Much has been said and written about the societal and educational future. Yet, despite the mounting proliferation of arguments, considerable confusion remains. What, in short, should the schools do in the way of anticipating the priorities that lie ahead? Three critical issues are crucial:

What should we teach youth about the future?
What new subject matter should be taught?
What kinds of school reorganization are necessary?

The first two of these issues require, chiefly, decisions as to the particular conceptual ideas and informational content that is essential. The third issue involves such matters as the length and time of schooling, the physical setting of learning, the character and workstyles of teachers' instructional theory, technological applications, and the nature of learning activities themselves. The same riddles that have always haunted theorists are still with us: What shall be taught, how, when, where, and by whom?

The major problem in answering these questions is that our ubiquitous itch for tranquility prevents us from facing our problems head on. In turbulent times, we are reluctant to look for trouble, or to search out latent weaknesses. One hopes, nonetheless, that we can overcome our customary apathy and think rationally about what best will serve the common good.

With respect to the curriculum proper, subject matter content will need, with increasing urgency, to emphasize the importance of civic awareness, social concern, and citizen responsibility. And, (despite a probable expansion of career education) learning and self-growth may come to be seen more as ends in themselves than as means to an end. We must, moreover, orchestrate the instructional program so that a large measure of practical knowledge is acquired outside the school. One can identify curriculum goals bearing upon the legitimate requirements for a good life, the virtues of quality as opposed to quantity, and sound moral values, which perhaps can be integrated into a reorganized instructional program. To help sort out the trends most relevant to our task, we might ask ourselves: What social crises, now gestating, would be lessened by particular learning experiences—in and out of the school?

We are, our philosophers tell us, what we believe. If, then, we believe that schools must serve society, we are obliged to assume that man is perfectable and can learn better conduct.

We must further assume, I think, that powerful ideas can act as a counterforce against social disease: for if we did not subscribe to these beliefs there would be little point to schooling in the first place. The human predicament can only be ameliorated by human will; efforts to nurture this will—to infuse it with muscle and judgment—must go on in the school as well as elsewhere. Where ideas, properly sown and nurtured, are a form of power, there is much to be said for a school in which realistic images of the future are conveyed. Though we cannot now, with finality, determine what will need to be taught in the future, nor how schools should be arranged, nor what teaching methodologies will be at our disposal, we can make judgments about what the young ought to know about the probable events that lie ahead. One can scarcely deny that the present instructional program is a bit top heavy with respect to the past and present, and that the attention given to social problems and trends is deficient. If matters like racial strife, urban deterioration, spiritual malaise, and environmental decay could be incorporated into the existing curricular structure, youth might leave school somewhat less naive about the society's unfinished business.

The possibilities for examining social problems through the traditional disciplines are substantial. Past, present, and future can be treated as a continuum so that students grasp what will be needed to control the human environment intelligently: genetic manipulation can be considered in biology classes, interplanetary travel might be discussed in physics classes, the consequences of synthetic foods can be analyzed in home economics courses, civics classes might debate the effects of computerized public opinion polling on participatory democracy, a unit on aesthetics might be added, the implications of artificial life can be pondered in chemistry classes, and so on.

Continued on page 5
FROM THE PRESIDENT

Was there ever a time when the challenges facing us as educators were greater than they are today? It seems as though I've heard that same question repeated many times during the past 25 years. I find it difficult to relate with any degree of concern about what has taken place in the past. I tend to look at our present position more in terms of a future filled with promise. The problems that confront us, to a large extent, can be approached as stimulating challenges. Some of the problems that confront us are new, so new that they antedate the time many of us received our training. Whether or not we successfully cope with these problems and issues depends to a great extent on how we view them. I feel it is important for us as members of ASCD to take a positive approach and provide the leadership to provide answers to these challenges. We have the resources within our ranks to positively affect the future of education in Washington.

The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, at both the state and national levels, is one of the smaller professional organizations in terms of members. We cannot accomplish what we must by sheer strength of numbers. Rather, we maintain our firm commitment to the improvement of instruction as our most compelling goal. We must not allow ourselves to be diverted from this task. Of all professional educational organizations, none should be more completely dedicated to achieving this goal.

Ted Knutsen
President
Washington State ASCD

EDITOR'S COMMENTS

Dear Readers:
Perhaps you've noticed the grim expressions on the faces of many Washington ASCD members, as we've been feeling a little sorry for ourselves.
You see, this last summer, we received word that our clever sister-state to the south had landed what has to be one of this year's finest catches. A far-sighted group of directors, the Albany, Oregon school board, announced that they had offered their superintendent a very special friend of Washington educators--WS-ASCD's own past-president, Dr. Robert Williams.
To those of us who have had the privilege of knowing and working with Bob over the years, we can only applaud the obvious insight and incredible good fortune of the people of Albany. They are surely in for a big treat!
Bob's accomplishments as a capable school district administrator, as a skillful leader, and as a concerned human being are recognized widely. And his contributions to WS-ASCD are legend.
We're going to miss you, Bob. We wish you great success as you embark on the new challenges ahead. Please mark February 10-11, 1978, the date of this year's annual conference on your calendar. To quote another legendary figure, we want you to "come up and see us sometime."

Connie Kravas
Editor
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If, when I entered a classroom and said, "Good morning," my students responded, "Good morning," I knew they were undergraduates. If they took out their notebooks and wrote down my greeting, they were graduate students. Mortimer Adler

Hilda Grobman in Nation's Schools
THE BASICS IN BALANCE

by Elizabeth S. Randolph

The Bicentennial seemed to create a national nostalgia for "the good old days" in America. Symbols of this flirtation with the past like Betsy Ross flags and three-cornered hats became popular. Perhaps it is more than a coincidence that a traditional movement in public education seemed to really take hold in 1976. "Back to the basics" became the rallying cry, reminiscent of the passion, if not the eloquence, of Patrick Henry. The parades and celebrations are over now but the push for basic education seems to be gathering support. This cause seems to have captured the imagination of the press. Without wars or major protest movements to report, newspapers have discovered the emotional impact of the "back to basics" crusade.

A major North Carolina newspaper (Charlotte Observer, August 24, 1977) ran the following headline with an article about the national study of S.A.T. results: "School Leniency Cited for Drop in Test Scores." (2) Similar stories are appearing regularly in publications across the nation.

"Local school districts must take leadership in accountability... or they will find that lawmakers will assume (that) control."

This national focus on public education should not be feared by educators. Education should be a major public concern. However, local administrators must not just react to public pressures but instead must act responsibly with the public to examine the priorities for the schools and to plan for the future. Local school districts must take leadership in accountability and in competency based education or they will find that lawmakers will assume control in these areas.

There must be caution in mandating that teachers stress the basics. Many teachers are confused. Education is quite different today than in the romanticized past. Colonial schools were limited to the elite and they provided primarily academic instruction, leaving moral, social and vocational education to the family and the church. Today, society expects teachers to be responsible for these and many other areas not formerly considered part of public education. Teachers were encouraged by curriculum leaders in the sixties and the early seventies to be open, to be creative, to meet individual needs. Now they are chastised by the public for lax discipline and low standards. It is not surprising that these teachers, bruised by the infamous educational pendulum, are wary of the implications of competency testing, performance indicators and accountability.

Too often in the past educational movements have been "either/or" propositions--open/traditional, humanistic/conventional, sight/phonics, etc. Many educators fear that this wave of neo-traditionalism will sweep aside the recent progress in humanistic and affective education. The unproductive debate being conducted by these supporters at extreme positions serves only to polarize teachers rather than to enlighten them.

In a 1974 Newsweek article Dean Mario Fantini, now at the University of Massachusetts, warned that "conservatives and liberals will soon collide over the question of how their children should be educated." (1) In some districts the collision has already occurred. It is essential for educational leaders to explain to the public that basic skills instruction and affective education are not mutually exclusive. It is even more important that they provide the environment for teachers to facilitate humane basic education.

Let us look at the relationship between basic skills instruction and affective learning. It is the unique function of the schools to provide for the development of basic skills. No other institution in our society has been established solely for that purpose. When any educational program loses sight of this primary function they do students a disservice. Without the ability to read, write and compute, individuals will not be able to perform as self-sufficient adults. If teaching basic skills was the schools' only charge the task would be relatively simple. However, as we discussed earlier, society demands more than the mere schooling of youngsters. The public expects the schools to provide a comprehensive education. Therefore, teaching must be more than a series of measurable tasks. It involves a complex relationship between teachers and children and must deal with the students' emotional readiness as well as intellectual readiness for learning tasks.

Unfortunately, some groups in their enthusiasm for humanistic and affective education have neglected to integrate their processes with any systematic approach to ensure skill acquisition. It is for this reason that Anthony Monkarty states that the utopian theories and methods of radical humanists "...have an air of unreality and often absurdity to the practicing administrator." (3) The problem is one of proportion. If we compare teaching to baking a cake, the relationship may become more clear. Think of the ingredients such as flour, eggs, milk, etc., representing basic skills and the oven's heat representing the classroom climate. The cook can combine all the ingredients but until he/she puts them in the oven at the right temperature there will be no cake. Similarly, teaching basic skills cannot produce a satisfactory result unless it is provided in the right environment, in an atmosphere of mutual respect. Just as a hot oven is only one of the requirements for making a cake, so too is a happy classroom only one of the requirements for effective learning.

How do we insure the acquisition of basic skills while attending to the affective needs of students? The first step is so obvious that it may be overlooked. The teacher must be a caring adult. He or she must really believe in the dignity of each student regardless of background or academic achievement. No number of human relations exercises can compensate for a teacher who does not believe in the students worth teaching. Too often comments like, "If you

Continued on page 8
ACCOUNTING FOR INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES IN WAYS THAT WORK

by Delmo Delle-Dono

There's not much in research to support current practices in the classroom for individualization of instruction. The available data seem to indicate that students learn as well through whole group instruction as through small group and/or individually approached homework in general use. Attempts to account for individual differences through ability grouping yield similar results, namely, students seem to learn no more in ability groups than they do in regular mixed groups. As a matter of fact, some studies have shown that students of high ability learned less in a high ability group than in a regular (heterogeneous) group. Research results are not definitive and conclusive: however, they simply do not support these two most commonly used approaches in this country which attempt to account for individual differences in learning ability.

"Most of the (individualized instruction) approaches commonly in use...are indeed no more effective for learning than if whole-group approaches are used."

One reason for such results may be that the research studies do not cover a long enough span of time and/or may not be adequately controlled to properly compare individualized approaches with those that are not. Another reason may be that most of the approaches commonly in use, which fall under the heading of "individualized instruction," are indeed no more effective for learning than if whole-group approaches are used.

If the latter reason is true, it poses a real problem: the inescapable fact is that students do vary widely from each other in their ability to learn, and whole class instruction has generally been deadly to the spirit of teachers and students alike. We also know that even if more learning does not occur, individualizing instruction does provide opportunity for livelier classes and also probably reduces the problems of discipline. Thus, we must have some forms of individualization; the question is what kinds shall we employ?

Possible Flaws in Current Practices

Let's look at other possible reasons for the apparent lack of advantage of individualized approaches over whole-group instruction. My own view is that the most frequently used methods for individualizing tend to foster dependence of the student on teachers, create an undue burden of effort and time on teachers and fail to capitalize on students' potential for taking significant responsibility for their own learning. This set of approaches is all part of the "medical syndrome" (inappropriately) transferred to education, in which we see teachers "diagnosing" individual student needs for standards, "prescribing" a host of learning activity for students in order to "remedy" the problem and then "monitoring" their progress for them through elaborate record-keeping.

The basic characteristics of these particular approaches are that teachers spend countless hours testing/assessing, analyzing results to diagnose needs, planning activities built around different workbooks and/or individual worksheets, correcting hundreds of worksheets and keeping progress charts of various kinds for each student. Most of this effort takes place before and after school, evenings, weekends and even during vacations or recess times. The most conscientious teachers are likely to wind up being most inhumane to themselves...because of their work.

"The most conscientious teachers are likely to wind up being most inhumane to themselves...because of their work."

What Are Potentially Effective Ways to Individualize?

There are a number of practices which have been used since the beginnings of the drive for individualization in this country in the 1930's. Some of them are likely to be more effective than whole group instruction. These practices emphasize one, or more, of the following criteria:

1. Students learn to set some of their class/school goals with assistance of teachers.
2. Students learn how to analyze goals and how to plan for their achievement.
3. Students learn how to carry out their plans both individually and in groups (including identification of resources needed and how to use them).
4. Students learn how to assess their own progress and how to assess attainment of goals. This includes self-assessment of basic skill development in reading, writing, speaking, and number usage, among other things.

Examples of practices which have been, or are being, used to develop such skills are: unit planning in elementary schools (1,2,3,4)*; some of the core curriculum practices used in secondary schools (1,2,3,4); values clarification techniques of Sidney Simon et al (1,2); Lawrence Kohlberg's "moral development" (1,2); Ralph K. Ojemann's "causal" teaching techniques (grades K-9 primarily) for understanding of the why of human behavior (1); the McClelland/Aschbacher material (grades 7-12 primarily) for teaching achievement motivation (1,2,3,4) and a host of other methods and materials with lesser known names or without labels.

There's ample evidence from practice and from research that students can learn to in-

Continued on page 9
USING THE DELPHI TECHNIQUE TO RECOGNIZE THE CHARACTERISTICS OF EXCELLENT TEACHERS
by David R. Stronek

Instruments used for evaluating teachers are usually developed from the philosophy of those who will use the instruments. Dale L. Bolton has suggested: "Local school districts have the major responsibility for determining what is to be measured and evaluated." (1) The literature contains many examples of appropriate instruments. (2)

In this study, pre-service and in-service teachers of the State of Washington described the characteristics of excellent teachers through the Delphi technique. Their estimation of which characteristics are most important may assist others in composing more appropriate evaluation instruments. This study involved 287 students enrolled in university undergraduate courses and 51 in-service teachers participating in a summer institute.

The first step of the Delphi technique is to ask the participants to write freely, without restrictions or guidelines, their responses to open-ended questions. Forty-four pre-service teachers were asked to list in their own words the three most important characteristics of a good teacher and the three most important characteristics of a poor teacher. Their 44 responses were collected into eight synonymous categories for each question. A ninth category was added to allow users of the questionnaire to express another opinion by specifying it with their own words.

The second step of the Delphi technique is to use the questionnaire generated from the original responses offered by the first group. In the questionnaire invited the user to follow this direction for each question: "From the list of nine items given below, put in rank order what you consider to be the three most important characteristics. Write number 1 in the blank before the characteristic which is of highest rank. Put 2 before the second most important characteristic and 3 before the third." The ninth item allowing users to specify another characteristic (not explicitly named) was used as an average of 2.67% per question.

The responses among the groups of the undergraduate students had a very high correlation coefficient of 0.8491 on the average. The coefficient of correlation was 0.3694 between the in-service teachers and the students. The tables below give the relative scores for each item based on a total of 100 points for all responses to each question. Only the five most important items are listed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Undergrad. Students Rank Score</th>
<th>In-Service Teachers Rank Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of and interest in students, rapport</td>
<td>1 32.26</td>
<td>1 2.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imagination, creativity, ability to get the most out of each child</td>
<td>2 25.81</td>
<td>2 2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of subject matter</td>
<td>3 15.05</td>
<td>4 11.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire to teach</td>
<td>4 9.68</td>
<td>3 20.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to communicate information</td>
<td>4 9.68</td>
<td>3 16.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Scores for the Characteristics of a Poor Teacher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Undergrad. Students Rank Score</th>
<th>In-Service Teachers Rank Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lazy, indifferent, ignorant, bored</td>
<td>1 24.73</td>
<td>4 17.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of interest in students</td>
<td>2 21.43</td>
<td>3 22.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to communicate</td>
<td>3 19.78</td>
<td>2 23.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflexible</td>
<td>4 13.19</td>
<td>1 24.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfair, hypercritical, stressing only grades</td>
<td>5 9.69</td>
<td>5 12.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The groups involved in this study have demonstrated an interesting consensus, especially on the characteristics of an excellent teacher. Administrators may wish to use these results in the development of their local school district instrument for evaluation. Perhaps the best use of this research will be to follow the steps of the Delphi technique (successfully used in this study) for formulating an evaluation instrument with the teachers' input.

References

Dr. Stronek is Associate Professor of Biological Sciences and Education, Washington State University, Pullman

EDUCATIONAL TRENDS Cont’d

Finally, human goals and ambitions are heavily bound up in role images: our perceptions of our personal future influence our behavior in the present. We look ahead with anticipation only when we think our aspirations are achievable. When, in contrast, the reaching of personal goals appears hopeless, delaying gratification seems senseless, and we seek—often short-sightedly—to extract all that we can out of the present. There is, therefore, a strong need to instill in the young an optimism about their future, and correspondingly, to counter alienation and despair.

What all of this suggests is that we should think carefully about what is basic in basic education. Our students must be able to read and count; they must know the important lessons arising out of their intellectual heritage; they must be functional and competent; and they must have the emotional skills to cope with the inevitable frustrations and adversities that are a part of living.

Dr. Rubin is Professor of Elementary and Early Childhood Education, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
EVALUATING EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY: THE COMPPELLING FORCE

by Warren H. Burton

In our democratic society, equal educational opportunities for all children has become the compelling force in planning and implementing change in the educational spectrum. In order to equip children to develop their potential and to participate fully in American life, it is essential to the future of our society that desegregation-integration-pluralism be the priority educational strategy.

In the past the school has been used as an institutional device for cultural assimilation; to make, literally, the United States a homogeneous nation of multi-racial Americans. This institutional device, utilizing the ancient concept of "cultural deprivation" is not merely an insult to every minority student; it is an extension of the missionary urge of White Anglo Saxon Protestants (WASPs) to demonstrate the assumed superiority of their culture by making everyone over to their own image.

It should be mentioned that not all educators who force the culturally different child into the American mold would do so because of a conscious desire to implement a superiority complex or mono-cultural prejudice. Many have never thought of the United States as a culturally heterogeneous nation and assume that minority groups must conform in order to compete in our American society.

However, the realities of American life indicate differently. Bicultural Chinese Americans, for example have advantages in the qualitative areas of life such as access to a dual heritage in literature, philosophy and art. In addition, they have the practical economic advantage of being bilingual. The fact is that the Caucasian middle class has controlled the public schools for at least a century. The various racio-cultural minorities have been guinea pigs for experiments in mono-cultural, mono-lingual, vacuum ideology and compensatory education for a lengthy period of time. What is needed is a completely different conception of the function of the school and its relationship to cultural heterogeneity.

The argument for culturally heterogeneous schools is not totally dependent upon pedagogical needs. Any society which gives a high value to democracy and individual freedom cannot consistently utilize the school as an instrument of enforced cultural change.

What kind of democracy would utilize public schools to suppress the heritages of minorities simply because they are minorities?

What kind of democracy can utilize the schools as a means to diminish individual freedom and enforce conformity?

Creating a system of mono-cultural schools is not merely damaging to the self-confidence and self-knowledge of students drawn from the various racial and cultural groups. Majority group students are being deprived in our schools when they master only one language, when they learn about a biased viewpoint of American history, when they are exposed to only one musical tradition, when they read only one kind of literature, when they learn only one approach to the visual arts, when they are exposed to a curriculum which has not any deep roots.
in the soil of their region and in America. The problem is to educate all children in such a way that the school is both relevant to the individual and to the full and complete heritage of the region and the nation. The multi-cultural reality of American life and history should be a part of every school’s curriculum. Furthermore, the structure of schools should be flexible to take advantage of cultural differences in a common concern—the successful progress of children in school. The following are suggested as recommendations for corrective actions:

1. Freedom, tolerance, and cosmopolitanism must be exhibited by school district employees as an example for the children, youth, and adults of the communities served.
2. Each school must be responsive to the needs and interests of all the students which it serves.
3. All segments of the population should have a voice in policy-making and educational planning.
4. The school must replace irrelevant attacks on the cultural values of minority groups with concentration on essential learning.
5. The school must recognize and utilize the cultural assets of the values of minority groups with concentration on essential learning.
6. The curricula of our schools should vary from region to region in order to reflect the rich diversity of American life.
7. Bilingualism should be regarded as not merely an asset, but as a necessity in the twenty-first century; all pupils should be expected to master at least two languages in the elementary grades.
8. All teachers and administrators should be required to receive training of an anthropological-sociological nature and be expected to possess or acquire the linguistic skills necessary for communication with local students and their parents.

"Introducing material about minority groups may bring out unexpected resistance..."

Introducing material about minority groups may bring out unexpected resistance in students, parents, and teachers. The reason is not difficult to discover; it is difficult to abandon a long held belief or image, and the image of minorities has been a degrading one formed by histories, textbooks, and mass media. However, new instructional materials on minorities will interest students because the material is fresh and will provide new dimensions to this country’s culture, whatever symbolic conflict it uncovers.

Replacing the myths of the past with the truth will not be easy, but as Robert F. Kennedy stated in 1966:

Each time a man stands up for an ideal, or acts to improve the lot of others, or strikes out against injustice, he sends forth a tiny ripple of hope, and crossing each
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**EVENTS**

**National Meetings**

October 17-18 NCASI*, "Supervision," New York City

October 31-November 1 NCASI*, "Strategies on Basics," Boston

November 3-4 NCASI*, "Strategies on Basics," Montreal

November 14-15 NCASI*, "Supervision," Portland

December 5-6 NCASI*, "Staff Development," New York City

December 26-January 1 NCASI*, "Russian Curriculum Issues," Moscow, U.S.S.R.

January 1-15 NSBA Regional Conference, San Diego

January 16-17 NCASI*, "Organizational Development," Phoenix

*NCSI = ASCD National Curriculum Study Institute

**State and Regional Meetings**

October 7-8 Legislative Assembly–WSSDA–Annual Fall Meeting, Wenatchee

October 9-11 WA Elem. Principal’s Ass’n., Annual Fall Conference, Sheraton, Spokane

October 13-14 State Board of Education Meeting, Everett

October 14 Statewide In-Service Day, SPI

October 20-22 Standards Revision Conference, SPI, Olympia

October 27-29 NW Council of Chief State School Officers, Region X, Seattle

October 29-30 WEA President-Elect Conference, Seattle

November 2-4 Jr. High, Middle School Princ. Annual Fall Conference, Downtown Hilton, Seattle

November 2-4 WERA, Fall Conference, Thunderbird Inn at the Quay, Vancouver, WA

November 4-6 WSTA, Olympic Hotel, Seattle

November 12-13 WASBO, Renton Sheraton Inn, Renton

November 17-19 WASSP Parliament, Washington Plaza, Seattle

December 1-2 State Board of Education Meeting, Sheraton Hotel, Spokane

December 1-4 WSSDA Convention, Sheraton Hotel, Seattle

December 8-10 Practitioner’s Workshop, Issaquah

January 26-27 State Board of Education Meeting, Bellevue

February 2-4 Oregon ASCD, Ottercrest Inn, OR
A CULTURE INSTITUTE IN A NEW KEY
by Howard L. Nostrand

For the first time, some teachers will have a novel and continuing aid in making French something more than a foreign substance in a school or community college curriculum.

Teams of three—-a French teacher, a teacher of a potentially related subject, and an administrator from the same district—will spend a month, expenses paid, preparing plans and materials to bring French into a more functional relationship to the rest of the curriculum.

The co-directors of the innovative Institute-Workshop, to be held June 19 to July 19, 1978, are Professors Victor E. Hanzell and Howard L. Nostrand of the University of Washington, and Dr. Lester McKim of the Bellevue Public Schools. Professor Genevieve Morain, University of Alberta, will be on the faculty. The program is supported by the National Endowment for the Humanities and will carry university credit.

For further information, readers can contact Professor Nostrand (Department of Romance Languages and Literature, University of Washington, Seattle, WA 98195).

Professor Nostrand is with the Department of Romance Languages and Literature, University of Washington, Seattle.

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY Cont’d

other from a million different centers of energy and daring, these ripples build a current that can sweep down the mightiest walls of oppression and resistance.

The future does not belong to those who are content with today, apathetic toward common problems and their fellow man alike, timid, and fearful in the face of new ideas and bold projects. Rather it will belong to those who can blend vision, reason and courage in a personal commitment to the ideals and great enterprise of American Society.

A child’s educational environment need not be crippling forever. Educational systems need not remain inflexible forever. Needed alternatives in educational practice can be found; and education for all children is not a dream.

Educators in Washington state possess the knowledge and skills to create equal educational opportunity now. Courage and freedom to apply that knowledge can indeed transform the vision of our forefathers into reality for all children.

Elizabeth Randolph is the 1977-78 President of ASCD, and is Asstiant Superintendent, Zone II, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools, Charlotte, North Carolina

Warren Burton is Director of the Office for Equal Education, Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, Olympia.
INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES Cont’d

dividualize their own instruction for themselves. A group of us have formed a non-profit private association, known as The Center for Self-Directed Learning, to assist ourselves and others who are interested in developing more materials and in devising more effective methods. We think that if sufficient effort is given to emphasizing student sharing in responsibility for learning, that the traditional basic skills will be learned as well and, more likely, better than they are being learned now. There is also reason to believe that needed skills in planning and decision-making, alone and with others, will be part of what is learned. Another potential benefit is that good conscientious teachers need not spend all the time they now spend outside of class doing things for students. They may instead spend time in class teaching students how to do more for themselves. (A personal bonus will be to spend a better rounded life doing something other than school work all the time).

Perhaps the most important value of individualizing with emphasis on self-direction is that education in a democratic society ought to be distinctively different in some ways from that in an autocratic society. All societies must teach the mechanics of learning ("basic skills") well. What should distinguish our country's education is that people learn the skills and knowledge needed to govern themselves. This country's students can, and should, begin the processes necessary to accomplish that goal when they begin school. It should be an integral part of all school experiences from that time forward.

*Numbers in parentheses refer back to the "criteria" cited above.

Dr. Della-Dora is Past-President of ASCD, and is with the Department of Teacher Education, California State University, Hayward, Hayward, California
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This WSASCD membership is: [ ] NEW [ ] RENEWAL

Please fill in all spaces carefully and return this form together with $10.00 dues to:
R. A. Flinnigan, WSASCD Membership Chairman, Anacortes School District No. 103, 1402 24th Street, Anacortes, Washington 98221.
SRA'S Distar® program

It Works!

This extraordinary statement is based on substantial information from the federally funded Project Follow Through. Dramatic things occurred.

Overall, the children who were taught by SRA's DISTAR program showed improved self-esteem. And they learned to read.

DISTAR Reading works well for many reasons:
- Every child is involved and interest levels are kept high.
- Sequencing of skills is tightly controlled.
- Lessons are programmed efficiently; students are taught just what they need to know to master a skill.
- Teachers can concentrate fully on teaching.

SRA'S DISTAR Reading. It demonstrated its effectiveness in national Follow Through evaluation. An outstanding program to help you help them read.

To learn more about the DISTAR programs, DISTAR results in your area, or the Follow Through evaluation contact your local SRA representative.

Eastern Washington: Thomas Flom
(509) 456-8475

Western Washington: A. Vance Beckwith
(206) 845-5098

Southwest Washington: Neil Schroeder
(503) 639-4982

SRA
SCIENCE RESEARCH ASSOCIATES, INC.
A Subsidiary of IBM