MEASURED FOR MEASURED

Angela Hurley
Transylvania University

Three years ago, our small liberal arts college initiated an August Term for all in-coming first year students. This year, as I listened to the dean give his charge to these new students, I applauded his invitation for them to join a community of scholars, seeking knowledge. Then I wondered if that idea and our college mission actually align with most of the incoming students' reasons and expectations for attending college.[1]

My question centered on how well P–12 schooling experiences and the current accompanying educational discourse on the importance of attending college actually match with traditional notions of the purposes of academic life held by college faculty. Does the current, performance data-driven system of P–12 schooling that purports to prepare a standardized product for the economic good of the nation match at all with college mission statements that describe a climate where students are prepared to think, reason, and become humane individuals?

For the purpose of examining these questions, I focus in this paper on one prevalent word from current educational discourse: *measured*. In conversations about P–12 schools, and in general culture, the word *measured* is ubiquitous, and certainly the in-coming college students have experienced a life of being measured in numerous ways: via birth weight and length, the Apgar Scale, pre-tests for kindergarten, school grades, standardized test scores, class rank and so forth. These students are a part of an often and constantly measured-for-comparison culture. One would therefore expect that current incoming students attach a very different meaning to the word *measured* than do most college professors, for whom *measured* usually means thoughtful and reasoned.[2] In other words, I am suggesting that there may be a mismatch

[1] My college's mission statement: "Through an engagement with the liberal arts, Transylvania University prepares its students for a humane and fulfilling personal and public life by cultivating independent thinking, open-mindedness, creative expression, and commitment to lifelong learning and social responsibility in a diverse world."

[2] Similar arguments have been put forward by Martha Nussbaum, *Cultivating Humanity: A Classical Defense of Reform in Liberal Education* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997) and other liberal arts advocates, along with Eva Brann of St. John's College, and my colleagues at Transylvania. Certainly all college professors are aware of the current meaning of measured as a verb, as the pressures for numerical accountability increasingly become a part of college life, but in college classrooms the older meaning of the word still tends to be salient as can be evidenced by examining course syllabi.

between this adjective meaning of *measured* and the verb meaning, which is the one P–12 students know best.

Prior to the passage of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) in 2001, the discourse about schooling contained numerous arguments related to the purposes of formal education; ideas and disagreements about that purpose, values, the teaching of values, moral education, diversity, and democracy formed the conversation.[3] Within that older discourse, educational philosophers proposed aims for schools and their students that related to the "big" questions of life. Things such as "Who Am I?" "Where do I fit in the scheme of things?" "What is worth knowing?" These questions were grounded in the larger question of "What matters?" "Do I matter?" Given the profound nature of the questions, the possible educational ways of answering them varied and took a "long view" of when and how the answers could be located. These types of questions also required "noble" sounding purposes for schooling children and youth.

Today, educational literature, especially after NCLB, contains very few such essays. Instead, the language now narrowly focuses on performance, assessment, accountability, testing, data, and results, which are applications of a certain set of values; however, the stated rationale eliminates almost entirely any lengthy discussion of the values that support the measuring movement or of how it relates to the purpose of schools other than in economic terms. It seems that policy-makers and many educators have moved away from "worrying" about broad purposes, content, and context toward a focus on narrowly-defined procedures that lead to a "certain" measurable product or a set of competencies. The keen emphasis on raising test scores arises from a societal narrative that asserts public schools are failing, with the problem mainly emanating from poor quality teaching.[4] Therefore, these teachers and

[3] Many examples of this conversation can be located. In the twentieth century, for example, John Dewey spoke strongly about democracy and schooling, and the work of Alfred North Whitehead pushed against the penchant for acquiring factual knowledge (inert ideas) exclusively. Whitehead argued the aim of education is not just an accumulation of facts. The twentieth century also saw the growth of Maria Montessori's ideas, where schooling includes such values as those required for peace, and her theories certainly advocate for more than learning "facts" for an exam. In addition, the progressive education movement included more in its philosophy and proposed curriculum than the acquisition of "facts." Later in the century, the Philosophy for Children Program (Matthew Lipman, Gareth Matthews, and Kieran Egan) emphasized philosophical inquiry and the importance of dialogue for elementary level students. The Civil Rights movement of the 1960's occasioned many thinkers to write about culture, race, and gender in schools. Educational writers, such as James Banks and Jawanza Kunjufu, among others, wrote passionately on the topic. Before the twentieth century, such philosophers as John Locke argued for a balanced view of the aim of education. In Locke's hierarchy of purposes, "book learning" is listed as last in importance.

[4] The claim of poor teaching is based solely on students' test scores, ignoring other important factors that are involved in good teaching. See Mike Rose, *Why School?*

schools should be held accountable, with the accounting measure being students' test scores.[5]

This fear of failing schools has been exacerbated by the regulations imposed by NCLB, and educational discourse reflects that heightened anxiety. Prior to NCLB, many of the purposes given for formal education and schooling practices mainly reflected *measured* as an adjective,[6] while currently the verb meaning of the word dominates. The comparison is between that of a discourse containing arguments about long-term and diverse aims for schooling and conceptions of the educated person, centering on ideas having to do with a regulated approach to teaching and learning that could consist of contemplation, deep thoughtfulness, and realization of the necessity of ambiguity, to the current preference for standardization and numerically evaluated outcomes, perhaps resulting from the desire for instant fixes in a bid for certainty.

A caveat here: I am not implying that all schooling ideas prior to NCLB were of a profound and deeply thoughtful ilk; I am saying, though, that a fairly strong strand of deep thoughtfulness in educational conversations existed, a kind of strand that is not widely present today.

This shift in the meaning of *measured* greatly affects the atmosphere and daily lives of students and teachers.[7] This change has long-term effects for

---

Reclaiming Education for All of Us (New York: The New Press, 2014); and David C. Berliner and Gene Glass, *50 Myths and Lies that Threaten America's Public Schools: the Real Crisis in Education* (New York: Teachers College Press, 2014).

[5] Diane Ravitch, *Reign of Error: The Hoax of the Privatization Movement and the Danger to America's Public Schools* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2013). See especially chap. 1–3.

[6] Numerous examples can be given of these purposes. Twentieth-century examples of such purposes include such thinkers as John Dewey who argued the value and purpose of schooling to be preparing an environment where the young could learn the attitudes and acquire the dispositions for being active members capable of forming a democracy with others. See especially Dewey, *Democracy and Education* (New York: Macmillan, 1922). Maxine Greene's major works of the twentieth century featured the importance of imagination and for the need of education to help individuals to locate their existential freedom and act on it; see Greene, *Dialectic of Freedom* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1988). Nel Noddings's work on an ethic of care began in the 1980's and became a purpose for schools in her later writings; see Noddings, *Caring: A Feminine Approach to Ethics and Moral Education* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984).

[7] While several educational writers now give negative examples of how current discourse and policies have changed and in many ways disrupted former schooling policies, Mike Rose, who has spent many hours in P–12 schools, offers an account filled with specific examples of how students and teachers are harmed by these new measures; see Rose, *Why Schools? Reclaiming Education for All of Us* (New York: The New Press, 2014). In that text, Rose gives examples of how the curriculum has become truncated and unimaginative and that instruction in many schools, especially those that are "failing," has become routinized and formulaic. In addition, notions of care have

the educative experience to the future lives of students, teachers, and ultimately the communities in which they live. The adjective meaning of *measured,* when applied to schooling experiences, traditionally has been advocated and implemented through disparate ideologies.[8] These resulting curricular designs historically differed from one another in numerous ways, but the grounding purposes of each one related in some way to preparing students to think well in order to claim their human agency and to enrich their given communities through their ability to reason and live life well. Collectively such purposes now *grate* against the data-measured system of schooling currently in place in most P–12 schools.

Certainly I am not drawing a sharp dividing line between "then" and "now." Such a line would be difficult to define—nothing is ever so clear and sharp, but I do think that in viewing the two meanings of *measured*, a definite pattern of thinking about schooling practices can be discerned, especially if the verb meaning of *measured* is considered in how it affects notions of time, space, and curricular content and process.

TIME

In the verb meaning of *measured*, with its emphasis on keeping one's eyes on multiple sets of numerical data points, educators (and citizens in the wider community) are failing to look up, out, back, and in-depth. That is, in constantly focusing on the immediate, individuals are neglecting to value past experiences and ideas, along with failing to provide students the time to allow ideas to incubate and grow, bearing fruits into the future. Immediacy appears to be the hallmark of using *measured* as a verb. As Alfie Kohn asserts, we are the culture of "do this, get that" NOW![9] Such thinking brings about the

become legalistic and codified. Michael B. Katz and Mike Rose, ed., *Public Education Under Siege* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013) also contains examples of the changes in schools. Visits to P–12 schools can confirm that the change in the discourse to the emphasis on test scores greatly affects the daily lives of teachers and students: teachers now constantly administer learning checks and send that information to their school's data rooms and revise their teaching plans based on that data; teachers must include common core standards and how they are being met on all lesson plans; evaluators observe classrooms and note on their palm pilots whether teachers are teaching the prescribed curriculum that matches the tests. Students are constantly verbally reminded of the importance of the tests, with items related to the tests featured on many classroom walls. In addition, recess time, in many schools, has been limited so that more time can be spent on content, and art, music, and social studies classes have been either eliminated or truncated in many elementary schools. Kindergartens now have fewer learning centers, if any at all, and more time devoted to paper/pencil worksheets.

[8] Here one can review the ideas of Maria Montessori, Rudolf Steiner, John Dewey, Nel Noddings, and numerous liberal arts advocates, such as, Eva Brann or Martha C. Nussbaum, among many others to see the disparate conceptualizations of their ideas.

[9] Alfie Kohn, *Punished by Rewards* (New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1992).

development of short-cuts. How can "that" be learned faster? How can the results be achieved quicker? For example, one short cut to improving test scores quickly is to teach only the skills, formulas, and materials needed for the exam.

Hence, skills and drills and learning checks are commonplace in today's schools. Pulling pertinent facts from standardized exams and then teaching those defines "knowledge." When *measured* is used as a verb, knowledge becomes isolated bits of information that can be recalled quickly, on demand, as opposed to contextualized concepts and connected knowing.

Viewing knowledge as bits of information also privileges certain electronic media, especially computers, as favored technologies for schools. Older technologies, such as the printed word, are losing dominance. Even when printed texts are used, often only snippets of them are pulled from longer volumes in interest of time and covering material for the test. Elementary students mainly read short selections abstracted from longer texts or short stories in a reader and then answer literal comprehension questions on worksheets. The process of reading in this practice has become more important than the why of reading. For example, advocates for literature argue that literary texts provide a way for individuals to consider the big existential questions of life and to evaluate various possibilities of answering those questions,[10] but that type of purpose has been obscured with the rush to teach the strategy of reading. In addition, the beauty of language and the ability of novelists to create beautifully "turned phrases" has little place in fast-paced P–12 classrooms that mainly test for literal reading comprehension.

Also to achieve speed, slogans such as "all children can learn" have become dominant in educational talk. Slogans provide a quick way to reference complicated ideas and practices, and they achieve power and "protected" status in that they are seldom queried for meaning or criticized in a vigorous manner. In such a measure-focused atmosphere, slogans and other identifiers become salient. Most often the identifier is a number, such as an IQ score, an ACT score, or a class rank, but identifiers can also be generic labels, such as "learning impaired," "ADD," "autistic" and so forth. Along those same lines, schooling officials often announce test rankings on their outdoor billboards. In the wider culture, citizens are encouraged to know their credit scores, blood pressure, cholesterol numbers, blood sugar level, insurance rating. Professionals and organizations have user ratings that are easily retrieved from the internet. TV shows and movies are rated numerically by critics. Colleges and universities vie to rank high in US NEWS and World Report and on other ranking data reported by various non-education sources. All of these identifiers serve as ways to place individuals and institutions into categories for the quick

[10] For an example of this type of literary analysis, please see the work of Maxine Greene, especially *The Dialectic of Freedom* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1988), chapter 5, or *Landscapes of Learning* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1978).

sorting and evaluation that takes place in economic, social, and educational settings.

In schools, numbers and numerical rankings are constantly reviewed by those in oversight positions who make evaluative decisions. Slogans and labels, then, promote a means for easy surveillance, serving as time-saving measures. Not having to take the time to work with students and to form holistic views of their talents, abilities, learning levels and general personality, saves time and moves educational decisions into immediate time. At a glance, educators can look at student labels and test scores and make instructional and behavioral decisions quickly. However, knowing that one is constantly under scrutiny tends to make one hesitant to try new experiences for fear of not achieving the requisite score and label. In fact, surveillance, in general, promotes a culture of fear and mistrust, a fear of not measuring up to some preconceived standard.[11]

Space

Along with an emphasis on the importance of the immediate, a collapsing of space currently exists, especially through the use of electronic media. Students now can connect with people and places no matter where they are in the world without leaving their school buildings or homes. Again, time is immediate, and through computers, space can be instantly traversed. Arguments are made that such collapsing of time and space serves to connect people and people to places in a way that is new and positive. But researchers, such as Sherry Turkle from M.I.T., argue that a strong negative side exists to this type of interacting. Individuals are no longer present in their existing space or in real-time: they are present to cyber space, neglecting those in their immediate place.[12] Additionally, searching for connection with others, information, and places via cyber-space promotes "surface" treatment of people and ideas, and it encourages addiction to novelty and newness. When individuals live on the surface of things, they tend not to acknowledge the depths of their existences and to make connections with others in real space.

While arguments are made that social media connects individuals, the question becomes one of the kind and quality of relationships that occur via the internet. Are these cyber connections of the same kind as those that take place in real time and in a real place? Turkle and others say no. To make her case, Turkle gives the example of students in class, checking their cell-phones. This act takes them from their immediate surroundings and group. Turkle calls this being alone together.[13] She also says that research shows that there is no

[11] Onora O'Neill, *A Question of Trust* (Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 2002).
[12] Sherry Turkle, *Alone Together: Why We Expect More from Technology and Less from Each Other* (New York: Basic Books, 2011), 154.
[13] Ibid., 163.

such thing as proficient multi-tasking: each new device or "thing" that enters the person's real space actually diminishes the quality of each thing the individual is attempting to do.[14]

Given that the internet and text conversations offer constantly changing and new ideas, the user turns to those devices as soon as she or he feels the least bit bored. However, in educational experiences, one cannot always have fun and change the topic when the task is no longer enjoyable.[15] Yet, the constant use of electronic devices may prevent young people from developing the perseverance to see a tedious or laborious task through to completion. Also, messages sent in cyber time and space can be selective and edited numerous times before they are sent. Real conversation in real time cannot be edited to that extent, and many young people now find they are unable to converse well in real time. But learning how to interact with others is a necessary skill unless the entire world and its inhabitants are intending to become cyborgs.[16] Even if these "threats" to humankind and learning are not quite as dire as these remarks suggest, it is fair to say that media changes the ways in which humans interact with one another, and, yet, many people advocating the verb meaning of *measured* also promote greater use of technology in schools.

PRACTICE

How, then, do the new data-driven, measured schooling ideas affect schooling practices, and how are they different from past schooling experiences? In moving everything into the immediate now, students are given very few opportunities to "look beyond the claims of the moment,"[17] nor are they given time to contemplate or "consider." Immediate answers are required. Students must remain "on-task" at all times; therefore, no time is given for solitude, silence, or doing nothing, which some educationists in the past have valued (Montessori, for one) and brain researchers report to be vital to learning. Children and youth now have every moment accounted for during the school day, during which they must be "on task," and middle socio-economic class

[14] Ibid.

[15] Internet and text conversations differ markedly from classrooms using face to face instruction where students and professors engage in give-and-take conversations about controversial or difficult topics or texts. The skills of being able to truly listen to one another and to make suggestions about claims uses both time and space differently than does electronic media. For example, Parker Palmer writes about the learning process being the dance around a big idea in which both teachers and students engage: a dance that takes time and patience. Parker Palmer, *The Courage to Teach* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1998).

[16] Turkle, *Alone Together*, 207.

[17] Diana Senechal, *Republic of Noise: The Loss of Solitude in Schools and Culture* (New York: Rowman & Littlefield, 2012), 4.

children are overly scheduled after school,[18] leaving very little time for outdoor play. In addition, researchers claim, "When children do play outdoors, it is usually to participate in adult-directed sports."[19] The same editorial in *Encounter* notes that "the standards movement has made play rare at school, too. In order to raise academic achievement, schools have largely eliminated instructional play in kindergarten. Many schools have cut out and sharply reduced recess as well."[20] Close monitoring during school hours and in afterschool activities leaves little time for solitude or self-ruminations, which researchers, such as Diana Senechal, claim is needed so that individuals can form their own thoughts, originate their own activities, or think about their own thinking.[21]

In addition, most elementary schools have behaviorist systems of classroom discipline, many times with zero-tolerance policies. These forms of discipline perhaps produce the immediate change in behavior that the teacher seeks, but often the effects are short-lived. Gone are discussions about working toward long-term changes in student behavior—the type of transformation that comes slowly, over time, and through the direction of a mentor.

In a word, the verb meaning of *measured* dominates schooling practices, and the climate of constant assessment and standardization does not allow for authentic teaching and learning, which is messier and more complex than the current performance model allows.[22] For example, identifying children and youth by their test scores is wrong-minded and reductionist. Teaching and learning consist of more than what can be measured on standardized tests and reflected in test scores. Using testing in this manner, according to John Kuhn and others[23] goes against the design of the tests and their purposes, and such use provides a simplistic solution for the complicated and difficult task of

[18] See, for example, David Elkins, "The Overbooked Child: Are We Pushing Our Kids too Hard?" *Psychology Today* 36 (2003): 64–70; Chris Mercogliano, *In Defense of Childhood: Protecting Kids' Inner Wildness* (Boston: Beacon, 2007); Jared R. Anderson and William J. Doherty, "Democratic Community Initiatives: The Case of Overscheduled Children," *Family Relations* 54, no. 5 (December 2005): 654–65; and Vicki Abeles, "Students Without a Childhood," *USA Today* (Sept. 26, 2014). Vicki Abeles also produced the documentary *A Race to Nowhere* (Reel Link Films, 2009) on the topic of overscheduled children.

[19] Editorial, *Encounter: Education for Meaning and Social Justice* [Brandon, VT] (September 2008): 4, http://great-ideas.org/enc.htm.

[20] Ibid. The author of this editorial additionally claims, "American children have always experienced schools as stifling, of course, but the extent of these restrictions is unprecedented."

[21] Senechal, *Republic of Noise*, 4–5.

[22] Gert J. J. Biesta, *The Beautiful Risk of Education* (London: Paradigm, 2014), 26.

[23] Several researchers have written on the wrong-minded use of testing; see, for example, John Kuhn, *Fear and Learning in America: Bad Data, Good Teachers* (New York: Teachers College Press, 2014); and W. James Popham, *The Truth About Testing: An Educator's Call to Action* (Virginia: ASCD, 2001).

evaluating teachers and students. This type of accountability promises a "fix" that is actually conceptually flawed and dishonest. The current use of testing as the measure of schooling quality exacerbates the trend to make schooling yet one more commodity to be sold and to think of students as products.

As Deborah Meier states, "The very definition of what constitutes an educated person is now dictated by federal legislation. A well-educated person is one who scores high on standardized math and reading tests."[24] With tests being used in this way, then, techniques for raising test scores are valued above providing meaningful learning experiences that take time, demand patience, and use critical thinking. Stan Karp notes, "When schools become obsessed with test scores, they narrow the focus of what teachers do in classrooms and limit their ability to serve the broader needs of children and their communities."[25]

In contrast, in measured schooling[26] practices, a "long" view of time is required, and student development is considered. A guaranteed outcome cannot be promised, because genuine teaching and learning involves risks and not pre-determined outcomes. The "inputting" of instruction is important and the "outcome" is not always known or predetermined. Measured practices, in the adjective sense, allow for the reading of primary documents and longer texts, giving students the opportunities to struggle with ethical issues and existential problems contained in their readings, from which, combined with class discussions, a process develops that enables them gradually to develop acumen in critically thinking about ideas. In measured schooling practices, time is allowed for appreciating the eloquence of masterfully written and spoken language. Time is given to experiment and to learn through repeated efforts to accomplish mastery of complex skills and concepts. Ambiguities are permitted and considered. Learning that delves deeply into concepts is valued, and making connections among ideas that go beyond the surface level of information is encouraged. This type of learning eliminates the emphasis on the acquisition of facts and skills and places value on thoughtfulness and longitudinal learning. As David Hansen points out "contemporary humanity is indeed drowning in facts and information. Ideas, by contrast, are rarer, and they are more difficult to recognize."[27] Current schooling experiences reflect the greater society and may very well be experiencing the same problem; that is,

[24] Deborah Meier, "NCLB and Democracy," in *Many Children Left Behind*, ed. Deborah Meier and George Wood (Boston: Beacon, 2004), 67.

[25] Stan Karp, "NCLB's Selective Vision of Equality: Some Gaps Count More Than Others," in *Many Children Left Behind,* ed. Deborah Meier and George Wood (Boston: Beacon, 2004), 57.

[26] The view of measured as an adjective that this paper has attempted to craft fits into the descriptions of schooling practices where "the whole child," not just academic skills, are considered.

[27] David Hansen, *Ethical Visions of Education: Philosophies in Practice* (New York: Teachers College Press, 2007), 3.

they are filled with facts and information, but the students are entertaining very few profound and complicated ideas.

Realizing that a life cannot be lived well with simplistic worldviews forms a valuable aspect of being well educated. Figuring out how to choose between alternatives, sometimes between two goods, enables students to contextualize their lived experiences and to use their agency. Learning to take the time to analyze life problems and events from numerous perspectives and to engage with the "others" of the world with care and empathy are hallmarks of measured and educated individuals who struggle to make sense of their existential freedom.

As philosopher Gert Biesta argues, "Education is always more than production. . . . At the end of the day we, as educators, cannot claim and should not want to claim that we produce our students. We educate them in freedom and for freedom."[28] Biesta is referring to the same type of freedom that Maxine Greene and William Ayers, among others, describe in their essays about authentic education, whose theories advocate for individuals to question ideas and to understand their rationales.[29] Elliot Eisner states this point well: "What is missing from American schools . . . is a deep respect for personal purpose, lived experience, for the life of imagination, and for forms of understanding that resist dissection and measurement."[30] Ideas take more time to analyze and connect than do isolated facts—and in verb-measured schooling practices, most often the time for such reflection is not allowed.

The current outcomes-centered, performance-based system of schooling diminishes the importance of understanding "why" in favor of striving to achieve pre-determined, measureable outcomes that basically center on "how." Even though skills are important, if they are the only focus of schooling policies and practices, then concepts and connections needed for developing into thoughtful human beings are left out of the curriculum and schooling practices. Such omissions ignore the rich layers of what it means to be a human being—a humane and creative human being. Focusing on numerical data and its collection reduces or eliminates teaching time dedicated to entertaining complex ideas, and often complex ideas are removed from schooling curricula because these most important aspects of being an educated person cannot be measured on standardized exams.

All of these problems are exacerbated by the realization that NCLB and the accountability movement are built on a faulty narrative: the narrative that public schools are in decline and failing. This narrative was formed and perpetuated during the past twenty years by schooling critics, both by those

[28] Biesta, *The Beautiful Risk of Education*, 134.

[29] See, for example, William Ayers, *Teaching Toward Freedom: Moral Commitment and Ethical Action in the Classroom* (Boston: Beacon Press, 2004).

[30] Elliot Eisner, *Educational Imagination: On the Design and Evaluation of School Programs* (Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1994), 52.

who are intentionally dissembling and those who honestly are misguided. Researchers, such as Diane Ravitch, have shown how the fabrication came about, was accepted, and then was used to ground the current accountability system.[31] The problem now, however, is to figure out how to counter the false narrative and to move schooling practices away from the harmful effects of the accountability policies based on that faulty narrative—a Herculean task.

Given these ideas, this essay's title is not meant to be merely catchy. The relationship to Shakespeare's *Measure for Measure* is intentional. That play, critic Marjorie Garber notes, is known for its "darkness."[32] As Garber also explains, the play contains the "language of weighing and measuring, of scales of justice,"[33] and the play asks the question, "What is natural? And how can we contend to know ourselves?"[34] These thoughts resonate with the questions explored in this paper. That is, in the end, the underlying questions that educational philosophers and theorists of knowledge must entertain are: "How can we know who we are as human beings? and "How can we learn to live life fairly and well?" These loaded questions spark controversies. Therefore, answers vary, but current schooling policies focus on only one answer which involves a great deal of measuring, as a verb, and as a "treatment meted out," but what does the future hold?

In conclusion, to return to the question of the match between current students' experiences in P–12 schools and the notions of measured held by many of those in academia, the answer may be that currently a fairly grave mismatch exists, but moving into the future, as the verb meaning of *measured* continues to creep into higher education,[35] the mismatch may cease to exist, and that is a frightening thought because higher education will then be moved into a technocratic mode of existence and many of the important aspects of teaching and learning may be deleted from the curriculum; those aspects that give students opportunities to "worry" with the questions of what it means to be humane human beings may be the first to disappear.

[31] Ravitch, *The Reign of Error*, especially chap. 1–3.

[32] Marjorie Garber, *Shakespeare After All* (New York: Anchor Books, 2004), 563.

[33] Ibid., 571.

[34] Ibid.

[35] The "creep" of the verb meaning of *measured* into higher education originates from several sources, but the main perpetuating forces come from accrediting agencies that require specific accountability measures and from a rise in the number of colleges expecting their faculty members to publish or perish. Michael Katz and Mike Rose in *Public Education Under Siege*, previously cited, claim current reforms are "rooted in a market model" and the economistic view of the purposes of education eliminate the "democratic vision of education for citizenship that has been integral to the purposes of American education since the days of its origin" (2).