems in school, kids who allegedly have short attention span, spending thirty to forty hours preparing a single three-minute super-8mm film.

Edgar Friedenburg (The Vanishing Adolescent) has talked about this phenomenon in adolescents and argues that there is in most adolescents a kind of "Pride of craftsmanship" -- that is, kids truly like to do things well. (As English teachers, we may be a bit blind to this because we so seldom see that sense of craftsmanship demonstrated in our own classes.) But it we look at the way the kids discipline themselves in the study of their own music, the way in which they absorb background information about the rock groups they enjoy, they way they know the "literature" of music backward and forward, it is clear that they do have a sense of pride in quality.

To shift this discussion to teaching: It seems to me that we have been in a stage of romance in the teaching of English during the past ten years. We have had a romance with a number of teaching concepts. We have discovered the fact that we can break up the rows and get students into informal learning patterns. We have discovered the notion of student choice, realizing that in fact young people can make responsible decisions about matters that are of concern to them. We've learned that language is related to experience, and doesn't grow from study of a grammar text. We've had a romance with the notion of English as process, as a set of activities rather than a set of knowledges. We've had a romance with paperbacks and electives and thematic courses and film study and creative drama and creative writing and a number of other topics.

What we must do in the coming years -- perhaps in the coming decade or so -- is to enter into a stage of "precision," where we synthesize all that we have discovered in this stage of romance in the past ten years and move on in new directions to refine the knowledge and skill we have gained.

To illustrate, I would like to talk with you about our heaviest romance, our first starry-eyed love of the past decade: the elective curriculum. It

seems to me that electives have been one of our greatest success. Kids demonstrably like electives. (There are even cases on record of kids sitting in study hall studying the offerings being given by the English department and talking animately about what English course they are going to be taking the following term.) Teachers like electives, because it frees them from the traditional curriculum, gives them greater freedom to choose their own material. In many cases faculties which didn't talk to each other for twenty or thirty years have had to get together if only to decide who is going to take what course. Electives have produced a wealth of new commercial material and they have catalyzed the paperback revolution.

However, in 1974 many people are beginning to become a bit disenchanted with electives, seeing that they are not the cure-all that they once appeared to be. I would like to recommend two publications that go into these problems in considerably more detail than I will this afternoon: One is George Hillocks' book, Alternatives in English: A Critical Appraisal of the Elective Programs (NCTE, 1972). The second is an article we printed in the April English Journal by Mary DuPuis, "Undeceiving and Decision Making: Some Thoughts on Electives and Mini Courses in English." Both Hillocks and DuPuis detected some very serious problems with the elective movement. For instance, Hillocks surveyed seventy-six elective course curriculum guides in his study and found that of these, only five actually included a rationale for the array of electives that was being offered. That is, in only 5 of 76 cases had the faculty actually talked through the question of why particular courses were being given at particular times to particular kids. The importance of this is fairly self-evident: You frequently see in schools today something like a course in Victorian Lit, being offered side by side with a course in filmmaking -- both being justified as "English" options. Yet at the same time, the faculty really can't explain why Victorian Lit and filmmaking belong in the same curriculum. In a related problem, we see a course like science fiction, everybody's favorite being offered at the junior high level and at several points in the high school curriculum. So science fiction becomes a staple of the curriculum. In fact, in some schools, students could go through six years of English and never read anything but science fiction. The point is that as good as SF is, there ought to be a rationale for offering it in particular ways at particular times to particular kids. Maybe science fiction belongs in the junior high years; maybe it belongs in the senior high; but it is only when it comes to that point of writing some sort of rationale for a program that we begin to take up those kinds of issues.

Other problems were observed by Hillocks, Phillips, and DuPuis. One is that despite the expressed interest of teachers in "student choice," most of the elective course titles that are being presented in the schools are, in fact, courses that sound rather like teacher-designed titles. When quizzed about what they want to take, most kids put down "reading for pleasure" as a first choice, and then choose thematic courses -- courses that get into contemporary issues and problems. However, the course being most frequently offered in elective programs is none other than "The Works of Shakespeare," and it is followed very closely by courses in the genres -- poetry, fiction, drama, and the like. Very clearly then, despite the fact that students have their own preferences, in all too many curricula teachers are imposing their own academic interests on the curriculum which then reflects student choice less than we would like to believe.

Further, as DuPuis notes, a great many elective courses once instituted have no student "after-choice"; once the kids are enrolled in a ten-week course or a three-week course, their choices are over. The curriculum is set by the teacher; the books are assigned; the assignments are set. In effect, many elective courses pay lip service to the whole notion of giving students a choice. (And woe be unto the student if he has made a "bad" choice, for then the teacher is able to say, "You weren't responsible," or "You didn't

look through the catalogue carefully enough." In no cases is the teacher forced to say, "Perhaps the materials I'm offering are irrelevant."

Both writers noted that many elective courses have hidden tracking systems. Despite the fact elective systems were designed to eliminate teaching, too often the same kinds of kids wind up in the same kinds of courses: The students who wind up in Phase I electives are always the kids who were in the "remedial" classes in the tracted system. In too many schools one finds teachers reluctant to teach Phase I courses, wanting to teach the Phase V courses, where the college preps, the honor students, the bright consistently wind up.

There is also a problem in elective programs of aimless course proliferation. One high school in New Jersey now has on record a total of 301 elective courses -- mini-courses, maxi-courses, and so on. (How they staff these courses escapes me; I suspect no one has survived in that department to be able to report how they do the preparations.) Many courses, not legitimately "English," wind up in elective programs if development is not a controlled process.

Both Hillocks and DuPuis note that electives sometimes simply put old wine in new bottles! Despite the changeover to electives, many teachers continue to teach in the same ways that they taught before. They are still concerned principally with the "content" of literature, not with the literary experience. They are concerned principally with correctness in composition, not with the process of composition itself. But because electives change the appearance of the school, teachers no longer feel the need to question what they are doing, and they proceed to teach "as usual."

I might say that these are problems not limited exclusively to the high school. If one wants to see the weaknesses of the elective approach, all one has to do is pick up the catalogue of the nearest university. You'll find a great hodge-podge of courses, many of them, in essence, monuments to people's academic specialty. There are courses that haven't been taught in years, because the person who taught or developed them is no longer on the campus. You can thus see at the college level the effects if departments don't develop rationales, if they allow the electives system to be an excuse for idiosyncratic teaching that doesn't relate directly to students' needs.

We need to raise a good many questions about electives, but we also have to question for example the whole notion of the <u>course</u>. As someone has said of Americans: Whenever they discover something <u>new</u>, they start giving a course in it. We are, in a way, "course crazy." In graduate education classes I often ask experienced teachers to design a hypothetical, ideal high school. How would they organize the curriculum? And almost invariably groups begin talking about what <u>courses</u> they offer and how they will <u>group</u> the kids. But there are many alternatives to courses and classes. We could introduce independent study curricula, small-group/large-group instruction, or experiment with a dozen or two other patterns. One suggestion I've made (only half facetiously) is that we should ignore the whole notion of course titles (because, after all, any course called "Victorian Literature," "Science Fiction," or "Poetry" must, in the end, be content-centered rather than person-centered). I suggest that we ought to allow teachers to collect all the books that they have read, or would like to read, all the magazines that they know, all the activities that they like to teach and cluster these in workshop centers; then, instead of having course titles, we would have "people titles" -- Mr. Brown's English, Miss Smith's English -- and the kids would come to the workshop and do the kinds of things that Mr. Brown and Miss Smith were good at. This might not be workable in the "real world," but it suggests that we do need to question whether the kinds of courses that we are offering should always be centered on the discipline of English rather than on the people who are <u>giving</u> the courses or <u>taking</u> them.

I also think we need to involve computers to a much greater extent in our course planning. I'm consistently amazed by the airlines reservations system. If you want to go, say, from Athens to Lansing, you simply telephone United Airlines, and within thirty seconds the person on the line can tell you any

of a dozen possible flight combinations between Lansing and Athens. It seems to me that we could do the same kinds of things very easily in our curriculum: Instead of having all the courses the same length, three, six, or nine weeks, we could offer a much richer variety of choices, employing the computers to help kids seek out the best of all possible learning patterns.

Another area where English teachers have had a romance and need to sharpen their thinking is in the discussion of "free" and "open" education. This is an area where people become inflamed and angry very quickly, and much nonsense has been uttered in the debate over free schools, open schools, and the like. Typical statements I have heard from time to time: "I tried freedom and it didn't work." "I am an open teacher, for as an adult, I realize that I have nothing to offer children." (This second teacher must find it difficult to pick up a paycheck from time to time.) Or the classic, "If kids knew what they wanted and needed, there would be no need for schools." I think a lot of this semantic confusion was created by the so-called romantic critics of education, people like Jonathan Kozol, Herbert Kohl, and John Holt, when they were writing in the mid-60's. They had a new idea and valid criticism of the schools, and they wanted to arouse and anger people. But in many cases they overstated the whole case for open education. You may remember that in The Open Classroom, Kohl talks about a teacher who didn't want to "impose" upon kids, and therefore couldn't decide how to set up the chairs and desks in the classroom. Should he place them up in a circle? Well, there were problems with that, because that meant that discussion was being "imposed" on the class. Could he line them up facing the back of the class rather than the teacher's desk? No, that too was anti-authoritarian in some ways. So he stacked all the furniture in the middle of the classroom, and when the kids came in, he sat back in stony silence and did nothing. After three or four days the kids decided to do something (perhaps because they were weary of standing up); they unstacked the desks and created their own structure, and Kohl and the teacher rejoiced in their freedom. It seems to me that that was the best misleading example of what "freedom" is all about, and it helps to create a kind of animosity many teachers encounter when they start to talk about injecting some "freedom" in their classes. Frequently those who object to freedom are basing their objections on extreme, romantic statements, not on the realities of informal education. We need to discipline ourselves then, reacting a little bit less emotionally to statements about freedom and openness, and then concentrate on discovering ways to inject openness (whatever that really means) into our classes.

For example, it seems to me, that all classes are structured in one way or another. Even "free" classes are structured in their openness. The ultimate effect of structure ought to be producing kids who are skillful and independent users of the language. If we can keep that notion at the forefront, we can begin talking much more sensibly about the kinds of freedom, the kinds of openness, the kinds of informality or formality that we want to use in the English classroom.

There are, of course, many other priorities for English, and in looking through the conference program, it seemed to me that every topic listed there is a priority area. I simply want to touch on two or three additional areas that are of particular concern to me.

In the teaching of composition, we have had a romance with creative writing and things like the writing journal. Ten years ago kids hated writing and there was nothing we could do about it; now kids are not as averse to writing--they have had a good experience or two with the journal; they have written a poem and gotten some positive response to it. But we need to move beyond that. Many teachers seem to be stuck at what I call the "wishes-lies-and-dreams" stage. They have introduced "formula writing" of the sort advocated by Kenneth Koch, but they haven't reached the point where kids draw on creative writing freely and naturally, as naturally as they do on other forms of writing.

Similarly, I see a great dichotomy between the philosophy that we use when we teach creative writing and what we do when we turn to traditional expository writing. In too many schools, I see kids who have had a good poetry writing experience plunked back into what is essentially a traditional curriculum of exposition, focusing on the formal outline, the topic sentence, the structured paragraph. I think there are many ways of engaging students in "serious writing" --going editorials, scripts, videotape, and the like--which will teach them the skills of expository writings, without reverting to the kind of traditional education that most of us went through.

In reading, it seems that we have been fairly successful in turning on a lot of kids through paperback approaches, yet we are still a long way removed from what many have called the "lifetime reading habit." I want to recommend another essay, one of the more significant that we have published in the English Journal, "A Proposal for Motivating More Students to Lifetime Reading of Literature," by Noma Kahn (February 1974). Mrs. Kahn synthesized the work of a number of people. She discusses the work of Daniel Fader and the response approach of people like Allen Purves and James Squire; she talks about reading skills, and ways of moving beyond the hooked-on-books approach to make kids dependable "consumers" of literature throughout their lifetime.

I think we also have to refine much of what we have done in film and media. In too many cases, students make one or two or three "groovy" films and never go beyond that. Film in too many classes is nothing more than a novelty, something that the kids do a few times. Too seldom do we incorporate it fully and naturally into the flow of the English class.

Much of what I have been advocating comes down to a single word, one that also needs semantic analysis, and that is professionalism; for what I am trying to suggest, in essence, is that in coming years we must be professional in finding ways to assess the failures and the successes of what we have done in the past ten years and then to move beyond. This kind of spirit was something that my colleague, Professor Kestenbaum, noted at Gull Lake, and I would like to quote from him again: "At this meeting I found none of the jaded cynicism I encounter too often at educational meetings. I found high morals and a sense of commitment, an eagerness to share and listen to new ideas and experiences. The new English seems to enrich not only the curriculum but the lives of the practitioners." And that last sentence is one that I take to be especially important, because what Kestenbaum has perceived is that the past ten years of revolution in English has done great things for English teachers themselves. I think that as a profession we are much more alive, much more interesting, much more fun to talk to than we were a decade ago.

This is a key point, I think, because in the end the priorities that are established for education in coming years will be established by "the practitioners," by the classroom teachers. The priorities for education will not be established in nationally constituted committees. They will not be established by state departments of education (albeit state departments of education would dearly like to think otherwise). The priorities assuredly will not be established in Washington, D.C. They won't be established in college seminars on the teaching of English; they won't be established by methods instructors; they won't be established by people lecturing on the topic of establishing priorities.

I'm convinced that we must continue to do what Mr. Kestenbaum called "asking tough questions." If we continue to ask tough questions--tough questions about ourselves as human beings, tough questions about ourselves as teachers and what we are doing, tougn questions about kids, who they are, where they are in the precoess of becoming, what they are doing in our classes. And if we continue to ask tough questions the priorities that we establish for ourselves will be good and strong and productive ones. If we continue to talk in these ways, despite the difficulty of the times in which we live and teach, I think our prospects will be very bright indeed.

ACCOUNTABILITY, COMPETENCY-BASED EDUCATION, AND POLITICS

- Ruth Purnell, Secretary of GCTE, presiding
Ramon Veal, Language Education Department, University of Georgia, Moderator
Carl Hodges, Executive Secretary of GAE
Joel Formby, Chatham County Schools
Lester Soloman, Georgia Department of Education
Moses Norman, Superintendent of Area V, Atlanta
Alva Sanks, Muscogee County Schools
Edmund Martin, Georgia Educational Improvement Council

The following was excerpted and summarized from the typescript of the taped program:

Dr. Veal: A forthcoming book from NCTE on Using Standardized Tests in English begins with the following: "Accountability, accountability, when I use the word," says Humpty-Dumpty, "it means just what I choose it to mean, nothing more and nothing less," and so by implication at least, say state legislatures, state departments of education, local boards of education, school administrations, as well as teachers, when they discuss and think about finding out about the effectiveness of instruction in schools for which they are responsible and in which they are involved. Examples abound: from national assessment, schools being accountable could mean writing three paragraphs with fewer than three punctuation errors; from state assessment it might mean a certain percentage of students making a certain score on the reading test. In some communities it might mean the dropout rate. It might mean the number of students entering college or the number of teachers who hold master's degrees. In short, accountability can mean anything, really, sometimes depending on who is doing the talking. The case is similar with performance-based education, which can mean that third-graders move to fourth grade only when certain performance criteria, perhaps on standardized reading tests, are met. It can mean undergraduate teacher preparation programs. Usually, but not always, characterized by a strong field center; and it can mean performance certification or recertification. Our phrase "and politics" that we add into this panel's consideration was made when we were thinking of matters such as accountability, or tenure laws, legislative requirements for certification, like courses in drug education or exceptionality, funds for material purchase, and of course the state's comprehensive minimum foundation program. All these issues and more led us to schedule this panel of individuals who we hope represent different perspectives on these as well as related lissues. Also while emphasizing the issues, I do not mean to imply that accountability, performance-based education or politics are necessarily bad for education in general or for English teaching in particular. I do mean to suggest though that these are matters that teachers of English need to discuss and debate openly, not only among themselves, but with others who are involved. To that end, we have assembled this distinguished group, and perhaps if nothing more we can begin to arrive at some common understanding of the meanings of these terms.

This group assembled represents, I think, several different perspectives. We have two teachers; we have the executive secretary of the Georgia Association of Educators; we have the director of the Georgia Educational Improvement Council; we have an area superintendent from Atlanta; and we have a representative from the state department of education.

Dr. Hodges: When I received the invitation to appear on this panel and noted the topic, Accountability, Performance-Based Education, and Politics, I thought of all the things that Dr. Veal has pointed out here, tonight, all the possibilities as you look at this subject, and my first reaction was that I would like to talk about performance-based teacher education and certification. I guess because we are so engrossed with that subject right now in GAE. But when I got here tonight and noted that Dr. Solomon was talking about this subject, and as I talked with Dr. Veal, it occurred to both of us that maybe it would be more appropriate for me to talk about accountability a little bit in general terms, trying to represent GAE, and I'm not sure that I can do that or that anybody can do it, but I will try as best I can to present the viewpoint of the state association in this area of accountability, very briefly and very informally, if I may.

All of us know that within the past decade, the public has become more concerned about public education than perhaps ever before in the past of the history of our nation. There has been a great deal of criticism of performance in the public schools -- and we could talk at length -- but we don't have time for that, and you know the factors as well as I do. At any rate, there has been a great deal of public concern in America about the performance of the public schools. It wasn't long before somebody initiated the thought that the primary problem was that the schools aren't accountable, that teachers and administrators of the public schools aren't accountable, and they compared schools with business and industry, in particular, and with government to some extent, and came up with the conclusion that our basic problem was that our people weren't accountable -- that schools and school people in America simply weren't accountable for their performance. There were all kinds of suggestions about the way we ought to solve that problem, and I'm not going into those either -- you know all the things that have been said.

The profession's reaction, the reaction of the teaching profession, as I saw it, was two-pronged. One, many educators said, Here's an idea that we might use effectively; here's an idea that we might use to improve public education, because, say what you want to, the theory of accountability makes sense. When I think of accountability, I think of being responsible, fully responsible, for doing what I am supposed to do, and therefore I can justify it perfectly in that kind of context. So a lot of people in education began to say, here's an idea, a good idea, maybe it is an idea that we can use to improve public education in America, in our state, our local schools, and in our nation. At any rate, many educators said here's something that we ought to be looking at.

The second viewpoint of the profession was if we aren't careful, here's something that is going to be used by somebody to do something to us -- I put it crudely, but that was the second sort of reaction. They began hearing political leaders and others talking about this concept, blaming teachers, blaming schools, talking about what ought to be done, and frequently making suggestions for solutions that were totally unacceptable, totally irrational -- you read them, saw them in the papers, saw them in magazines. Our second reaction was that people are going to try to use this against educators.

against the schools, and therefore we had better begin defending ourselves.

Now our association really adopted both viewpoints. We felt that if we could use it to help us, we ought to do it; but we also felt that we had a keen responsibility to protect the public schools and protect educators in our state against those who might use this concept to damage us. So, as many of you remember, we got busy. We spent a whole year having meetings around the state, conferences involving literally thousands of educators. Out of these meetings came legislation that we introduced in the General Assembly or had introduced in the General Assembly -- an accountability bill. Now in all truth, our association never did see any great reason for having legislation in this area except for one purpose -- to protect the profession from those who might misuse the concept. Of course it was never passed, and I don't think anybody in education grieved too much that it wasn't, because it fulfilled its function: it at least stopped temporarily, and I think stopped permanently, those people who were beginning to move in on us in this area and might have done things harmful to the schools of Georgia.

Now let me quickly point out two concerns, I think, of all of us in the area of accountability. One is this: Teachers hear the public, political leaders and others, say that the way you determine whether a teacher performs adequately is by product assessment, by evaluating the pupils' learning. Right? Now it sounds good. But you know that there are so many variables in this equation other than the ability of the teacher, you just get mired up and lost when you begin to try to measure in this area. The Jenks Study at Harvard I believe showed that the number one factor in determining whether a child learns or not is the economic status of his parents, not the ability of the classroom teacher; and so teachers and educators far and wide apprehensive when somebody gets up and says simply, We'll determine whether she is a good teacher or not by the way the pupils in her classroom perform. This is our number one concern in this whole area of performance-based education.

The next concern, and I will stop with this one, is the fact that all of us know that you can't isolate a classroom teacher and say, "You, as an individual, are accountable for the learning of the youngsters in your room;" when all of us know that the amount of money spent per pupil, the supplies that are provided, the amount of supportive services, the homes from which those youngsters come -- all kinds of factors -- impinge. It is just totally unreasonable, you see, that the classroom teacher by herself is going to accept the total load, the total responsibility for the learning of youngsters in America.

Mr. Formby: I'm an English teacher in a junior high school. I think that I will probably reflect the feelings of many teachers concerning accountability and competency-based education. I have a real fear when someone mentions accountability, I think of two questions: accountable for WHAT? and accountable TO WHOM? And the answers that I have come up with are accountable to state legislators, and accountable for a body of information, a standardized body of information to be determined by these state legislators. I'm very fearful of that. We have to realize that students are individuals. They have individual personalities; they have different capabilities; they have different environments; and they have different needs. To try to have all students statewide achieve on a common level on some type of standardized body of information is very unrealistic. It is very frightening also.

But what about competency, competent teachers? Most teachers work under a department head. Department heads work under experienced, competent principals;

principals work under experienced, competent superintendents; superintendents work for boards of education; boards of education work for the voters. So ultimately it is the voter who determines whether a teacher is competent or not, and well they should, but I really can't understand how expanding the bureaucracy that we have is going to improve education.

And what about politics? Well, I have heard some people say that the state pays your salary, the state has the right to determine what you teach and how you teach. This is false. The taxpayers pay my salary. The parents of the students that I teach pay my salary, and these are the people who should determine, if anyone, how I teach and what I teach. The students -- individual personalities, individual certification, environments, individual needs -- and the students' parents and the students' teacher, perhaps the students' principal -- these are the people who should determine the goals, who should determine the methods, and who finally should make the evaluation.

In conclusion, I'll sum up what I feel this way. I believe that individual teachers should be responsible to the individual parents for the teaching of individual students.

Dr. Soloman: "The most important influence the school can contribute to the learning of any student is the attitudes, skills, knowledge and understanding of the teacher." That statement, interestingly enough, already appears in a piece of legislation that has passed in a sister state. Now, to try to meet one of the stipulations Dr. Veal is talking about within a five-minute period, at least trying to define some terms, as the state of Georgia including a statewide task force and an on-going steering committee, made up of people broadly representing, really the same interests as represented at this table, with the inclusion also of higher education which is I guess the only major component not representing the panel tonight. The common definition that has run through all of the work thus far, including that of the statewide task force and of the on-going steering committee, is that competency is defined as knowledge and skills and attitudes, and so if we substituted the word competency where those three words appeared in this quote, you'll have a little better understanding of what competency really means. It would then read, "The most important influence the school can contribute to the learning of any student is the competencies of the teacher." Now this interest and this thrust towards what has become in Georgia to be regarded as competency-based preparation for performance-based certification. A lot of times these words competency-based and performance-based are used interchangeably, but a decision has tentatively been reached that the emphasis will be on competency-based preparation and performance-based certification. It really goes all the way back to the state's short-range needs assessment of 1969 when the word appeared as one of the needs to improve teacher competencies. In 1970 when the Georgia State Board of Education adopted the goals for education in Georgia, which includes our long-range needs assessment of student outcomes under what we call our products' goals. Included in the enterprise goal were numerous statements that give some of the basis for part of the developmental work that we are involved in right now. Included are these statements: "So that all children, youths, and adults in Georgia are assured competent professional teachers and other personnel, state board of education and local school systems should provide for the employment of competent professional personnel who are trained and educated in the areas to which they are assigned, possess knowledge and understanding of human growth, development, and behavior, are required to demonstrate continuous professional and personal growth and development, and are able to recognize the role of professionals and non-professionals and

effectively use their services to improve the learning process; provide a continuous review of certification and adjustment of the certification process to license teachers and other professional personnel on the basis of demonstrated competency and ability."

In 1972 in the State Department of Education, the state superintendent identified 23 missions for the department. One of these missions was to certify educational personnel on the basis of demonstrated competency, and that same statement presently appears in the 16 performance missions of the Georgia Department of Education. But only recently has there really been any effort to try to operationalize any of these concepts. Dr. Martin will be talking about APEG -- Adequate Program for Education in Georgia -- and let me just mention two of the recommendations that came out of that committee. One is a recommendation for the establishment of a competency-based tenure system for teachers. Another recommendation was that all teachers should serve a 180-day internship with pay under qualified supervision before receiving certification.

I have already mentioned the statewide task force. The state board authorized this task force in the fall of 1972. In the winter and spring of 1973 the group met on a number of occasions at two to three day intervals at Lake Jackson to formulate what's known as the long-range plan for competency-based preparation for performance-based certification. This statewide task force, and let me emphasize made up of a preponderance of people outside the state department of education, identified competency-based preparation as a process which specifies competencies to be demonstrated by educational personnel, makes explicit the performance criteria to be applied in assessing competencies, holds the student accountable for meeting these criteria, and holds the institution accountable for helping the student meet the criteria.

Now with regard to performance-based certification. This is the process of licensing and/or certifying educational personnel who have been assessed as demonstrating the sets of knowledges, skills, and attitudes believed to be essential in producing desired student learning and have been assessed as achieving desired consequences in the area of responsibility. The fortunate thing that we have in existence right now in the state of Georgia is that we don't have a mandate either from a state legislature nor from the state board of education to implement any of these kinds of dimensions without the proper kind of developmental work and we are involved in developmental activities, trying to actually validate these competencies that are believed to be essential in facilitating learning.

Mr. Norman: We would wish upon occasions of this nature that we had something really profound to share with a group like this, but as Dr. Veal has already indicated, the whole business of accountability and performance-based teacher education preparation can be rather nebulous and rather uncertain at times. If we look at competency-based education preparation for teachers, it has only one final objective and that is to improve instruction in the schools of the nation. That ultimately is the educational thrust.

People have spoken of this as being an old wine in new bottles; people have spoken of it as being a good idea if you can figure out what it means; and a goodly number of other things. One of the things that I have shared in the literature and some of those of you who are familiar with and have copies of the January issue 1974 of Phi Delta Kappa might read that entire issue that addressed itself to competency-based teacher education. Let me just indicate a couple of things in terms of the long-range goals and the immediate or short-range goals. One of the long-range goals obviously is to

increase the instructional delivery services in all schools in the nation. We have discovered that one of the immediate purposes achieved in competency-based education is that it has brought together three very important groups. It has brought together those persons who are responsible for the teacher training institutions,it has brought together teachers themselves, and it has brought together the schools or school systems. You have just heard alluded here to the fact that throughout the state of Georgia we have had these three entities together.

If you are interested in history, let me just share a few things with you. Where are we headed in terms of competency-based teacher education and preparation? In 1973, February, there was a survey done of the United States schools, and there were 17 states that had given legislative or administrative support to competency-based teacher education at that particular time. Fifteen states had adopted it as an alternative to the present method of certifying teachers. Then in 1973 also 1200 school systems were circularized with a questionnaire. Of the 783 that responded, only 228 indicated that at that time they were not in any fashion dealing with competency-based teacher education preparation. So of the 783 schools some 65 percent are very vigorously working toward competency-based preparation. In 1974 Alfred Wilson and William Curtis did a survey of the chief state school officers of all 50 states, and at that particular time they found that ten states had mandated this and that Tennessee had done it for administrators but not for teachers, so we are moving in that particular direction.

You might be interested to know that it will take roughly ten years from the time we start very seriously working toward building a competency-based teacher education thrust until it can be reasonably well implemented. I'm going to tell you why. Because there're four basic things that must be taken into consideration in terms of competency-based teacher preparation. One of them has already been alluded to: a tentative, with emphasis on the tentative, a tentative competency identification. What are the competencies that a teacher ought to be able to demonstrate? The University of Georgia in concert with a goodly number of other agencies, developed about four or five years ago -- and is still working on it, a plan that they call GEM, a Georgia Education Model. We are now using GEM in the Atlanta system. After competencies are tentatively identified, the second phase is to focus on the training of personnel so they can demonstrate those competencies, and here we go with the pre-service as well as the in-service programs. The third is an assessment of the degree of mastery of these competencies by staff. And then fourthly, these competencies must be validated in relationship to how well the students have performed, have grown, have accomplished those things that we call the affective areas, cognitive areas, and the psychomotor areas; and that continues -- it is cyclical. It continues to go, and it continues to go, and it continues to go. One of the things we have discovered is that competency-based teacher education can't be put into operation right now. First of all, in tooling up for competency-based teacher preparation we need to give attention to at least five things: tentative competency identification, a plan for tooling up the staff to deal with these competencies, instructional materials that will allow us to tool up, a system of management so that we can monitor students as they flow through the various programs, fifthly, we must have a plan for research. I guess this is one of the weakest areas: we really have not used research methods as well as we should have, to find out before the end of a cycle whether it is working or not. Accountability really means basically one thing, in three parts probably: Do we know what we are supposed to be doing? Do we know how we are expected to do it? Will we know if we did it well or not after we have done it? And compe-

tency-based teacher education will allow us to get a little closer to answering these questions than we are at this point.

Mrs. Sanks: As I sat and listened to the people that came before me, I've changed my subject each time. Whether we want to admit it or not, we might as well face it, accountability is here. How it affects us will depend upon us. What do we want it to be? What do we want it to mean? Will it mean that simply you will will follow a prescribed set of objectives handed down from perhaps the state legislature or the state board? Or will it mean that you will be able to use your creativity in the classroom with no fear of being weeded out because what you do does not follow the prescribed set of objectives? These are things that we are going to have to think about. I did some research and I found that there were several programs which have been instituted in some states. Some systems favor the voucher plan -- the parent is given a voucher for an amount of money for his child. Then he gets to choose which school his child will go to. Once he places his child in that school, if he finds that this is not the school where his child should be, the school is not improved, the parent simply moves his child again. There is another plan which allows a contractor to bid on schools. In other words, systems contract for objectives. Thus, if you don't come up to the objectives, then you don't get paid. Now is this what you want accountability to mean?

Accountability can work. As I sat here before the program started, one lady said to me, "You don't know what accountability is." I said, "I probably don't, but do you?" She said, "I am accountable, I've always felt that I was accountable." Now does your accountability mean that for fifty or fifty-five minutes you are simply accountable to that child or to that system? Or does your accountability go wherever that child goes, wherever help is needed for that child? This is accountability.

Who is going to hold us accountable? How will they measure our accountability? A Gallup Poll found that while most teachers were against it, those that were opposed were strongly opposed, and those that were for it were strongly for it. There are many pros and cons for accountability. For one thing, with a set of objectives the teacher would know exactly what he or she had to do. But suppose I have different children. Do I still impose these objectives on these children simply because they have been handed down? Performance-based education can work, but as someone else previously stated, there has to be a period of training all around. I think it will take a while. After a program has been implemented it will finally rest on the local board, the local system, to make adjustments for each particular community, and local needs.

Dr. Martin: To be last and to change what I was going to say six times already, I'm as anxious as you to hear what I really planned to say. One speaker mentioned that he had two fears about accountability -- for what is the teacher accountable, and to whom. I would add a third fear. I think that the last speaker indicated that the concept of accountability most of us can accept, but then the third fear that I would add to the two that were mentioned is by what instrument will I be measured -- in order that someone would not judge me in arbitrary means or by some standard over which I have no control.

Dr. Veal mentioned a number of definitions on ways that certain people could be accountable. When I was superintendent of the schools in Georgia, a person from Philadelphia that had moved into our community, a former chairman of the board of education in Pennsylvania, said to me that he did not see why the educational profession could not be accountable if industry was held

accountable: I said to him, "You have a child in our school. Would you name the best teacher?" And he named his little girl's teacher. I was shocked. I went to the principal and at that particular time we had six teachers in that particular grade in one building, and I said to him, "Will you tell me without it going further than this whom you consider the very poorest teacher in the certain grade." And he told me this particular teacher -- the very worst one was the one the man thought was the best. I said to him will you tell me the very worst teacher in your building -- about twenty-four teachers. This teacher was named again. I went to a friend of hers, a colleague, and I said would you tell me in your building the teacher that you consider the very poorest -- the same teacher. So I started trying to find out why the dad was so pleased, and so I add two to Dr. Veal's list. One, the child went to the right church in Cartersville. The other one, the child made all A's for the first time in her life. I do not want an instrument of that type of judge my future in education in this state, and yet I am for the concept.

For the next two or three minutes I would like to concentrate on the politics of education. So often in education we think politics is a dirty word and we should not become involved. January of next year, 1975, we will move from what is now known as MFPE or Senate Bill 180 to the Adequate Program for Education or APEG, Senate Bill 672. I hope you will get a copy of this bill. It's 70 pages long, divided into ten parts, 76 sections. Section 50 of the bill deals with competency-based teacher performance, and Section 51 with evaluation. I think you need to read both of these sections. I think you need to read the bill in its entirety. Many things in this bill can move Georgia forward very rapidly. Thirty-seven states now have kindergarten in some form. Georgia was the last state to start the twelfth grade, and I'm fearful that we will be the last state to implement kindergarten unless we begin as teachers to become politically concious. There are candidates in the state of Georgia at this time who say that it is so simple to implement kindergarten, all you have to do is cut off the 12th grade and start kindergarten. It is not so simple, but believe you me, this could happen if you think that politics is dirty.

In Georgia we have been holding back <u>so</u> often in many things -- pupil to teacher ratio in our state, career education, our compensatory education, which we are doing nothing about. All the things that could move us forward are included in three publications I'd like for you to know: (1) APEG. <u>Adequate Program of Education in Georgia</u>: The total study was developed last year; <u>The Recommendations of APEG</u> -- there are 147 of these, if you want to just put these in the hands of certain leaders in your community: and finally the ones of you that really want to know what we will be doing in public schools of this state K-12 in one year from now, ask for a copy of (3) Senate Bill 672, and read the sections that you want. Then finally may I say that as we look forward to the improvement of education you need to allow people to know what you want. After you read this bill, please say to the member of the General Assembly representing you that you believe Georgia should do these things to improve its educational system. We hesitate as teachers to do this. I remember when I was a principal in a Georgia school, I belonged to a very small church. Every year we had to take a church census. Have you gone through that? And everyone in the community knew who you were, they knew your age, whether you wanted them to know it or not, and to what church you belonged. But we had to go and see again -- you know go into the home and ask you all these questions. And being a school person, I felt I had to perform the duty, and I found myself praying as I walked up to the front door that they wouldn't be at home. I think you do the same things when you go to the legislators,

and I think we are going to have to go now and say to them, "If you expect us to be accountable, give us the tools that this bill provides and we will do the job you want done."

From the typescript of the taped discussion that followed the panel presentations, the following questions and answers were excerpted (and edited):

Q. We have heard a lot about the goals of education in Georgia. Who works out these goals?

A. One answer: The State Department of Education.
Another: A committee composed of people from various walks of life -- two college professors, a housewife, two ministers, etc. This committee went around the state holding hearings, meeting with people, getting demographic data of demographic data from communities that were geographically similar, geographically different, economically similar, economically different, racially similar, racially different, and asking those individuals what are the kinds of things that you think you would like to see your children be able to do by the time they have gotten out of school? What are the kinds of attitudes, the kinds of concepts, the kinds of perceptions do you think they ought to have by the time they get out? And this went on for a period of time and then we asked people who were scholars in the areas -- psychology, sociology, finance, et cetera, asked them to present position papers. So it was from the grass-root participation, this group came up with the product goals. That was the process that was used in coming up with these tentative goals for education in Georgia that was published in '70.

Q. Were classroom teachers involved?

A. Yes. There were classroom teachers on the task force committee. In addition to that, you will recall that the task force did have hearings around the state . . . . I [Dr. Hodges] attended two or three of them, and at the ones I attended we had many, many classroom teachers there.

Q. I wonder how many here have ever read the goals for education in Georgia. Is it available?

A. Mr. Solomon: Yes. The Goals for Education in Georgia has been reprinted [and is available from the State Department of Education].

Another: A great deal of effort did go into this statement of goals, and it was adopted by the state board. It was a first step in the development of the ten year plan for education in Georgia that is given in APEG: Adequate Program for Education in Georgia, published in December of 1973.

Q. How far along are we in implementing the plan?

A. Mr. Solomon: Developing the statement of goals really was just the first phase of what was called the Georgia Assessment Project and through an assessment effort headed by Dr. Ray Swargert in the city of Atlanta the development of behavioral objectives for all of the major goal areas has been completed. We are in the process now of moving to the development of criterion reference versus norm reference instruments to actually measure the objectives that are related to the Goals for Education in Georgia. The objectives have been completed, and the instrumentation is now in process. When this is available during this next year, we will hope actually to start moving this kind of instrumentation into our statewide testing program as opposed to the norm reference kinds of instruments that we now have. If we do have the criterion reference it is going to be much more useful for diagnostic work, and it is also going to be related more directly to goals for Georgia and to instructional processes in our schools.

Dr. Hodges: We have another project going in Georgia that ought to concern you people tremendously. I hope it does, and I think it will. Let me talk about it. We are in the process right now of beginning to revise the curriculum framework for Georgia schools. Now it seems to me a matter of logic that out of the goals ought to grow the curriculum framework, the curriculum guidelines -- that ought to be the next step. You first determine what your goals are and then you determine what your curriculum is going to look like in broad generalities. I'm privileged to serve on the steering committee of this project, representing GAE. Now the tremendously significant thing about this is that the state department of education say they are committed, and I think they are, to grounding or basing all decisions on Georgia schools in the curriculum. In the goals, of course, that's basic, but that every decision about a building, about the training of a teacher, about supplies, equipment, administration, or everything else, ought to come out of the curriculum. Now the state departments say that from now on this is going to be the way we operate in Georgia, that we are going to develop the curriculum that we need for our schools and out of that will come the other decisions.

Mr. Solomon: Well, we are at the point where we do have a contract with ETS at the fourth and eighth grade in areas of communication and reading and career development. I'm sure that all of you in this room must be aware of the state survey that was conducted with regard to those objectives and we are in the process of starting that work with national evaluative systems on criterion reference tests for the seventeen-year-olds which is tied to the Atlanta Assessment Project which is tied to the Georgia assessment effort, but embodied in all of this so I think the thrust of your question is that you really do work with tests and measurements organizations, but you build in a constant review process of Georgia educators and as we get further down the line with regards, say, to the communications instrument for the 17 year-olds, many, if not most of you in this room, will be involved in that review process.

Q. What about teacher -- and parent -- involvement? We are the ones directly involved. We are the ones responsible for what happens.

ERIC

A. Dr. Hodges: There is a tremendously important consideration here that bothers me some. It seems to me that we ought to draw a line, though it is difficult to draw, but we nevertheless ought to draw a line between the public's responsibility and the profession's responsibility. If we don't, the public moves in on our area of responsibility and does it in a hurry; and so I'd like to draw lines. It seems to me that the line ought to be drawn somewhere between goals and putting them into practice, that really it is the public's responsibility to determine the goals of our schools -- this isn't a professional responsibility. I understand you, and I agree with you totally, that professionals could help with it, but nevertheless, basically the matter of determining the goals of Georgia schools is not a professional responsibility; it is a public responsibility. After the public determines what they want us to do, then they ought to leave us alone as professionals to get the job done. It does seem important that we draw lines between the public responsibility and the professional responsibility.

Mr. Solomon: And that has been an underlying assumption in our work thus far. The establishment of goals for education in Georgia was based off a societal examination and by the representative leaders of society. As the effort continued, we moved into the objectives. When Dr. Swargert came in, he felt that it was very important to run some Delphi Studies, and so separate Delphi Studies in terms of verifying the goals were conducted with community leaders, with educators, with predominantly teachers, and with students. So we did have those separate Delphis, but Dr. Hodges' underlying assumption to all of this was exactly the way it was approached -- and as our teacher from Savannah has articulated, goal-setting is the province of the public and then the determination of the actual objectives and the assessment procedures and instructional activities is the function of the professional.

Reports from the Group Sessions:

These brief reports do not adequately reflect the quality of the presentations or of the discussions that followed. However, perhaps they, with the reading lists, will give some idea of the scope of the conference program.

1. STUDENT-CENTERED LANGUAGE STUDY
Presenters: Marcia Mann, Forsyth County Schools
Rosemary Umpleby, Greene County Schools

Marcia Mann presented a student-centered approach to book reports. She said, "It is possible to replace the book report with a series of student-centered activities that will achieve the above mentioned goals (understanding of theme, appreciation of style and familiarity with character development). Initially activities are best contained within the abstraction levels of recording and reporting with some generalization. Practice on these levels enables future competence in the more difficult abstractive procedures of critical judgment. She then showed work produced by her students.

Rosemary Umpleby gave a presentation on the Language Experience approach to language study. She said that each of the student-centered language activities must have a practical purpose in the student's eyes, develop from or draw on the student's experience, and use the student's language. She then gave examples of this approach, demonstrating the variety and individuality of students' responses.

Suggested Readings:

Burrows, Alvina, et al. New Horizons in the Language Arts. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1972.

Clegg, A.B. The Excitement of Writing. London: Chatto and Windus, 1965.

Koch, Kenneth. Wishes, Lies and Dreams, Teaching Children to Write Poetry. New York: Random House, Inc., 1970.

Macrorie, Ken. Uptaught. New York: Hayden Book Company, Inc., 1970.

Moffett, James. Teaching the Universe of Discourse. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1968, pp. 14-119.

Yatvin, Joanne. "Things Ain't The Way They Used To Be In The English Classroom." English Journal; 60, 11 (nov. 1971), pp. 1080-85.

2. LANGUAGE STUDY, CREATIVITY, AND COMPOSITION
Presenters: Lola Wells, Clarke County Schools
Cheryl Crawford, DeKalb County Schools

The presentation by Mrs. Wells included a brief introduction regarding the importance of creative writing in the elementary classroom. Mrs. Wells stressed the importance of varied activities drawing upon many sources. She believes that children should be allowed to express themselves without fear of criticism. The introduction was followed by a description and examples of various ways of making book reports, children's poetry writing, seasonal creative writing topics, papers expressing negative feelings, the use of the newspaper, idioms, and class booklets. Language Arts learning centers developed by the speaker were displayed with a brief explanation. Finally, there was a presentation of a primary classroom's scrapbook that made composition relevant.

Cheryl Crawford began with a definition of composition: Having something to say to someone and finding a way to reify it. Composition includes oral, visual, and written symbols. The steps in composition are fluency, control, and effectiveness. The methods she suggested include: pre-writing discussion, warm-up activity, individual conferences, multi-media appraoch, individual folders, time for revision, peer evaluation, and creative reader's theater. The projects she discussed included: newspapers, poetry notebooks, dramatic monologue, poetry illustration, comics, improvisation, story book, collages and journals.

Suggested Readings:

Ashley, Rosalind Minor Successful Tecniques for Teaching Elementary Language Arts. Parker Publishing Co., Inc.

Creber, J.W. Patrick. Sense and Sensitivity. London: University of London Press, Ltd., 1965.

Daigon, Arthur. Write On! Chicago: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 1972.

Dixon, John. Growth Through English. Reading, England: 1967, pp. 1-31.

Jenkinson, Edward B. and Donald Seybold. Writing As A Process of Discovery. Bloomington: Indiana Univ. Press, 1971.

Koch, Kenneth. Wishes, Lies, and Dreams. New York: Random House, 1970.

Morgan, Fred. Here and Now II. Chicago: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 1972.

Platts, Mary E., Sr., Marguerite Rose, and Esther Shumaker. Spice. Stevensville, Mich.: Educational Service, Inc., 1970.

Torrance, E. Paul, and R.E. Myers. Creative Learning and Teaching. New York: Dodd, Mead and Co., 1971.

3. PUBLIC COMMUNICATION: THE RHETORIC OF NOW LITERATURE

Presenters: Matthew Morrison, University of Georgia
John Bloodworth, University of Georgia

The Rhetoric of Now Literature: The Comic Books (summary) -- Matthew Morrison

Ancient Greece had Hercules
Modern America has Superman.

Since the advent of Superman in 1938, the comic books of each decade have mirrored the culture and values of our society.

Today, we see that heroes, even the flawed and agonizing Superheroes of the sixties who were involved in solving our social and political ills, do not really exist in any world.

Comic books in the seventies seem to have lost belief in themselves and in their creations. Replacing the Superhero in the seventies is a new kind of "hero," -- the sympathetic monster, Marvel's Man-Thing cannot think: all he can do is sense. Like other heroes of this type, he does not really understand the things that are happening around him.

The best of the Now Literature, such as Marvel Comics, is twentieth-century mythology and their artists this generation's Homer.

Music as Expression (summary) -- John Bloodworth

The rhetoric of the emerging youth counterculture was discussed by Mr. Bloodworth, with emphasis placed on a primary form of communication today -- music. The songs of the sixties and seventies were represented as the handles for an anxious and alienated sector of the American population to communicate their thoughts, their goals and desires, and their hopes for a restructured life style and a changed world.

The discussion following the presentations centered around three questions: 1) How to use these techniques when others in the school object: 2) How to justify these as "classroom activities": and 3) How to get students to know (background) what the "message" is.

Suggested Readings:

Dixon, John. Growth Through English. Reading, England: 1967, pp. 1-13.

Lupoff, Dick and Don Thompson. All in Color for a Dime. Ace Books, paper, 1970.

Marvel and DC Comics, 1966-1974.

Perry, George and Alan Aldridge. The Penguin Book of Comics, Revised ed. Penguin Books, 1971.

Roszak, Theodore. The Making of a Counter-Culture. Garden City: Doubleday, 1969.

4. READING AND THE LANGUAGE ARTS PROGRAM
Presenters: Carol Garbin, Clarke County Schools
Anita J. Greene, Atlanta City Schools

Carol Garbin presented a report describing the use of read-aloud stories as an integral part of the language arts program for primary grade children in an elementary school in Clarke County. Purposes for including such a program in the language arts curriculum were discussed and slides were presented which depicted various aspects of the program. The follow-up activities for read-aloud stories were demonstrated by a display of students' work.

Suggested Readings:

Chambers, Dewey. Literature for Children: Storytelling and Creative Drama. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Company, 1970.
Cullinan, Bernice. Literature for Children: Its Discipline and Content. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Company, 1971.
Huck, Charlotte. "Strategies for Improving Interest and Appreciation in Literature." Pp. 203-210 in Paul C. Burns and Leo M. Schell (eds.) Elementary School Language Arts: Selected Readings. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1973.
Montebello, Mary. Literature for Children: Children's Literature in the Curriculum. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Company, 1972.
Ranta, Taima. "Literature for Children in a Culturally Diverse Society." Pp. 220-227 in Paul C. Burns and Leo M. Schell (ed.), Elementary School Language Arts: Selected Readings. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1973.

Anita Green presented a program for the secondary school. She said that the two types of communication skills which should concern every secondary English teacher are receptive communication skills which involve listening and reading and expressive skills which include speaking and writing. The language arts skills are ultimately dependent upon one another. Listening and speaking are the child's basic means of communication in his pre-school years. With the child's basic language as a foundation, the school provides experiences which broaden language usage. The child's listening and speaking vocabulary is used to develop a reading vocabulary; whereas the child's listening skills are refined to utilize auditory discrimination as a basis for phonetic analysis in reading. As the child's reading ability develops, he uses reading and speaking skills as a foundation for writing. Thus, these practices recognize interrelations among the four language arts: listening, speaking, reading, and writing. All in all, the language is the same, only the media for communication are different.

Suggested Readings:

Bond, Eva, and Guy L. Bond. Developmental Reading in High School. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1941.
Hasselriis, Peter. "Reading in Literature: Student Involvement Is Just the Beginning," Reading in the Content Area. ERIC/CRIER IRA Monograph Series, 1972, 31-74.
Herbert, Harold L. Teaching Reading in Content Areas. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970.
Hosier, Max, and Guy Wagerner. Reading Games. Darien: Teachers Publishing Corp., 1960.

Karlin, Robert. "What Does Research in Reading Reveal -- About Reading and the High School Student?" English Journal, 58, 3(March 1969), 368-95.
Marksheffel, Ned. D. Better Reading in the Secondary School. New York: The Ronald Press Co., 1966.
Rauch, Sidney J. and H. Alan Robinson. Guiding the Reading Program. Chicago: Science Research Associates, Inc., 1965.
Zintz, Mules V. The Reading Process. Dubuque: Wm. C. Brown Company Publishers, 1970.
The Commission on the English Curriculum of the National Council of Teachers of English. The English Language Arts in the Secondary School. Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1956.

5. REMEDIAL AND DEVELOPMENTAL READING PROGRAMS

Presenters: Frances Reed, Hall County Schools
Jane Kesler, Hall County Schools
Marcelyn Hooks, McDuffie County Schools

Frances Reed and Jane Kesler, using transparencies, slides and tapes, described a program in reading that has evolved at Johnson High, Hall County, without federal or state funds but with local administrative support and voluntary community materials and resources help. In the course the communications laboratory approach is used; instruction is individualized. The course was initiated for students reading below grade level; however, because the method has proven so helpful in improving reading skills, plans are being made to provide a developmental reading improvement course as an elective.

Marcelyn Hobbs gave an excellent and comprehensive report of a Title I English-Reading Rotation Program in McDuffie County. This program, which Mrs. Hobbs has worked with and helped shape and direct over a period of several years, has been recognized nationally for its effectiveness and for its organizational excellence. In her presentation, Mrs. Hobbs used slides, transparencies, statistical data, and samples of student work.

Both presentations were well received. Audience interest and involvement were high. The questions from the audience were concerned with the practical, procedural details that seemed crucial to the success of both programs.

See Readings under #4 and #18.

8. MEDIA COMMUNICATION: COMPOSITION IN A NEW KEY
Presenters: Pat Manning, Walton County Schools
Gail Ayres, Graduate Student, University of Georgia
Faye Phillips, Graduate Student, University of Georgia

Pat Manning explained how a group of students in her composition classes produced a Super-8 Movie for less than $56.00. The movie was based on Saki's "The Interlopers." She said that even those teachers who know nothing about filming can be successful if they follow a list of steps she presented.

Gail Ayres and Faye Phillips presented student and teacher made visuals for communication and composition. Many of their ideas were for elementary students, but they could be adapted for junior high and senior high students. Some of the examples of the materials include: 1) transparencies of students' poems; 2) books for poems; 3) feel box; 4) see chest -- a collection of pictures for composition; 5) puppets to aid self-expression; and 6) a slide and tape presentation.

Almost all members of the group reacted with intense interest and enthusiasm; some asked questions about a rationale for film-making in an English Class. The general attitude of the group was one of sharing new and exciting media techniques.

Suggested Readings:

Brown, et. al. Audio Visual Instructions: Materials and Methods. New York McGraw-Hill.

Hanke, Jeannette J. "Filmmaking -- Some Experiences with the Gifted." English Journal; 60, 1 (Jan. 1971), pp. 121-125.

LeFelt, Carol. "Language, Meaning, and the Classroom." English Journal, 62, 7 (October 1973), pp. 988-993.

Media and Methods (monthly). Philadelphia: North American Publishing Company.

O'Keefe, Patrick A. "The Movie's the Message!" English Journal, 60, 7 (Oct. 1971), pp. 957-959.

Planning and Producing Audiovisual Materials. Jerrold E. Kemp (ed.), 2nd ed. Scranton: Chandler Publishing Co., 1968.

Purvis, Alan. How Porcupines Make Love: A Response-Centered Curriculum. Lexington, Massachusetts: Xerox College Publishing, 1972.

Westbrook, Leon. "Input: A communication Experience." English Journal, 62, 7 (October 1973), pp. 1004-1007.

(See Readings under #9 and #21)

7. IMPROVISED DRAMA: A WAY OF GROWING

Presenters: Jane Quinn, University of Georgia
Betsy Acheson, University of Georgia

Jane Quinn gave a brief introduction to improvisation in drama; than twelve of her drama students demonstrated different types of improvisations with masks, cardboard characters, etc.

Betsy Acheson listed the overall areas of potential growth that a teacher would want to keep in mind when working with improvisation. (1) The first is the development of the child's self concept. Each child should come through the drama experience liking himself better than when he started. (2) Verbal growth is the second. Participating in situations demanding the use of various styles of spoken language and vocabularies peculiar to the situation enhance this learning. (3) Drama fosters intellectual growth by actually enticing students into research to locate information with which to continue their drama. (4) The final growth is that of values -- of morality. Exploration of the results of one's actions in a play (reversible) situation allows the participants to reflect on the repercussions of various decisions taken -- or the lack of them!

The audience was involved and interested. Audience experience with drama were discussed and questions involving how to prepare students for improvisation were emphasized.

Suggested Readings:

Britton, James. Language and Learning. London: Penguin Press, 1972.

Drucker, Peter F. "School Around The Bend." Psychology Today, June, 1972.

Heathcote, Dorothy. Drama in Education of Teachers. University of Newcastle-upon-Tyne: Institute of Education, 1966-67.

Hosford, Prentiss M. "Magic of Drama." Language Activities. Urbana, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1973, pp. 84-87.

Hosford, Prentiss M. and Elizabeth Acheson. "Child Drama . . . and Jonathan Livingston Seagull," English Record. Summer, 1974.

Jones, Robert. The Dramatic Imagination. New York: Theatre Arts Books, 1941.

Moffett, James. Drama: What is Happening? Champaign, Illinois: NCTE, 1967.

Polsky, Milton. " . . . Bag-O-Drama and sociodrama: Techniques for Role Playing." Dramatics. Ohio: The International Thespian Society, February, 1974.

Rosen, Connie and Harold Rosen. The Language of Primary School Children. London: Penguin Press, 1973, pp. 207-224.

Warner, Betty Jane. "Evoking Out Level Drama." Learning. March, 1974.

(See Readings under #8)

8. IMPROVISATION: A PROCESS OF DISCOVERY
Presenters: Frank Chew, Academy Theatre, Atlanta
Prentiss Hosford, University of Georgia

Frank Chew spoke of the value of improvisation and of the factors which often cause failures in improvisation. He was more concerned with what so often keeps improvisation from being a process of discovery. These failures he lists as: 1) the fear of failure, the fear of criticism, and the fear of appearing ridiculous; 2) vague goals and arbitrary standards of judgement; 3) pantomime as harmful to the process of improvisation. He concluded by saying, "Improvisation must be a process of discovery for everyone, not just the students. Issues must go below the surface."

Dr. Hosford spoke using literature as a background for drama. She gave as an example an improvisation by fourth and fifth graders based on The King's Fountain by Lloyd Alexander. She concluded that a great deal was learned about history, feelings, and the children themselves.

The presentations were exciting and a discovery process for everyone since the participants were actually asked to improvise. Through the improvisations they discovered how important concentration, believability, relaxation, and enjoyment are in making the technique worthwhile.

Suggested Readings:

Barnfield, Gabriel. Creative Drama in the Schools. New York: Hart Publishing Company, 1968.

Holbrook, David. English for Maturity. London: Cambridge University Press, 1961.

Redgrave, Sir Michael. Mask or Face. New York: Theatre Arts Books, 1961.

Stanislavski, Konstantin. Creating a Role. New York: Theatre Arts Books, 1961.

Way, Brian. Development Through Drama. Longman Group Limited, London, 1967.

(See Readings under #7.)

9. TV AND MOVIES AS CONTENT AND TOOL

Presenters: Paula Anderson, Graduate Student, University of Georgia
Dan Ward, Clarke County Schools

Paula Anderson described a high school course using TV home viewing as content, discussing reasons for television study, processes involved in this specific study, and the introductory period of the course.

The major emphasis of the presentation was on how to structure the content of TV into a curriculum. She did not go over every genre of TV, but rather discussed in depth the genres of commercials and dramatic shows. In each genre segment the student was asked to read at least one specific article, view several shows and be prepared to discuss what he sees, and finally to compose and present an example of each genre.

Dan Ward presented an account of his course in film study and movie-making. His emphasis, also, was on using viewing experiences as content.

The participants raised questions about using TV and movies as tools and about developing critical methods for evaluating TV and movies.

Suggested Readings:

Beach, Richard W. "Teaching Visual Cliche Through Language." Media and Methods. 1, 1, (September, 1973), pp. 38+.

Durgnat, Raymond. Films and Feelings. Cambridge: The M.I.T. Press, 1967.

Giblin, Thomas. Popular Media and the Teaching of English. Pacific Palisades: Goodyear Publishing Company, 1972.

Gross, Larry. "The 'Real' World of Television." Today's Education. 63, 1, (January/February, 1974), pp. 86-92.

Katz, Sheldon. "Turning the Kids on with Media." Audio Visual Instruction. 14, 8 (October, 1969), pp. 48-51.

Kuhns, William. Exploring Television. Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1971.

__________ and Robert Stanley. Exploring the Film. Dayton: George A. Pflaum, Publisher, Inc., 1968.

Littel, Joseph F. Coping with Television. Evanston: McDougal Littel and Company, 1973.

Postman, Neil. Television and the Teaching of English. New York: Appleton-Crofts, Inc., 1961.

Schrank, Jeffrey. TV Action Book. Evanston: McDougal, Littel and Company, 1974.

10. A HUMANITIES-CENTERED ENGLISH PROGRAM
Presenters: Gervaise Perdue, Houston County Schools
LaJuana Modling, Rockdale County Schools
Emma C. Walker, Fort Valley State College

Gervaise W. Perdue spoke on the humanities program in the Houston County High Schools. She said, "Humanities is a multi-disciplinary study of thematic topics and/or chronological eras. The thrust is on involvement by students through simulation activities such as mini-worlds, mini-societies, mock court systems, mock senares, world councils, etc. Activities vary: individual and group research; plays, skits, lectures; producing movies, composition, newspapers; art, music, dance, multi-media presentations; visitors and field trips.

LaJuana Modling presented a paper "Humanities Curricula Consensus: Current Writing." The three major points of the paper were: 1) a humanities program must be designed specifically for the system in which it is to operate; 2) organization and content of the program expand the existing system; and 3) the program must be humanistic.

Emma C. Walker presented a brief for "A Humanities-Centered English Program." In the forward she said, "Dormant in courses in English and American literature is the potential for humanistic focus. To a large extent a humanities-centered course depends upon the teacher's skill in adapting content to the humanistic disciplines. The acquisition of such skill would hardly require extensive formal study; it might well receive impetus from this statewide English conference . . . " Areas of discussion included the climate for nurturing the humanities; the purpose, goals and expected results of courses in the humanities; efforts to reach the culturally deprived student.

Suggested Readings:

Brandwein, Paul F. The Permanent Agenda of Man: The Humanities. Altanta: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 1970.

Davidson, Robert F. et. al. The Humanities in Contemporary Life. New York: Henry Holt and Company, Inc., 1960.

Jarrett, James L. The Humanities and Humanistic Education. Reading, Massacusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1973.

Marckwardt, Albert H. (ed.) Literature in Humanistic Programs. Champaign, Illinois: NCTE 1967.

Miller, Bernard S. The Humanities Approach to the Modern Secondary School Curriculum. New York: Center for Applied Research in Education, 1972.

Muller, H. J. The Children of Frankenstein. A Primer on Modern Technology and Human Values. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1970.

Patterson, Cecil H. Humanistic Education. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1973.

Walker, Saunders E. "Putting the Humanities to Work," The Fort Valley State College Bulletin. Vol. XXXIV, May 1973, No.

11. EVOKING SATISFYING RESPONSES TO LITERATURE
Presenters: Howard Dunlap, Fulton County Schools
Anna Hall, Rome City Schools
Marilyn Schmidt, DeKalb County Schools

The first presenter, Howard Dunlap, presented several ways teachers can help students give logical responses to literary selections, with emphasis on lyric poetry. The major point brought out was the fact that we should attempt to be sure that all parts of a poem live or are logically interpreted.

The second presenter, Anna Hall, presented slides on what was happening in her school to evoke responses in literature. She showed many slides that contained many of the projects the students of her school were doing in their elementary reading program.

The third presenter, Marilyn Schmidt, presented overhead transparencies showing how teachers can encourage students to become expert readers of literature not only in high school, but throughout life. She said, "The teacher must create an atmosphere conducive to open student response. Not only must he provide an open classroom, but he must respond actively to literature himself. Reading as many books as possible, especially current ones and ones students suggest, enables the teacher to feel confident to teach a variety of books and prevents him from having repetitious programmed responses to books he assigns the students." In discussing students' responses she said, "Students should be allowed to respond to the literature in a way comfortable to them. Some possible ways are individual presentations involving student-made audio-visuals, dramatizations analytical and creative writing, research, and student publications."

The audience discussion focused on ways of interpreting and responding to poetry.

Suggested Readings:

Blake, Robert W. "I See You, I Hear You, You're OK: Humanizing the English Classroom." English Journal; 63, 5(May 1974), pp. 41-46.

Carlsen, G. Robert. Books and the Teen-Age Reader. New York: Harper & Row, 1971.

Dixon, John. Growth Through English. Reading, England: 1967, pp. 32-70.

Hillocks, George, Jr. Alternatives in English: A Critical Appraisal of Elective Programs. Urbana, Illinois: ERIC 1972.

Kahn, Norma B. "A Proposal for Motivating More Students to Life Reading of Literature." English Journal, 63, 2 (February 1974), pp. 34-43.

Kohl, Herbert R. The Open Classroom. New York: New York Review, 1961.

Purves, Alan C. How Porcupines Make Love: Notes on a Response-Centered Curriculum. Lexington, Massachusetts: Xerox College Publishing, 1972.

individual. As Ken Donelson has so ably pointed out in the Georgia English Counselor, English Journal, and elsewhere, there are specific steps which may be taken against the assault of a critic of the book or books students will read in a climate of free and independent reading. Especially important is the need for each teacher to have carefully developed rationales both for the teaching of literature and for specific works which students may be asked to read. It goes without saying that every English teacher must be more than passingly familiar with the range of contemporary literature for adolescents.

Suggested Readings:

Advisory Statement Concerning Restricted Circulation of Library Materials. (Approved by the Intellectual Freedom Committee, June 20, 1971, as an interpretation of the Library Bill of Rights.) Chicago, Illinois: American Library Association.

Censorship. (Twelve articles reprinted from The Leaflet of the New England Association of Teachers of English.) Champaign, Illinois: NCTE, 196[illegible].

Censorship and the English Teacher. (Arizona English Bulletin) Champaign, Illinois: NCTE, 19[illegible].

Crouch, Alice, (ed.) "New Products and Publications for 1975." English Journal; 64, 1 (January 1975), pp. 21-4[illegible].

Donelson, Kenneth L. "Censorship: The English Teacher, The English Department, and The State English Affiliate," Georgia English Counselor, 1[illegible] (May 1971), pp. 1-7.

________________. "Challenging the Censor: Some Responsibilities of the English Department," English Journal; 58, 9 (September 1969), pp. 869-876.

Gordon, Edward, et al. The Students' Right to Read. Champaign, Illinois: NCTE, 1962.

Lynch, James J., and Bertrand Evans. High School English Texts: A Critical Examination. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1963.

McClellan, Grant S., (ed.) Censorship in the United States. New York: The H.W. Wilson Co., 1967.

Meeting Censorhsip in the School: A Series of Case Studies. Champaign, Illinois: NCTE, 1967.

Viewpoints: Controversy in Content and Materials in Schools. Division of Curriculum Development and Pupil Personnel Services, Office of Instructional Services, Atlanta, Georgia: Georgia Department of Education, 1973.

"What to Do Before the Censor Comes and After," (Reprinted from the Newsletter on Intellectual Freedom), Chicago, Illinois: American Library Association, March 1972.

12. BRIDGING THE GAP BETWEEN STUDENT TEACHING AND FIRST YEAR TEACHING
Presenters: Eunice Sims, Atlanta City Schools
Robbie Weeks, Jefferson County Schools

Bridging the Gap (summary) - Eunice Sims

The subject sounds simple -- as though there were only one gap. As a matter of fact, there are as many gaps as there are supervising teachers, student teachers, school philosophies, administrative regulations, pre-student-teaching educational opportunities, and the constantly changing demands of the educational scene. If a prospective teacher has had the advantage of an internship even before the student teaching experience he is already "gap-oriented," and is much better able to cope with the succeeding gaps.

Even before student teaching, there has no doubt been adequate preparation in subject matter. In the new assignment, however, there may be the need for willingness to acquire knowledge in new fields. College preparation in teaching methods, and curriculum development and implementation may not have been exactly what was expected in the student teaching experience. Demands in these areas may be different again in the new assignment. The philosophies of the schools' administrations may not be the same. Adaptability is the key to success here. "Doing your own thing" is great as long as a teacher recognizes the success of his methods with the students, but making an issue of all of the school's policies and practices with which he doesn't agree is a sure way to make the new teacher an isolate, without the cooperation and help he will surely need in a beginning situation.

Bridging the Gap (summary) - Robbie Weeks

Perhaps the most staggering task that faces a first year teacher is curriculum development, and no matter how many experiences the student teacher has in his college program, he will never fully realize the weight of this responsibility until he begins to plan his own curriculum for his own students.

Too often teachers regard curriculum as a neatly written document handed down by state departments, county boards, or obliging book publishers. George Hillocks, Jr., provides a brief definition of the term in "The English Teacher as Curriculum Maker":

> It is far more useful to think of a curriculum as a sequence of interactions among students, materials, and teacher, a sequence of experiences through which a student progresses toward some goal. In that sense, the teacher is truly the curriculum maker, for he is largely responsible for both the kind and quality of the experiences.

Of course, we have all repeatedly heard similar definitions in our curriculum courses, and most of us probably paid lip service to such theory; however, how many first year teachers have had enough experience in planning and implementing such a curriculum to feel comfortable in the role of curriculum maker?

Admittedly, every Education major makes some attempt at curriculum planning when he carefully designs lesson and unit plans for methods and curriculum courses. Usually, these plans are designed for an imaginary group of students who all read above grade level, who have an unquenchable desire

to learn, and who will write haunting, sensitive poetry and prose if only asked to do so. When the student begins his student teaching experience, he gets another chance to play curriculum maker. However, he usually relies on the classroom teacher's assessment of her students' needs and on her evaluation of his instruction. Thus the student teacher receives little practice in carrying out the important first and last steps of curriculum development.

Suddenly this same student teacher, now a real teacher, bravely faces six classes of high school students. In one class alone, he discovers students who read two years above grade level and students who read two years below first grade level. This curriculum maker must develop a curriculum that will meet the needs of approximately 150 students for the year.

In order to develop this sort of curriculum, a first year teacher will have to do an unbelievable amount of involved planning. Speaking for myself, I am one first year curriculum maker who needed all the help I could get.

In their reaction to the presentations, members of the audience gave their views of the gaps and possible solutions. These suggestions were made:

1. Conference including classroom teacher and college supervisor before the student teacher comes to discuss goals, organization, evaluation, etc. Keep communication open at all times between these two aspects of student teaching.
2. Sponsoring teacher for each first year teacher.
3. Be professional -- ask questions, attend meetings, read, etc.

Suggested Readings

Aston-Warner, Sylvia. Teacher. Louisville, Kentucky: Touchstone Publishing Company.

Dixon, John. Growth Through English. Reading, England: 1967, pp. 107-110.

Fader, Daniel. The Naked Children. New York: Bantam Books, Inc., 1972.

Glasser, William. Schools Without Failure. New York: Harper and Row.

Gregory, Thomas B. Encounters with Teaching. Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972.

Hillocks, George, Jr. "The English Teacher as Curriculum Maker." English Education. April/May, 1974, pp. 238-48.

Maloney, Henry B. Accountability and the Teaching of English. Urbana, Illinois: NCTE, 1972.

McGuire, Vincent, et.al. Your Student Teaching in the Secondary School. Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1959.

Neal, Charles D., et.al. The Beginning Teacher at Work. Burgess Publishing Co., 1971.

Postman, Neil and Charles Weingartner. The School Book. New York: Dell Publishing Company.

Reilly, Howard F. Student Teaching: Two Years After. Wm. C. Brown Company, Inc., 1965.

13. NATIONAL AND STATE ASSESSMENT PROGRAMS

Presenters: Roy O'Donnell, University of Georgia
Eugene Bottoms, State Department of Education

The National Assessment of Education Progress, funded by the Carnegie Corporation, the Ford Foundation, and the U.S. Office of Education, is designed to provide information on the knowledge, proficiency, and values of students and young adults in ten subject areas of the typical school curriculum. Writing was one of the ten areas selected for assessment.

The first writing assessment was conducted in 1969-1970. The population was 2000 individuals in the following age groups: 9, 13, 17, 26 to 35, selected by sampling procedures similar to those used by Gallup. Other assessments are scheduled at least through the 1970's.

Reports of the National Assessments of Educational Progress -- Report 3, Writing; 8, Writing Mechanics: 02-L-01, Understanding Imaginative Language: 02-L-02, Responding to Literature; 02-L-03, Recognizing Literary Works and Characters -- may be obtained from

Superintendent of Documents
U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, D.C. 20402

In 1970 the Georgia Board of Education approved the Goals for Education in Georgia, goals which are directed to the development of the individual and relate to the preparation of students in reading, mathematics and career development.

The present Georgia Statewide Testing Program utilizes norm-referenced standardized measures in grades four, eight, and eleven, but the Department of Education is now moving into the development of criterion-referenced tests.

Georgia teachers, subject area supervisors, and Department of Education staff have participated in defining the fourth and eighth grade objectives to be used in the construction of the criterior-referenced tests. As test items are written by specialist at Educational Testing Service, Georgia teachers will review each question for relevance and appropriateness.

Field testing will take place in all sections of Georgia. In order to collect data for performance "above" and "below" acceptable criterion levels, the tests will be given in grades 3 and 5 for determining 4th grade standards, and in grades 7 and 9 to establish 8th grade standards. Data from the field testing will be used by committees of Georgia educators to assemble final test forms for use in grades 4 and 8.

Further information about GAP, Georgia Assessment Project, may be obtained from

Division of Planning, Research, and Evaluation
Georgia State Department of Education
Educational Annex Building
Atlanta, Georgia 30334

14. CENSORSHIP, TEXTBOOKS, AND PAPERBACKS
Presenters: Marlene Caplan, DeKalb County Schools
Juneta Shadburn, DeKalb County Schools
Hugh Agee, University of Georgia

Censorship (Summary) -- Marlene Caplan

The presentation is divided into two parts: a consideration of the targets of censorship and of the censors themselves; a discussion of how to avoid censorship and how to deal with it if it has not been avoided. The essential points are summarized below.

Haphazard book selection by teachers can only aggravate the problem of censorship. As books are selected, teachers should take into consideration the many targets of censorship, which include the following:

1. political views in a work that differ from those of the censor
2. treatment of minorities and ethnic groups
3. roles portrayed by women in books
4. problems of contemporary society as the central concerns of books
5. use of language not acceptable to the censors and not appropriate to polite classroom discussion

Kenneth Donelson, in "The Students' Right to Read," sets forth the N.C.T.E. guidelines for dealing with censorship. Briefly, the Council suggests a two-step program for every school:

First -- a committee of teachers should be established to consider book selection procedures and to screen complaints.

Second -- efforts should be made to establish a community atmosphere in which local citizens may be enlisted to support the freedom to read.

The first of these steps is most important -- every English Department should develop its own statement explaining why literature is taught and how books are chosen for each class. The Council suggests that this statement should be on file with the administration before any complaints are received. Every English teacher should prepare a rationale, preferably written, for any book to be read by an entire class. The rationale should include teaching approaches, objectives, any possible censorship problems and how they will be handled. The administration should know the books that will be used for class reading by English teachers. The second step -- enlisting community support -- is equally important. If members of the community are informed about book selection procedures and are perhaps involved in considering complaints against any work, there will probably be very few complaints.

Mrs. Shadburn suggested guidelines that would enable English departments and textbook committees to establish criteria for selecting textbooks and supplementary materials. Long range planning, continuous evaluation of materials being used, and wise investment in supplementary materials can contribute much to the effectiveness of the instructional program.

Censorship, the English Teacher, and the Paperback Revolution (Summary) -- Hugh Agee

Censorship in some form has existed for thousands of years, and doubtless will continue to exist in some form. The English teacher, the English department, the school, and the entire school system must be prepared for the challenge of censorship. Every teacher and administrator must realize that no book or idea is ever immune to the critical eye of some group or

15. DEVELOPING A CLIMATE FOR CROSS-TEACHING

Presenters: Angelia Moore, Graduate Student, University of Georgia
Mike Cook and Foxfire Editors
Bettye Johnson and Linda Fair, Teacher Corps

Developing a Climate for Cross-Teaching - Angelia Moore

The term cross-teaching may be relatively new, but the idea of students teaching other students is not. Peer teaching is as old as the one room schoolhouse, but what we are talking about here is more than peer teaching, or an educational innovation, or a romantic illusion. I think what we are talking about here is an attitude or even a philosophy about education.

It seems to me that the chief obstacle to cross-teaching has been the past conditioning of both teachers and students. To develop a climate for cross-teaching, one is really developing an attitude about teaching and learning -- an attitude that says students have something worthwhile to say to each other, to their teachers, and to their community; an attitude that says students can and do learn from each other and the world around them as much or more than they learn in our educational systems; an attitude that says students learn best when they initiate a learning situation in which they become totally involved; an attitude that says one of the most useful tools students and teachers can learn in the modern world is learning about the process of learning and the process of change.

Cross-teaching involves students and teachers in group interaction. James Moffett says that the teacher's role in the group process is "to create models of talking together and helping each other that pupils can put into operation in small units . . . Out of his spirit he creates the climate of collaborative learning and helpful responding." Both Moffett and Carl Rogers give lists of some of the qualities necessary for a facilitator of learning. Stanford and Roark have an excellent chapter on group development in the classroom. Some of the other books offer practical suggestions for classroom use. However I do not think the idea of cross-teaching should be limited to the classroom. I think the concept expands to include learning in the environment, in the community. The best examples I can give you are Foxfire and the work done by the Teacher Corps.

The Foxfire student representatives through film and personal experiences presented elements of one type of cross-teaching. This cross-teaching situation is eight years old and centers around the concept of first establishing a climate of student involvement by engaging them in a task-oriented project, here putting out a magazine. In the process, students learn and are taught skills from others in the community, draw upon English skills to write the articles, use added skills of photography, editing, financing, to put the magazine together for distribution. When other students join the staff, students train the new students. Students also achieve certification in skill areas (photography, editing, etc.), the certification once again granted by the students. Students vote and are instrumental in all changes, additions, decisions. It is truly a most ideal cross-teaching arrangement, with students teaching students, community teaching students, students teaching community, students teaching teacher, teacher advising students and teaching them at the same time. A climate evolves for this by openness, acceptance, and tolerance for others.

The teacher corps representatives discussed their experiences as students, as teachers and as community leaders. Together with the panel and the participants they emphasized key ideas concerned with developing a climate for cross-teaching. First, the teacher must be concerned with developing positive self-concepts, trust, and acceptance. Second, the teacher must establish working patterns with other [illegible]achers, between the students, and with each other. And finally, the teacher must be committed to long hours of planning -- It's not an 8:00-3:15 job.

Suggested Readings:

Bruffee, Kenneth A. "Collaborative Learning: Some Practical Models." College English. February, 1973, pp. 634-643.

Gartner, Alan, Mary Kohler, and Frank Riessman. Children Teach Children. New York, 1971.

Hunter, Elizabeth. Encounter in the Classroom New Ways of Teaching. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1972.

Mason, Edwin. Collaborative Learning. New York: Agathon Press, 1972.

Moffett, James. Teaching the Universe of Discourse. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1968.

______________. A Student-Centered Language Arts Curriculum, Grades K-13: A Handbook for Teachers. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1973.

Rogers, Carl. Freedom to Learn. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1969.

Stanford, Gene and Albert E. Roark. Human Interaction in Education. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1974.

Weinstein, Gerald and Mario D. Fantini. Toward Humanistic Education: A Curriculum of Affect. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1970.

Wigginton Eliot. The Foxfire Book. New York: Anchor Press/Doubleday, 1972.

ERIC

16. ENGLISH PROGRAMS IN THE 70's: REAFFIRMING GOALS
Presenters: Edna Earl Edwards, West Georgia College
Willanelle Greene, Gainesville City Schools

Edna Earl Edwards re-defined the goals in teaching English in terms of the student. She said, "We must not have the same expectancies for all students. Overall, each student should achieve a sense of identity as an individual and as a member of a larger society. Literature is a means of his learning about himself and others, of gaining a broader scope of mankind with individual interpretations of people and the universe. Thus, a student must be able to read and must have a positive attitude toward reading in order to continue to read without assignments from teachers. Using the language effectively in oral or written form can enable a student not only to clarify his thinking but also to explore possibilities of inventiveness. Thus, our students should find language a tool to communicate their ideas to themselves and others."

Willanelle Greene presented the English Program in the Gainesville Schools as fairly typical of those which are trying to become adequate to present needs of students, which retaining any points of excellence from our recent past and establishing a curriculum and methodology which will show some awareness of the language needs of students who will live most of their lives in the 21st Century. Assuming that these are typical goals for English programs in Georgia in 1974, a comparison of what is happening locally with what we can learn from the scholars and practitioners from pre-school to university levels by examining the literature, the projects, and the materials should enable us to evaluate our efforts and chart future objectives.

Questions from the audience included: What has been the trend in teaching traditional grammar? What is our goal for the student -- is the emphasis in the quarter system too much on courses instead of on students?

Suggested Readings:

Art and Man, and Scope, from Scholastic.

Carlson, Ruth Kearney. Writing Aids Through the Grades. Teacher's College Press.

Circle of Stories. Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich.

Cullum, Albert. Push Back the Desks. Citation Press.

Curriculum for English. Grades 1-6. Nebraska Curriculum Development Center, NCTE.

Livingston, Howard. "Public Doublespeak: Language and Meaning in the English Curriculum." English Journal, 63, 6 (September, 1974), pp. 18f.

Nelson, C. Lynn. "Toward Teaching English for the Real World." English Journal, 63, 6 (September 1974), pp. 45-49.

Russell and Russell. Listening Aids Through the Grades. Teacher's College Press.

17. STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS: DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION
Presenters: Elizabeth Deal, Chatham County Schools
Mary Jo Boyd, Cobb County Schools
Jack McCleod, Cobb County Schools

Elizabeth Deal presented staff development as a concept which includes in-service, and some new factors -- accountability and competency-based teacher education and certification. She said, "Teachers are the real key to education. Good staff development then is essential, for we can not change all the colleges or the world, but we can help to change the places where we are."

Mary Jo Boyd presented the two options available to loval school systems -- the State administered grant-in-aid program or funds for a local staff development plan. The major emphasis of the local staff development plan must be the provision of in-service programs designed to build competencies necessary to meet the identified student needs.

Jack McCleod discussed the Concentrated in-service classes with forty-eight hours of instruction as equivalent to five quarter hours of college credit for salary increment. Cobb County has used the plan with much success.

Suggested Readings:

Bruner, Jerome S. The Relevance of Education. New York: W. W. Norton and Co., Inc., 1971.

Dixon, John. Growth through English. Reading, England: NATE, 1967. Pp. 95-106.

Evertts, Eldonna L. (ed.) English and Reading in a Changing World. Urbana, Ill.: NCTE, 1972.

Guthrie, James W. and Edward Wynne. New Models for American Education. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1971.

Shaver, J.P., and A.G. Larkins. Decision-Making in a Democracy. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1973.

Theory into Practice: Models of Staff Development. Vol. XI, No. 5. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University, 1972.

Trump, J. Lloyd. Images of the Future. Washington, D.C.: Commission on Utilization of Staff in the Secondary School, 1959.

18. READING AND THE TEACHING OF ENGLISH
Presenters: Jean Greenlaw, University of Georgia
Robert Jerrolds, University of Georgia

Dr. Jerrolds discussed principles and strategies for working with high school students to help them improve reading skills. He gave specific suggestions to English department chairmen for integrating work in English and reading.

The primary emphasis of Dr. Greenlaw's presentation was integrating reading and English, or language arts, in the elementary and middle grades. She distributed a handout listing sources of information and materials.

Suggested Readings:

Dixon, John. Growth through English. Reading, England: NATE, 1969. Pp. 14-31.

Hall, Mary Ann. Teaching Reading as a Language Experience. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company.

Heilman, Arthur W. and Holmes, Elizabeth Ann. Smuggling Language into the Teaching of Reading. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1972.

Kaplan, et. al. Change for Children: Ideas and Activities for Individualizing Instruction. Palisades, California: Goodyear Publishing Company, 1973.

Lee, Dorris M. and Allan, R.V. Learning to Read Through Experience. New York: Meredith Publishing Company, 1963.

Ramzey, Wallace Z. Organizing for Individual Differences. Newark, Delaware: International Reading Association.

Smith, James A. Creative Teaching of Reading and Literature in the Elementary School. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1967.

Smith, James A. Creative Teaching of the Language Arts in the Elementary School. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 2nd ed., 1973.

Stauffer, Russell G. The Language Experience Approach to the Teaching of Reading. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1970.

[illegible] A DESIGN FOR AN ENGLISH CURRICULUM: ITS VALUE IN THE CLASSROOM

Presenters: Marilyn Harris, [illegible] County Schools
Marie Shepard, Dougherty County Schools
Carol [illegible], Clayton County Schools

A Design for an English Curriculum is the curriculum guide for Language Arts Curriculum in Georgia. It has the content and structure necessary to build a good language arts program at all levels of learning. The structure and content are easily adapted to fit the needs, abilities and interests of all teachers and students.

An integrated language arts curriculum is the primary aim behind the Design, a fusing together of reading, English, spelling, listening, speaking and writing into an integrated whole to produce communication skills. Emphasis is placed on producing communication skills through using the language. Research and discovery teaching methods are put to use in workshop type learning centers where many levels of multi-media are grouped for effective utilization by learners. The teacher takes the role of facilitator acting in a consultative or advisory capacity.

The three presenters discussed their use of the Design informally; two used slides in their presentation. Each represented different schools and each demonstrated the value of the Curriculum guide in the hands of resourceful, innovative teachers and supervisors.

Questions from the audience indicated that many were not aware of the materials available nor of the fact that the materials had been field tested in various schools of the state. (Several excellent handouts were given to the participants.)

Suggested Readings:

Blake, Robert W. "I See You, I Hear You, You're OK: Humanizing the English Classroom." English Journal, 63, 5 (May 1974), pp. 41-46.

Bruner, Jerome S. The Process of Education. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1960.

______. Toward a Theory of Instruction. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1966.

Cullum, Albert. The Geranium on the Window Sill Just Died but Teacher You Went Right On. A Harlin Quist Book.

Fader, Daniel. The Naked Children. New York: MacMillan Company, 1971.

Moffett, James. A Student-Centered Language Arts Curriculum, [illegible] Houghton-Mifflin Company, 1968.

Waynant, Louise F. Learning Centers: A Guide for Effective Use. Paoli, Penn.: Instructo Corp., 1974.

20. MILESTONES AND GUIDEPOSTS: ASSESSMENT OF TRENDS IN CURRICULUM DESIGN
Presenters: Shirley James, Georgia State University
Edieann Biesbrock, Brenau College

Shirley James defined the key words in the title and discussed the reasons for the emergence of new trends in curriculum design. The trends in curriculum design grades 1-8 which were discussed included: 1) individualization of instruction via use of learning centers, learning contracts, and independent projects and activities; 2) open curriculum programs; 3) experiential oriented curriculum; and 4) behaviorally oriented curriculum.

Edieann Biesbrock presented an assessment of trends and factors relating to the secondary curriculum. She said, "Every civilized society fashions a curriculum from which the young of the society emerge educated. Depending upon the philosophy of education, the goals and aspirations of the society, and its views of the youthful responsibilities and obligations in preserving that same civilization, the curriculum is molded into a unique system. These same concerns have produced such diverse products as the militant training and physical endurance of the Spartan culture, the music and art schools for production of artists and musicians in the European city states, and the "life adjustment" curriculum in 20th century American schools." In a media presentation, she presented the concerns of the schools in the 1970's -- concerns for the type of society that our current teenagers will find they have inherited.

Questions from the audience concerned (1) coping with parents and others who want a return to the basic skills and (2) teacher preparation for an experienced-based curriculum.

Suggested Readings:

"Focus on Curriculum," English Journal; 63, 4 (April 1974), pp. 29-89.

Kentucky State Department of Education. New Directions: New Dimensions, English Language Arts in Kentucky. Frankfort, 1968.

Knowlton, Ruth E. "The Memphis English-Language Arts Living Curriculum," Elementary English, 51, No. 5(May1974).

Postman, Neil and Charles Weingartner. Teaching as a Subversive Activity. New York: Delacorte Press, 1969.

Sieber, Sam and David Wilder. The School in Society. New York: Free Press, 1973.

Silberman, Charles. Crisis in the Classroom. New York: Random House, 1970.

Van Til, William. Curriculum: Guest for Relevance. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Company, 1971.

Trump, Lloyd, and David Wilder. Secondary School Improvement: Challenges, Humanism, Accountability. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1973.

21. MEDIA LITERACY FOR SURVIVAL
Presenters: Jerry Sparks, University of Georgia
Dan Kirby, University of Georgia

Visual Communication is Basis for Verbal Communication (summary) - Jerry Sparks

Most of our communication is so unconscious that we are unaware that it occurs. Although much of our communicating is in the form of spoken and written words, a greater quantity takes the form of a visual medium. The central question to be approached is whether we can gain significantly by teaching both information and emotions through pictures. Teaching in this medium, additionally, would help prepare students to use available media more effectively.

Media Literacy for Survival (summery) - Dan Kirby

The concept of literacy is constantly expanding. English not only refers to just literature and grammar but encompasses the whole of language arts -- especially communications -- and is one that teachers of English must learn to deal with. The concerns of the teacher should be beyond the teaching of institutional media such as the newspaper, television, motion pictures, and mass communication. If it is to be effective and relevant for kids, it must include the non-print media and music which are an important part of their environment.

Questions centered around sources of films, faculty conflicts, involving students actively in producing in media, and specific classroom situations.

Suggested Readings:

Bach, Robert O., (ed.) Communication: The Art of Being Understood. New York: Haskings House, 1963.

Browne, Ray B., and David Madden, (eds.) The Popular Culture Explosion. New York: Wm. C. Brown Company, 1972.

Hall, Edward T. The Silent Language. New York: Doubleday, 1959.

Lacey, Richard A. Seeing With Feeling: Film in the Classroom. Philadelphia: W.B. Saunders Co., 1972.

McLuhan, Marshall. The Medium is the Message: An Inventory of Effects. New York: Bantam Books, Inc., 1967.

Nye, Russel. "Notes" for an Introduction to a Discussion of Popular Culture," Journal of Popular Culture, IV (Spring 1971).

Purves, Alan. How Porcupines Make Love. Lexington, Mass.: Xerox College Publishing, 1974.

Rosenberg, Bernard, and David Manning White,(eds.) Mass Culture Revisited. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Company, 1971.

Schramm, Wilbur, and Donald F. Roberts, (eds.) The Process and Effects of Mass Communication. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1971.

Schrank, Jeffrey. Teaching Human Beings: 101 Subversive Activities for the Classroom. Boston: Beacon Press, 1972.

(See Readings under #9)

22. TRENDS IN THE TEACHING OF ENGLISH IN THE EARLY GRADES
    Presenters: Carol Fisher, University of Georgia
    Peggy Natarella, University of Georgia

There appear to be two major competing emphases in Language Arts instruction: accountability and individual expression. Although at times these two conflict with each other, they are not necessarily contradictory. With additional research and effort, we should be able to measure the more creative, individualistic affective skills.

Within language arts the pressures of accountability are evidenced by continued standardized testing, National Assessment in oral and written communication, the development of local curriculum in behavioral terms, and the growth of performance-based or competence-based programs.

The effects of other disciplines -- especially psychology, linguistics, and psycho-linguistics -- has led to more accurate or realistic language in children's textbooks and a greater appreciation of the relationship between language development and ability to read.

There is greater emphasis on individualizing the language arts curriculum. This is apparent in a number of ways: diagnostic and prescriptive teaching programs, programmed or modularized materials, self-selection by children of tasks or activities, use of learning centers more language experience or individual group dictacted stories.

There is also more emphasis on creativity: a child's need to explore his world and the world of language without the imposition of adult standards. This is shown in the work in writing stories and poems, in movement and improvised dramatics, in finger play and storytelling.

Suggested Readings:

Burrows, Alvina T., Dianne L. Monson & Russell G. Stauffer. New Horizons in the Language Arts. New York: Harper & Row, 1972.

Carlson, Ruth Kearney. Literature for Children: Enrichment Ideas. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Company Publishers, 1970.

Evertts, Eldonna L. ed. Explorations in Children's Writing. Urbana, Ill.: NCTE, 1970.

Lane, S. M. and M. Kemp. An Approach to Creative Writing in the Primary School. London, England: Blackie, 1967.

Leavitt, Hart Day and David A. Sohn. Stop, Look, and Write! New York: Bantam Pathfinder, 1963.

McIntyre, Barbara M. Creative Drama in the Elementary School. Itasca, Illinois: F.E. Peacock Publishers, Inc., 1974.

Moffett, James. A Student-Centered Language Arts Curriculum, Grades K-6: A Handbook for Teachers. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1968. (revised 1973)

Smith, James A. Creative Teaching of the Language Arts in the Elementary School. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1967.

23. TRENDS IN THE TEACHING OF ENGLISH IN THE MIDDLE GRADES
Presenters: John F. Dickinson, Gwinnett County Schools
Jane Payne, Clarke County Schools

John Dickinson discussed the goals of the Middle School. He said that these goals must be realistic in terms of students' lives and teachers' lives; that teachers must set goals or the goals will be set for them; that teachers must ask "Why are we teaching what we are teaching?"; that teachers should let students help set goals. He concluded that teachers should use the natural characteristics of Middle School students -- "Stay in Pattern."

Jane Payne discussed group organization for learning. The organization is based on group development and makes use of peer evaluation. Activities include learning centers, library assignments, reading (set up by levels), social studies and language arts (heterogeneous) groups. The assignments require group cooperation. Group work usually follows direct teaching.

Suggested Readings:

Abercrombie, M. L. Aims and Techniques of Group Teaching. London: 1970.

Gartner, Alan, Mary Kohler and Frank Riessman. Children Teach Children. New York: Harper & Row, 1971.

Glasser, William. Schools Without Failure. New York: Harper & Row, 1969.

Mason, Edwin. Collaborative Learning. London: Ward Lock Educational, 1972.

Moffett, James. A Student-Centered Language Arts Curriculum, Grades K-13. New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1973.

Overly, Donald E., et al. Humanizing Education through the Middle School. Worthington, Ohio: Charles A. Jones, 1972.

Rogers, Carl. Freedom to Learn. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio University Press, 1969.

Stanford, Gene and Albert E. Roark. Human Interaction in Education. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1974.

Stapleton, Peter T. "Make-It-Yourself Exams for Do-It-Yourself English." English Journal, 62, 2 (February 1973), pp. 275-277.

Torrance, Paul and R.E. Myers. Creative Learning and Teaching. New York: Dodd, Mead and Co., 1972.

24. TRENDS IN THE TEACHING OF ENGLISH IN THE UPPER GRADES
Presenters: Jean Miller, Clarke County Schools
Nancy Houghtaling, Butts County Schools
James H. Sledd, Visiting Professor, University of Georgia

Jean Miller discussed the evolution of the English Curriculum from a traditional, teacher-oriented approach to the present student-centered approach. As its name implies, a student-centered curriculum makes the student the 'center of abstraction' and the teacher becomes, not only an instructor, but a guide and resource person as well. Activities within such a curriculum are designed to enhance 'discovery of self' through doing as well as listening, and to make the process of learning as enjoyable as possible. A humanistic approach to the teaching of English is evident in the curriculum structures, content, activities, and methods of English.

Drawing upon her own teaching experience, Nancy Houghtaling described specific classroom procedures that could be used in teaching literature. She stressed the need to establish realistic goals and to adapt materials and techniques to the needs and capabilities of individual students.

Suggested Readings:

Burton, Dwight L. Literature Study in the High Schools. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1970.

Fagan, Edward R. and Jean Vandell. Classroom Practices in the Teaching of English 1970-71. Urbana, Illinois: NCTE, 1970.

Fowler, Mary E. Teaching Language, Composition and Literature. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1965.

Guth, Hans P. English for a New Generation. New York: McGraw-Hill Co., 1973.

Hipple, Theodore W. Teaching English in the Secondary Schools. New York: MacMillan Co., 1973.

Judy, Stephen N. Explorations in the Teaching of English: A Source Book for Experimental Teaching. New York: Dodd, Mead and Co., 1974.

______________, ed. Lecture Alternatives in Teaching English. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Campus Publishers, 1971.

Loban, Walter, Mary Ryan and James Squire. Teaching Language and Literature. New York: Harcourt Brace and World, 1969.

Purves, Alan C. How Porcupines Make Love. Lexington, Massachusetts: Xerox College Publishing Co., 1972.

Rice Frank M. English and Its Teaching. Lincoln, Nebraska: Professional Educators Publication, Inc., 1972.

Shuman, R. Baird, ed. Creative Approaches to the Teaching of English. Itasca, Illinois: F.E. Peacock Publishers, 1974.

James H. Sledd:

After thirty five years of teaching (mainly happy and mainly wasted), I'm quite sure that when I look for present trends I see only the shadows of my own mistakes; and I would never have consented to inflict myself upon you if my hosts at Georgia had not been so kind, this summer, that it would be rude to say no to anything they ask. They asked me to talk -- for no longer than twenty minutes. I am, therefore, duty bound to emit speech of the prescribed duration, but instead of "Present Trends" my title should be probably "Pratfalls Revisited."

By some strange linkage, the image of the pratfall evokes in my mind the image of the tripod -- the old tripod of language, literature, and composition on which our profession sits enthroned (or lies impaled). When I emerged from graduate school, the evangels of structural linguistics were winning their first numerous converts among the heathen pedagogues; and I shortly joined them in assuming the missionary stance. Our spiritual progeny, for a time, were numerous, and I am not persuaded that we did more harm than our approximate contemporary, the Senate's super patriot Joe McCarthy, whose own sins, were they enacted on the present stage, would seem little more than amiable eccentricity; but our gospel was like the seed that sprang up quickly, yet having no root, soon withered in the sun. Only Paul Roberts profitably walked the water from traditional to structural to transformational grammar; and (if I may say so with no disrespect for the memory of a gifted man) Paul Roberts was lucky that he did not have to make the further passage from <u>Syntactic Structures</u> to <u>Aspects of the Theory of Syntax</u> and thence to generative semantics and case grammar and the pullulating theories of the young linguists of today, the cleverest generation, intellectually, in the history of linguistics -- and the least likely to say one word that will be useful to high school teachers. My guess is that if Roberts had survived his fall in his Roman bathtub, he would by this time have done two books on social dialects and would be hard at work on women's language.

Traditional philology, structural linguistics, generative grammar of various kinds, generative semantics, and now the hot rich dubious hell-broth that the sociolinguists are serving up -- the activity has been immense, but the gains for high school teachers by no means commensurate. The chief accomplishment of the structural linguists was to discredit the traditional grammarians, whose work, it should be noted, provides the frame for the traditional histories -- the only real histories -- of the English language and also for our English dictionaries. Generative grammar in its turn has been debased by such applications of it as transformational sentence-combining, and sociolinguistics has given us bidialectalism, a device for making black folks talk like white folks so that they can join the whites in promoting inflation, depletion, pollution, and the exploitation of the undeveloped countries by more subtle forms of slavery. The history of applied English linguistics in my day can only be called inglorious.

Yet I persist, like many others, in trying to teach such linguistics as I know to new teachers every year. If I should be required to justify the expenditure of the tax-paying Texan's money in this enterprise, I would privately remark that it allows me to keep bees beside the Pedernales; but a public justification could hardly be so scrupulous. I suppose I might say that new teachers should

learn something serious about the nature of language and its place in human life. Good approaches to those central questions might be the study of the nature, history, and social functions of standard languages in general and the particular history of the rise of English to its present status as the most popular language in the world; but no approach will be successful if it weakly avoids the technicalities of grammatical theory. Since with a few exceptions most of the fashionable applications of linguistics strike me as either dubious or trifling, I would hope that my students in their turn would not bother too much about them but instead would give their students some understanding of what it means to speak and to speak some dialect, standard or nonstandard, of late twentieth century English.

To turn from the linguistic leg of our tripod to composition is to turn from general confusion to utter chaos, from neurosis to dementia. Of the last two composition courses which I directed or devised, one was based on classical rhetoric and the other, with the label "Literature and Composition," on a vulgarization of Aristotle's *Poetics*. Very probably neither experiment proves anything more than my age -- and the fact that the first, best years of my professional life were spent in the old College of the University of Chicago. The chief conviction which those and other experiments have fixed in my mind is that nobody can *teach* anybody to write but that some people can help others to *learn* if they *want* to learn.

The sources of that strange desire are multifarious, and largely beyond our control: requirements for admission to colleges, refusals by girls to go to bed with boys, the narcissistic love of one's own maunderings, the pure love of shared inquiry, the itch for upward mobility, the necessity of forming a self or selves, and God only knows what else. I am pretty skeptical of the efficacy of exhortation to get motivated. Most talk about finding a personal voice simple encourages the public searching of souls where there's nothing to search for; and since English classes are further removed from reality than anything I know except Richard Nixon's protestations of innocence, I don't think we'll ever have many students whom we can really help to write. Nothing much would be lost, except our jobs, if separate, required courses in composition were just abandoned.

Yet there will always be some students, ours or not, who do need and want to learn, and I hope there will always be some teachers who can help them. A grammar may be useful in this effort because without one, nobody can talk to a student about the linguistic surface of his writing; but to make grammar or grammatical exercises central is stultifying. If I should ever finish the book for workaday writers which I claim to be composing, the whole truth about composition will be revealed. Meanwhile, I will simply urge the importance of one concpet -- the concept of controlled inference. A workaday writer is trying to tell somebody something, but because he can tell only a little bit of what he wants to tell, he must go choose and arrange and utter that one bit that his reader will tell himself the rest. The workaday writer's work is getting his reader to work with him. You will understand what I mean if you ask yourself what a well-turned literary allusion used to do, or how a sardonic wisecrack can destroy both its object and its suicidal maker, or what you know of Auden and his view of Housman when he says that Housman "kept tears like dirty postcards in a drawer."

ERIC
Full Text Provided by ERIC

With that quotation I arrive at literature, though the fear of uncontrolled inference restrains me from continuing the metaphor of the tripod. In speaking on this subject -- because I'm a long way from home and have so small an audience -- I will do the unforgivable and express some feelings (they are too wishy-washy to be called ideas) which flow from my own life, are quite possible phony even so, and almost certainly will provoke an embarrassed silence. However:

For five hundred years, white Europeans have exploited the other races of the earth. Our craving for more things -- for upward mobility, a continuously rising standard of living, a grosser national product -- that lunatic craving compels us to rob and bully and enslave less powerful nations: and yet our craving is itself a form of slavery, an addiction, because it can never be satisfied. The crowds of people who hustle back and forth on Atlanta's freeways, like their counterparts everywhere else, detest their way of life but are afraid to change it; and their children, our students, are more and more disoriented and despairing. Nobody who has children has missed seeing that despair. Anyone with the guts to look can see it among students here in Athens, this summer -- young people who know how crazy the world is, who feel themselves driven to conform to its craziness, yet who want desperately to find that good universe next door where they can believe in what they are and what they do.

It would be preposterous, of course, to suggest that literature can cure these ills, just as it would be grotesque to pretend that a teacher's life-forces are inexhaustible; yet my own needs, if nothing else, drive me to look for ways to keep my balance, for purposes that will make me get up in the morning now that the blind urgency of life has weakened, for some antidote against the poison of preferring death. At the risk of gross absurdity, I suggest that maybe, for some few students and few teachers, good books -- and particularly good fiction and good poetry -- can be part of a survival kit. Instead of adding bars to their prison by changing their language to make them upwardly mobile, we might give some of our studnets a hacksaw and a file -- i.e., the high pleasure of intelligent reading.

I'm not suggesting the soulful oratory of teachers who like to be called "exciting" as they babble about books. At least before streaking made nudity dull too, excitement could be produced in less damaging ways. Just as I think a man finds his voice in writing, not by looking for it, but by doing the job which brings him to his typewriter, so I think a man can draw strength from his reading only if he learns how to read well. That means hard work, close analysis, and every other practice -- if necessary, even critical theorizing -- which promotes understanding without murdering pleasure. Teachers will still have to teach, not vaporize, if they see literature as one means to survival.

So I conclude with a struldbrug's reminiscence. In Decatur High School in the closing 20's, our English textbooks were called Literature and Life. Just forty-five years after entering Miss Mary Lou Culver's freshman class, I shame myself by suggesting that a better title would change and to for. Almost none of my adolescent convictions has survived. Like most of my classmates, I suppose, I chiefly regret my cowardice and docility: we didn't do enough of the things that we were told were wrong. Yet somehow we depression babies, the infants of World War I and the adults of World War II, were slow to learn the distaste for life, for living, which is everywhere under the deceptive surface of our children's days. Maybe if we English teachers of all ages would live more

ourselves, quit worrying so much about conformity, respond more generously to the rowdy, randy folks whose books we first neuter and then embalm in our courses in literature, maybe then our courses would help an occasional lost soul to abhor the deadly sin of loving what is deadly. Of the current trend to such romantic nonsense -- if that is what it is -- I heartily approve. Worse than a pratfall in never getting off it.

25. TEACHING ENGLISH IN THE FIRST YEAR OF COLLEGE

Presenters: Elaine Douglas, Fort Valley State College
Mary Ann Hickman, Gainesville Junior College
Donald Barnett, University of Georgia

The session opened with Richard Rystrom, the moderator, presenting a paper entitled, "The Pop-Comp-Slop." The paper outlined the teacher's responsibility "to teach students how to structure what they want to communicate and the emotional responses they want to trigger." The second part of the paper discussed some principles which would be essential, in his view, to the kind of first-year English experience that is necessary and desirable.

Elaine Douglas gave a talk concerning what the teaching of English in the first year of college ought to be. Her emphasis was on the developmental course in the sense of "leading each student to his maximal potential in the expression of his ideas . . .

Mary Ann Hickman gave an account of the freshman English program at Gainesville Junior College. Her main thrust was toward how to make the students understand the real nature of the structure of the 500 word-theme. She presented some slides to show how she accomplishes this.

Finally, Donald Barnett explained the procedure used in teaching the freshman to write at the University of Georgia.

Audience reaction was spirited and evoked many thoughtful questions and comments. Again and again, one idea was emphasized: the need to make other members of the English department recognize their responsibility to help students continue that development of communication skills.

Suggested Readings:

Gibson, Walker. Seeing and Writing. New York: Longmans, Green, 1959.

Halverson, John and Mason Cooley. Principles of Writing. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1965.

McCrimmon, James M. "Will the New Rhetorics Produce New Emphases in the Composition Class?" College Composition and Communication; XX, 2 (May 1969), pp. 124-130.

Mills, Barriss. "Writing as Process," College English; 15, 10 (October 1953), pp. 19-26.

Smith, Ron. "The Composition Requirement Today," College Composition and Communication; XXV, 2 (May 1974), pp. 138-148.

Tate, Gary, and Edward P.J. Corbett, (eds.) Teaching Freshman Composition. New York: Oxford University Press, 1967.

Winetrout, Kenneth. "Communications," The Journal of Higher Education. February, 1950.

SECOND THOUGHTS FROM THE KEYNOTER -- Stephen Judy

Somebody asked me yesterday morning, "How can you possibly assess a conference that contains seventy-five sessions?" And I must say that that is a question that has remained with me the past two days. Add to that the fact that there are three hundred people in attendance here, it means that there are 300 different and equally valid views of what has been going at the conference. So I am going to take Ramon Veal literally in his invitation to depart from the "assignment," and not talk about the conference at all. Rather I would like to tell you a couple of stories about my kid.

The first took place about three years ago when Stephen was three years of age. It was a warm summer evening after supper, and he was standing on the balcony of our apartment. He had his elbows up on the railing and was staring off into the sunset. My wife and I were inside having coffee. She was a bit concerned with the possibility of paint-and-lead poisoning,and she called out to him,"Stephen, are you chewing on that rail?" He thought about that for a minute, and then turned and said to us, "No, I'm wondering on it." That struck me as a very exciting use of language. It was creative; it was original metaphor; it was highly effective in communicating (and it also occurred to me later that it was slightly ungrammatical). But that use of language by a three-year-old has come to provide me with a very useful metaphor; for the ways in which people learn to use language -- not only as preschoolers but also as adults -- is through a process of wondering with language, exploring with it, testing it out on the fringe of grammaticality as our experiences expand.

Now Stephen is six years old and his patterns of wondering have changed, just as his language "wonders" in different ways. This week my wife pointed out that his pattern of response to some of his books is changing. One of his favorites -- and one of mine, I must confess -- is Dr. Seuss's If I Ran the Circus, the story of a boy named McGurkus who imagines what it would be like if he ran a circus in the empty vacant lot behind Sneelock's General Store. In typical Seuss fashion McGurkus fantasizes about the circus. The climax: "At the top of the tent, look, the star of my show/great daredevil Sneelock, the world's greatest type/comes pulled through the air by three Subrian snipe/and a dingus contraption attached to his pipe/While people below bite their nails off in fright/great Sneelock soars up to a terrible height." This was always the high point of the book for Stephen; he would just stare in enchantment at the picture of Sneelock, soaring up, pulled by the snipe. This past week when we reached that section, he mustered all the rational cynicism a six-year-old can, and said to my wife, "Mom, you know three birds really couldn't pull a man up that high." It was interesting for several reasons. First of all, as my wife and I discussed it, it was sad to see that stage disappear. (I suspect Santa Claus is going to be the next victim of his six-year-old rationalism.) But it also occurred to me that there is no less delight for Stephen in reading Dr. Seuss at this point (which I enjoy

because it means we can continue to read the books from time to time). Within the past six months Stephen has reached a point where he is interested in knowing how things tick: He likes to know how things work; he likes to take things apart; he collects things (we are being inundated at the moment with treasures he finds, bottle caps, paper clips, anything that he can carry in his pockets he brings home). We now go through Seuss not simply gazing in awe and wonder at the circus that McGurkus is building, but talking about the various contraptions -- the "dingus contraptions" -- that Seuss has invented for us. In short, there is no less wonder in what he is doing; it's just a different kind of wonder, and it's the kind of wonder that is expanding as he matures.

Last year Stephen went to school for the first time, quite excited about the whole thing. We were the ones biting our nails off in fear and anticipation. He had had a very successful preschool experience and was looking forward to school; we were wondering just how _we_ would cope with it, wondering specifically what would happen when he met his first teacher. Would he get a good teacher? Would it be a teacher who would build on the kinds of things that he was doing, was interested in, and so on? (I think as an education professor I have always worried about what I'd do the first time I ran into a teacher who was doing things I found reprehensible? Do I storm in and talk to the principal? Do I flash him my Ph.D. diploma? Or, more sensibly, does one just stand back and hope for the best?) Fortunately, Stephen ran into a teacher who did all the kinds of things we were eager to have happen. She liked to read to the kids; she liked to get the kids to tell stories; she took dictation and at least once a week Stephen came home with a small booklet or a story that he had written and illustrated. So at the end of the first year in school, his language power had increased enormously; he was getting into the beginning stages of reading; he liked to write.

As I tried to suggest yesterday, I feel the odds are that within the next twelve years Stephen will encounter a good many more people like his first-year back. So my wife and I are, if not entirely relieved, at least moderately confident that he will continue to grow, continue to possess that sense of wonder about language.

To draw an analogy, it seems to me that the teaching art is in fact very much like that process of wondering that people go through when they grow in their use of language. For teaching very clearly is an art, not a science. There are no set rules; there are no set methods; there is a great deal of exploration and wondering and testing that must go on in the process. This is also something that isn't always as pleasurable for us as it is for the kids, because experimental teaching and teaching that involves a lot of wondering and exploration is not always comfortable; the fear of failure is always there, and it is more likely and more evident when one is doing experimental teaching than when one is pursuing the traditional curriculum, studying grammar, and so on.

Lawrence Ferlinghetti has talked of wondering as well, and I would like to read from a poem of his called "I Am Waiting." It is one of my favorites.

> . . . I am waiting
> to get some intimations
> of immortality
> by recollecting my early childhood
> and I am waiting

for the green mornings to come again
youth's dumb green fields
come back again
and I am waiting
for some strains of unpremeditated art
to shake my typewriter
and I am waiting to write
the great indelible poem
and I am waiting
for the last long careless rapture
and I am perpetually waiting
for the fleeing lovers
on the Grecian Urn
to catch each other up at last
and embrace
and I am awaiting
perpetually and forever
a renaissance of wonder.[1]

I now turn to my one and only comment about the conference that we've been involved in these past two days: Based on the conversations that I have had with a good many of you and the sessions that I have managed to attend, it seems to me that the renaissance of wonder is alive and well in Georgia. The kinds of questions that you are asking seem to be important and significant ones. It seems to me that a lot of people have good answers to many of those questions, but the people who are offering answers are offering them on a tentative basis. I haven't found anybody in the past two days who is presenting a cure-all or, for that matter, anyone who expects to find one. I've very much enjoyed the past two days, and I have enjoyed chatting with you and having an opportunity to do a little wondering with you.

---

[1]From "I Am Waiting," A Coney Island of the Mind. Copyright ©1958 Lawrence Ferlinghetti. Reprinted by permission of New Directions Publishing Corporation.

COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS FROM CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS

Comments from the recorders' reports and from the luncheon groups will be invaluable to the 1975 program committee. From them the committee will draw confidence and find direction for planning the Fourth Annual Conference. Excerpts from the suggestions are given here:

WHAT ASPECTS OF THIS CONFERENCE WOULD YOU RECOMMEND INCLUDING IN FUTURE CONFERENCES?

Conferees suggested:

- Having keynote speaker available for personal conferences
- Classroom teachers as presenters
- Presenters pre-planned for conference rather than "just be there"
- Conference on Thursday and Friday instead of Saturday
- Variety of people attending luncheon (including presenters), more book displays, division of methods, and curriculum instrument procedures into elementary, junior high, secondary
- Bring Stephen Judy back
- Advance registration and selection of groups
- Dr. Judy's availability was helpful
- Seminar organization
- Pre-planning sessions for participants for each session
- The exchange of actual procedures -- practices which worked in the classroom
- Continued emphasis on media in the classroom
- Demonstration and participation sessions
- Same format
- Classroom teachers as presenters; use students
- Foxfire session
- Some programs with two sessions so we can study an area in depth
- Time for sharing with counterparts; for instance, sessions for teachers who teach Humanities
- Reading sessions, language sessions
- Two full days for conference
- Format excellent (groups, teacher presenters)
- Sharing practical and tangible methods of classroom procedure
- Present format, duplication of group sessions

WHAT ASPECTS OF THE CONFERENCE WOULD YOU SUGGEST CHANGING IN FUTURE CONFERENCES?

Conferees suggested:

- Have group leaders limit "input" to allow members of group more time to discuss
- Group leaders need a chance to meet before group meetings to prevent overlapping
- More organization among presenters before presentations
- More demonstrations and less theorizing

ERIC

- Time limit for the presenters to enable more discussion
- Less concentration on trends in Georgia and more emphasis of national trends
- Increase time between afternoon and evening sessions
- More participation by those who deal directly with the problems
- A "curriculum smorgasbord" -- swapping units or curriculum for elective courses, etc.
- More time, begin on Thursday morning about 10
- Have banquet Thursday night -- forces acquaintance which no other situation does
- Workshop centers that can change topics/speakers: teachers can attend to exchange ideas
- Media workshop session would be much better than lecture
- Limit presenter to 2 per session
- During the year, poll teachers about problem areas
- Narrow scope of grades covered so that interests are similar
- More audience participation; more demonstrations; more practical suggestions; some teachers have ideas they want to communicate but no one has the time to listen
- Describe content more
- Title often not clear enough for choosing
- More time to attend group meetings
- Have more people involved in planning the programs
- More information on small group sessions with pre-registration data

ADDITIONAL REACTIONS

Conferees commented:

- There needs to be a time at the end for wrap up and answering questions
- More audio-visual equipment available
- More space for seminar presentations
- Include information about program participants in the written programs
- Why was so much time and money spent on the old and revised state curriculum guide and no reference was made to it except in one small session? Is it our guide or not?
- Good preparations on part of presenters in effort to make presentation meaningful
- Allow more time for audience participation and discussion
- This conference provides a great opportunity for Georgia teachers of English. Thanks for all your efforts in our behalf!
- Provide opportunity for individuals to confer with the "Specialists"
- The conference should involve more of participants
- Have display area for teachers to bring their ideas and projects that have succeeded to be shared, possible giving handouts

TENTATIVE PLANS FOR 1975 SUMMER CONFERENCE

Thursday, July 24

Time	Activity
10:00 - 11:30	Opening General Session
11:30 - 1:30	Book exhibits, Lunch on your own, Meeting of program participants
1:30 - 2:15	Major sessions: A. Reading, Literature, and the Language Arts B. Communication Skills C. Dramatic Activities D. Composition E. Student-Centered Teaching
2:15 - 3:15	Discussion groups 1 - 12
3:15 - 4:00	Refreshment break
4:00 - 5:00	Discussion groups 1 - 12 (Repeat)
5:00 - 8:00	Dinner on your own
8:00 - 10:00	Choice of activities Film Festival Pop Culture and the Teaching of English The Georgia Design and Quarter Programs ETV and the English Language Arts

Friday, July 25

Time	Activity
9:00 - 12:00	Book exhibits
9:00 - 10:00	Discussion groups 13 - 24
10:00 - 12:00	"Bring and Brag" (Teaching displays)
10:00 - 11:00	Discussion groups 13 - 18 (Repeat)
11:00 - 12:00	Discussion groups 19 - 24 (Repeat)
12:30 - 2:00	Luncheon

Each of the major strands will have its own "keynote" presenter. The discussion groups that follow will grow out of the major sessions. Thus, conferees will have time to pursue topics of interest in depth through the repeat sessions, or they may move to a different discussion group. There is also more time to visit book exhibits and interact with program participants and other conferees.

The "Bring and Brag" session Friday morning will give teachers an opportunity to share their accomplishments with other teachers in a tangible way. The field is open, and teachers who have materials, activities, etc. to share should contact Dr. Hugh Agee at the University about participating in this phase of the program.

All levels of the English language arts -- elementary, middle school, high school, post-high school -- will be included in the program scope. More details on the discussion group topics will be available in a program brochure to be distributed in May.

Dr. Hugh Agee, Program Chairman
125 Aderhold Hall
University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia 30602

ERIC

A Note from the President of GCTE, James M. Brewbaker:

"Renewal" has been chosen by NCTE for its unifying theme at the New Orleans convention in November of '74. Nothing, in my view, better characterizes what goes on at our statewide conferences than the notion of renewal -- renewal of ideas, renewal of commitment and attitudes, renewal of friendships among teachers from opposite corners of the state, renewal, to be sure, of people who care about kids in English classrooms. Renewal is what I come to these conferences for, and I have never left empty-handed. That's why I keep coming back.

The cynic will break in at this point to say, "Yeah, but what about your 'renewed' teacher in September? Will she really be a better teacher? Will the ideas gathered in Athens get to the kids?"

Of course she will! As a Columbus teacher said to me at the close of the last conference, "Dammit! I haven't been so charged up about teaching for years. Just let me at those kids!" Almost protesting her heightened commitment, this teacher forcefully expressed what I believe is a common experience among conference participants, cynics notwithstanding. As I tell teachers when I visit district GCTE meetings, "Just ask those who have been. They know."

The conference, of course, is a major undertaking sponsored jointly by GCTE and the Language Education Department. Let me take this opportunity to stress the importance of supporting the conference through active membership in the Georgia Council. Now - while the idea is fresh in mind -- take the time to renew a lapsed membership or to affiliate with GCTE for the first time. An application is attached for your convenience.

GEORGIA COUNCIL OF TEACHERS OF ENGLISH MEMBERSHIP APPLICATION 1974-75

Please complete all sections of the application. Please print.

NAME Miss Sister Mr. Ms. Dr. Mrs. (circle one) ________ Last ________ First ________ Initial DISTRICT ________

ADDRESS ________ STREET OR BOX NUMBER GRADES TAUGHT ________

________ city state zip NAME OF SCHOOL ________ SYSTEM ________

TELEPHONE NUMBER ________

Are you a GAE member? ( ) yes; ( ) no
Are you an NCTE member? ( ) yes; ( ) no

Membership dues for the 1974-75 year in the Georgia Council of Teachers of English are $5.00 or $9.00 for two years (through the summer of 1976). Make check payable to GCTE and mail it to:

J. Alvin Railey
Membership Chairman, GCTE
1941 Warm Springs Raod, 6-C
Columbus, Ga. 31904

IMPORTANT: WHEN JOINING THE GEORGIA ASSOCIATION OF EDUCATORS, PLEASE CHECK "TEACHERS OF ENGLISH" IN THE APPROPRIATE SPACE.