ED 433 244   SE 062 788

AUTHOR   Novello, Mary K.
TITLE   Recent Research in Math, Science, Language Arts, Social
                Studies and the Arts.
PUB DATE   1999-03-00
NOTE   21p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the
                Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (San
                Francisco, CA, March 6-9, 1999).
PUB TYPE   Information Analyses (070) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE   MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS   *Academic Achievement; *Academic Standards; Art Education;
                Constructivism (Learning); Educational Change; Elementary
                Secondary Education; Language Arts; *Literature Reviews;
                Mathematics Education; Problem Solving; Science Education;
                Social Studies

ABSTRACT
        There is consensus in the United States that schools are not
succeeding. This paper presents recent research in mathematics, science,
language arts, social studies, and the arts to discuss ways in which to
improve instruction and learning in these areas. Featured topics include
cooperative learning, problem solving, use of technology, whole language,
constructivism, and standards. (Contains 64 references.) (ASK)

Recent Research in Math, Science, Language Arts, Social Studies and the Arts

By Mary K. Novello, Ed.D.

Washington Institute Foundation

1

2

There is apparent consensus in the United States that our schools are not succeeding. Evidence for this opinion is given by the dismal showing of American students in recent international academic competitions, especially in mathematics and science. These were competitions which most Asian countries did not deign to enter, having walked away with all of the top honors in the previous ones.

Many efforts have been made over the years to solve this problem by fixing the schools. The newest idea is to impose national standards unifying what students are expected to know at what grade level. With the imminence of these standards, which imply achievement, my logic suggested that educational researchers would be concerned with innovations and techniques that would lead to higher grades and test scores. However, using the word "achievement" as a descriptor led to a paltry few studies, most of them in math and science.

Research on the teaching of problem-solving strategies, for example indicated that it neither enhanced nor diminished computational skills, but only that it improved problem-solving abilities (Fennema, Carpenter, Franke, Levi, Jacobs & Empson, 1996; Hiebert, Carpenter, Fennema, Fuson, Human, Murray, Olivier & Wearne, 1996; Kallam & Kallam, 1996; Mastin, 1996; Rudnitsky, Etheredge, Freeman & Gilbert, 1995; Wilborn, 1994; Wood & Sellers, 1996). Technology got mixed reviews. One study (DeVaney, 1996a) found significant negative associations with computation and geometry achievement for the frequent use of computers and using computers for drill and practice. Another (Clariana, 1996) studied the effects of

adding a computer-based integrated learning system (ILS) to traditional third-grade mathematics instruction and found that it made only a small difference in computation skills, but on the Stanford Achievement test the ILS proved to be particularly effective for delivering mathematics concept and application instruction. On the other hand, computer-assisted instruction in addition to regular classroom instruction produced statistically significant gains for at-risk students in the state of New Jersey (Schalago-Schirm, 1995). In other studies, animated graphics in computer-based instruction produced higher scores on a tenth-grade math lesson than did still graphics and text alone (Poohkay & Szabo, 1995) and redundant audio in computer-based instruction reduced the time required to complete practice questions Rehaag & Szabo, 1995). Another factor leading to success in mathematics and science was the choice of courses (Hoffer, Rasinski & Moore, 1995; Rock & Pollack, 1995). The students who took more courses and more advanced courses consistently showed greater gains on test items than those who took fewer, more regular courses.

By using the technique of cooperative learning where students form small groups to work together on problems or projects, many teachers believe they are contributing to academic achievement. Most of the research corroborated that belief for mathematics (Brush, 1996; Jacobs, Watson & Sutton, 1996; Lapointe, Mead & Askew, 1992; Nichols & Hall, 1995), although data from the International Assessment of Educational Programs and the Second International Mathematics Study indicated that teacher presentations to the whole group were more effective.

Another mode of grouping, based on ability, seemed to be more effective for students of middle and upper ability levels than for those of lower abilities (Bode, 1996; Fuligni, Eccles & Barber, 1995; Gregg, 1995).

In language arts, the reading and writing scores of nine- , thirteen- , and seventeen-year-olds remained virtually constant from 1971 to 1992. That would not be discouraging, except that the level where the scores remained was abysmally low, with 40% of fourth-graders, 30% of eighth-graders, and 25% of high school seniors below basic proficiency in reading in 1994. In 1998, the figures improved slightly, to 38% of fourth-graders, 26% of eighth-graders, and 23% of twelfth-graders unable to read at a basic level. The 1990 NAEP (National Assessment of Educational Programs) assessment of the writing proficiency of eleventh-graders showed inadequate skills in persuasive writing on the part of 68 to 79% of the papers rated, and 31 to 80% inadequate skills in informative writing.

Most researchers (Chall, 1996; Coulson, 1996; Davis, 1996; Eldredge & Baird, 1996) placed the blame for that failure squarely on the shoulders of the whole language movement which stresses the immersion in literature over the learning of structure for beginning readers and writers. Whole language advocates argue that children do not need to be taught to sound out words in order to speak, and therefore, they do not need to be taught to read by breaking words into sound groups. They also believe that it is important for children to write without correction so that their creative growth is not stunted. California, which had adopted whole language

statewide, abandoned it at the end of 1998, returning to the phonics approach of sounding out words and memorizing spelling.

Looking at young adolescents in all subject areas, one study (Nystrand, 1997) found that disengagement, including off-task behavior and failure to complete homework, adversely affected achievement while dialogically organized instruction including discussion, authentic questions, uptake, and high-level teacher evaluation, had a strong positive effect on achievement. Other factors studied which had effects on achievement were: 1) expository writing which promoted the learning of content (Newell, 1984; Newell & Winograd, 1989; Newell & Winograd, 1995); and 2) a supportive home environment with adequate learning resources (Fejgin, 1995), which remains unequaled in its contribution to academic success.

In social studies there were woefully few studies which pertained to achievement, although several (Barton, 1997; Levstik & Barton, 1996; Mecum, 1995) examined attitudes towards the history standards that were produced in 1994. Three researchers (Lotan, Cohen & Holthuis, 1994; Reuman & MacIver, 1994; Rothenberg, McDermott & Martin, 1997) did find that cooperative learning had positive effects on achievement, but all the rest of the studies dealt with the more amorphous areas of motivation and critical thinking.

Curiously, the most emphatic research on the correlation of subject and academic success was found in the arts where one study (Bezruczcko, 1997) pointed to art-trained children as surpassing their peers in reading. And that concludes the

extent of the material I found which related to achievement, despite the interest in that area expressed in the media and presupposed by the setting of standards.

The vast majority of the research that has been done recently has dealt with perceptions of students and teachers and reflects the prevailing emphasis on constructivism, described negatively by Paul Cobb in 1996 as follows:

As a theory, constructivism is often reduced to the mantra-like slogan that "students construct their own knowledge."...the characterization of learning as individual construction is frequently treated as a conclusively proven fact that is beyond justification....Pedagogies derived from constructivist theory frequently involve a collection of questionable claims that sanctify the student at the expense of mathematical and scientific ways of knowing.

Expressing the opposite opinion, a spokesman for the National Center for Science Teaching and Learning, and an outspoken advocate of constructivism, Robert Donmoyer, had this to say in 1992:

...educational practice should not be built around predetermined student learning outcomes, no matter what conception of learning the predetermined outcomes reflect. This position suggests that rather than attempting to control students, teachers should engage in dialogue with students, and rather than transmitting a predefined curriculum to students, teachers should work with students to construct jointly the curriculum for the class.

Three recent empirical studies in science (Grote, 1995; Kyle, Wolf, Bonnstetter &

Gadsden, 1989; Yager, 1995) showed moderate success for constructivist methods,

especially for females and low average middle school students. Other research dealt

with learning theory, including the learning cycle and stage theory, professional

development for teachers, and equity of access to science and mathematics learning

on the part of women and minorities.

In language arts, the defenders of whole language cite the "research base"

which brought it about. However, my investigation, using the descriptor "research

report," did not uncover a single empirical study to support whole language concepts.

Instead, there were surveys of teachers' and students' perceptions, observations and

vignettes of classroom activities, and the following reasons for not teaching Dickens

or Shakespeare, written by an English teacher and published in the English Journal:

> Reading autobiographies are *(sic)* a very effective way to evaluate your effect
>
> on your students' development as readers....Honestly, teachers should realize
>
> that students are more willing to read books that are of some interest to them
>
> and besides books are full of knowledge. Students learn more from things
>
> they understand and want to read rather then *(sic)* when they are being forced
>
> to read something of no interest to them. (Cope, 1997, p. 23)

Researchers in social studies were concerned with the historical thinking of children

(Barton, 1997; Brophy & VanSledright, 1995; Seixas, 1994; Stahl, 1995;

Wade, 1994), the qualities and deficiencies of textbooks (Kincade & Pruitt, 1996;

Romanowski, 1995; Wade & Everett, 1994), the effects of inschool TV news programs (Anderman& Johnston, 1994; Johnston, Brezinski & Anderman, 1994; Marlow & Inman, 1997; Nasstrom & Gierok, 1996), team teaching (Alspaugh & Harting, 1997), the use of computers (Berson, 1996), motivation, techniques for teaching students with learning disabilities, the value of citizenship education (Anderson, Avery, Pederson, Smith & Sullivan, 1997; VanSledright & Grant, 1994), and the history of the subject itself (Field, 1994; Whelan, 1994). There was also considerable interest in the authors and their studies cited in the 1991 Handbook of Research in Social Studies Teaching and Learning as compared to the newer research methodologies and of multicultural and feminist research which dominate the journal Theory and Research in Social Education.

And finally in the arts, many of the articles argued, sometimes passionately, for the inclusion of art, music, dance, and theatre in the core curriculum. Others concentrated on the difficulty of measuring student progress and the attributes that constitute talent as well as the factors which affect creativity (Etemad, 1994; Hurley & Eisan, 1997; Ward, 1994; Willoughby, Feifs, Baenen & Grimes, 1995).

To conclude as I began, the body of research that I examined in math, science, language arts, social studies and the arts did not overly concern itself with school success as I had expected considering the imminent arrival of national standards. Instead, it seemed to focus on those ephemeral areas of attitudes and perceptions that promote the contentment of teachers and students in their separate and overlapping

domains. Although this is the direction that both schooling and research have taken

recently, it is my opinion that they would be well served to concentrate more deeply

on academic excellence and achievement.

REFERENCES

Alspaugh, J.W. & Harting, R.D. (1997). Effects of team teaching on the transition to middle school. ERS Spectrum, 15 (1), 9-14.

Anderman, E.M. & Johnston, J. (1994). Achievement goals and current events knowledge. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA, April 4-8. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 381 451)

Anderson, C., Avery, P.G., Pederson, P.V., Smith, E.S., & Sullivan, J.L. (1997). Divergent perspectives on citizenship education: A Q-Method study and survey of social studies teachers. American Educational Research Journal, 34 (2), 333-364.

Barton, K.C. (1997). "Bossed around by the queen": Elementary students' understanding of individuals and institutions in history. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 12 (4), 290-314.

Berson, M.J. (1996). Effectiveness of computer technology in the social studies: A review of the literature. Journal of Research on Computing in Education, 28 (4), 486-99.

Bezruczko, N. (1997). Links between children's clay models and school achievement. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 410 031)

Bode, R.K. (1996). Is it ability grouping or the tailoring of instruction that makes a difference in student achievement? Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, NY, April 8-12. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 400 268)

Brophy, J. & VanSledright, B. (1995). Longitudinal analysis of fifth-graders' history learning. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 392 735)

Brush, T.A. (1996). The effectiveness of cooperative learning for low- and high-achieving students using an integrated learning system. In Proceedings of Selected Research and Development Presentations at the 1996 National Convention of the Association for Educational Communications and Technology. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 397 780)

Chall, J.S. (1996). American reading achievement: Should we worry? Research in the Teaching of English, 30 (3), 303-310.

Clariana, R.B. (1996). Differential achievement gains for mathematics computation, concepts, and applications with an integrated learning system. Journal of Computers in Mathematics and Science Teaching, 15(3), 203-215.

Cobb, P. (1996). Constructivism in mathematics and science education. Educational Researcher, 23 (7), 4.

Cope, J. (1997). Beyond "Voices of readers": Students on school's effects on reading. English Journal, 86 (3), 18-23.

Coulson, A.J. (1996). Schooling and literacy over time: The rising cost of stagnation and decline. Research in the Teaching of English, 30 (3), 311-320.

Davis, W.K. (1996). Educational implications of a study on grammar and basic writing skills in a developmental English course. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 392 067)

DeVaney, T.A. (1996). The effects of computers and calculators on computation and geometry achievement. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association, Tuscaloosa, AL, November 6-8, 1996. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 404 163)

Donmoyer, R. (1992). Rethinking the form and function of scientific research in science education. (NCSTL Monograph Series, #5). Columbus, OH: National Center for Science Teaching and Learning. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 366 509)

Eldredge, J.L. and Baird, J.E. (1996). Pronemic awareness training works better than whole language instruction for teaching first graders how to write. Reading Research and Instruction, 35 (3), 193-208.

Etemad, M.E. (1994). The role of kinesthetics in learning: The importance of active engagement and the connected process of reflection. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 374 887)

Fejgin, N. (1995). Factors contributing to the academic excellence of American Jewish and Asian students. Sociology of Education, 68 (1), 18-30.

Fennema, E., Carpenter, T.P., Franke, M.L., Levi, L., Jacobs, V.R., & Empson, S.B. (1996). A longitudinal study of learning to use children's thinking in mathematics instruction. Journal for Research in Mathematics Education, 27(4), 403-434.

Field, S.L. (1994). Scrap drives, stamp sales, and school spirit: Examples of elementary social studies during World War II. Theory and Research in Social Education, 22 (4), 441-60.

Fuligni, A.J., Eccles, J.S., & Barber, B.L. (1995). The long-term effects of seventh-grade ability grouping in mathematics. Journal of Early Adolescence, 15 (1), 58-89.

Gregg, J. (1995). The tensions and contradictions of the school mathematics tradition. Journal for Research in Mathematics Education, 26(5), 442-66.

Grote, M.G. (1995). Distributed versus massed practice in high school physics. School Science and Mathematics, 95 (2), 97-101.

Hiebert, J., Carpenter, T.P., Fennema, E., Fuson, K., Human, P., Murray, H., Olivier, A., & Wearne, D. (1996). Problem solving as a basis for reform in curriculum and instruction: The case of mathematics. Educational Researcher, 25 (4), 12-21.

Hoffer, T.B., Rasinski, K.A., & Moore, W. (1995). Social background differences in high school mathematics and science coursetaking and achievement: Statistics in brief (Report No. NCES-95-206). Chicago, IL: National Opinion Research Center. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 389 533)

Hurley, M.M. & Eisan, W.A. (1997). <u>Methods of measuring affective impacts from integrating the arts into core curricula.</u> Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Evaluation Association, Atlanta, GA, November, 1996. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 407 439)

Jacobs, D.L., Watson, T.G., & Sutton, J.P. (1996). Effects of a cooperative learning method on mathematics achievement and affective outcomes of students in a private elementary school. <u>Journal of Research and Development in Education, 29</u>(4), 195-202.

Johnston, J., Brezinski, E.J., & Anderman, E.M. (1994). <u>Taking the measure of Channel One: A three year perspective.</u> Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 371 712)

Kallam, L.G. & Kallam, M. (1996). <u>An investigation into a problem-solving strategy for indefinite integration and its effect on test scores of general calculus students.</u> (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 393 674)

Kincade, K.M. & Pruitt, N.E. (1996). Using multicultural literature as an ally to elementary social studies texts. <u>Reading Research and Instruction, 36</u> (1), 18-32.

Kyle, W.C., Jr., Wolf, M., Bonnstetter, R.J., & Gadsden, T., Jr. (1989). <u>Process science and standardized testing: Are they compatible?</u> Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Association for Research in Science Teaching, San Francisco, CA, March 30-April 1, 1989. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 306 084)

Lapointe, A.E., Mead, N.A., & Askew, J.M. (1992). Learning mathematics (National Center of Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education, and National Science Foundation Report No. 22-CAEP-01). Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Levstik, L.S. & Barton, K.C. (1996). "They still use some of their past": Historical salience in elementary children's chronological thinking. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 28 (5), 531-576.

Lotan, R.A., Cohen, E.G., & Holthuis, N. (1994). Talking and working together: Conditions for learning in complex instruction. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA, April 4-8. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 373 092)

Marlow, L. & Inman, D. (1997). Status report on teaching in the elementary school: Math, science, and social studies. Paper oresented at a meeting of the Eastern Educational Research Association, Hilton Head, SC. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 409 283)

Mastin, M. (1996). Children's mathematical learning. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Rocky Mountain Educational Research Association, Detroit Lakes, MN, October 4, 1996. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 401 120)

Mecum, B. (1995). Theory into practice: Standards into classrooms and into the hands and minds of students. A qualtitative research project. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 394688)

Nasstrom, R. & Gierok, A. (1996). Channel One and CNN Newsroom: A comparative study of seven districts. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 396 709)

Newell, G.E. (1984). Learning from writing in two content areas: A case study/protocol analysis. Research in the Teaching of English, 18 (3), 265-84.

Newell, G.E. & Winograd, P. (1989). The effects of writing on learning from expository text. Written Communication, 6 (2), 196-217.

Newell, G.E. & Winograd, P. (1995). Writing about and learning from history texts: The effects of task and academic ability. Research in the Teaching of English, 29 (2), 133-63.

Nichols, J.D. & Hall, N. (1995). The effects of cooperative learning on student achievement and motivation in a high school geometry class. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA, April 18-22, 1995. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 387 341)

Nystrand, M. (1997). Dialogic instruction: When recitation becomes conversations. In Nystrand, M., Gamoran, A., Kachur, R., & Prendergast, C., Opening dialogue: Understanding the dynamics of language and learning in the English classroom. New York: Teachers College Press.

Poohkay, B. & Szabo, M. (1995). Effects of animation & visuals on learning high school mathematics. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Educational Communications and Technology, Anaheim, CA, February, 1995. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 380 122)

Rehaag, D.M. & Szabo, M. (1995). An experiment on effects of redundant audio in computer based instruction on achievement, attitude, and learning time in 10th grade math. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Educational Communications and Technology, Anaheim, CA, February, 1995. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 380 123)

Reuman, D.A. & MacIver, D.J. (1994). Effects of instructional grouping on seventh graders' academic motivation and achievement. Baltimore, MD: Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 378 260)

Rock, D.A. & Pollack, J.M. Mathematics course-taking and gains in mathematics achievement. Statistics in brief. (Report No. NCES-95-714). Washington, DC: National Institute of Handicapped Research. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 386 499)

Romanowski, M.H. (1995). American history by the book: Teachers using textbooks. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA, April 18-22. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 396 978)

Rothenberg, J.J., McDermott, P., & Martin, G. (1997). Changes in pedagogy: A qualitative result of teaching heterogeneous classes. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL, March 24-28. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 408 346)

Rudnitsky, A., Etheredge, S., Freeman, S.J.M., & Gilbert, T. (1995). Learning to solve addition and subtraction word problems through a structure-plus-writing approach. Journal for Research in Mathematics Education, 26(5), 467-86.

Schalago-Schirm, C. (1995). Does the computer-assisted remedial mathematics program at Kearny High School lead to improved scores on the N.J. Early Warning Test? Paper in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Masters of Arts Degree, Kean College of New Jersey. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 382 460)

Seixas, P. (1994). Students' understanding of historical significance. Theory and Research in Social Education, 22 (3), 281-304.

Stahl, R.J. (1995). Cognitive psychology and constructivism: Concepts, principles, and implications within the social science disciplines and applications for social studies education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 401 184)

VanSledright, B.A. & Grant, S.G. (1994). Citizenship education and the persistent nature of classroom teaching dilemmas. Theory and Research in Social Education, 22 (3), 305-339.

Wade, R.C. (1994). Conceptual change in elementary social studies: A case study of fourth graders' understanding of human rights. Theory and Research in Social Education, 22 (1), 74-95.

Wade, R.C. & Everett, S. (1994). Civic participation in third grade social studies textbooks. Social Education, 58 (5), 308-11.

Ward, C. (1994). Art in the elementary schools: It's more than fingerpainting. (ERIC Document Reporoduction Service No. ED 372 427)

Whelan, M. (1994). Albert Bushnell Hart and the origins of social studies education. Theory and Research in Social Education, 22 (4), 423-40.

Wilborn, L.G. (1994). Improving problem-solving abilities of third-grade students through the use of problem-solving strategies (Ed.D. Practicum Report). Nova Southeastern University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 384 421)

Willoughby, M., Feifs, H., Baenen, N., & Grimes, E. (1995). Behind the scenes: Measuring student progress in the arts and beyond. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 394 863)

Wood, T. & Sellers, P. (1996). Assessment of a problem-centered mathematics program: Third grade. Journal for Research in Mathematics Education, 27(2), 337-353.

Yager, R.E. (1995). Science/Technology/Society: A reform arising from learning theory and constructivist research. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of

the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA, April 18-22,

1995. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 382 481)

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE
(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title:
RECENT RESEARCH IN MATH, SCIENCE, LANGUAGE ARTS, SOCIAL STUDIES AND THE ARTS

Author(s): MARY K. NOVELLO, Ed.D.

Corporate Source:

Publication Date:

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents
PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY — Sample — TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) 1	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY — Sample — TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) 2A	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY — Sample — TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) 2B
Level 1 ↑ [✓]	Level 2A ↑ [ ]	Level 2B ↑ [ ]
Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) *and* paper copy.	Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only	Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here,→ please

Signature: Mary K. Novello

Organization/Address: WASHINGTON INSTITUTE FOUNDATION 2016 N 78th ST, #1 SEATTLE, WA 98103

Printed Name/Position/Title: DR. MARY K. NOVELLO

Telephone: (206) 522-9507   FAX:

E-Mail Address: MNove111142@AOL   Date:

54th Annual Conference and Exhibit Show of ASCD (San Francisco, Mar. 6-8, 1999). *(over)*

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:	Karen E. Smith, Acquisitions Coordinator ERIC/EECE Children's Research Center University of Illinois 51 Gerty Dr. Champaign, Illinois, U.S.A. 61820-7469

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
1100 West Street, 2ⁿᵈ Floor
Laurel, Maryland 20707-3598

Telephone: 301-497-4080
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-953-0263
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com