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From The President

On June 27, the Board of Directors reaffirmed six major goals and established 21 annual objectives which will guide the direction of WSASCD during the year ahead. (Please refer to President’s Newsletter, Volume 2, No. 2, for details.)

Amidst the list of objectives, one in particular emphasizes the importance of promoting membership in WSASCD for all persons concerned about quality education. This objective stands out not because it is of higher priority than the others, but because it underscores WSASCD commitment to serving many different segments of the instructional community.

In the light of WSASCD’s commitment, a new institutional dues structure was developed last year. Participating institutions are strongly recommended to designate their members so that a wide spectrum of the educational family including school board members, central office administrators and staff, school principals, teachers, and support personnel are represented.

The fee structure for institutional membership is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Designated Members</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>$300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>$400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>$600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you would be interested in more information regarding institutional membership, please call Dale Linebarger, Executive Secretary, (206) 275-3716.

Sincerely,
Connie Kravas
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Let's Take the Reasonable Approach to Accountability

Speech given by Dr. Jack L. Frisk to 13 school district teams in ESD-105 involved in a Special Programs Coordination Project
Oct. 28, 1980, Yakima

Increasingly we are trying to relate actions and costs of programs to results. Much effort has been exerted to develop more sophisticated accounting systems to relate program costs directly back to the program.

Recently, I visited a computer operation and they described to me how they could determine the cost of teaching mathematics per pupil as they compared to the cost of teaching history. They took great pride in their program to isolate costs to program. Our ability to match costs to program has grown significantly in recent years. The budget documents used in school districts are more precise than they used to be.

Lately we have turned our attention to a more difficult area, determining the specific results of programs in learning increases. The effort has been to not only describe where the money went but what learning gains occurred because of the expenditure.

In this age of accountability, everyone needs to know what their money is buying. Congress began in 1964 to put sizable amounts of money into programs aimed at curing some of America’s ills. After a few years, the ills seemed to still be around and Congress wondered if their money had done any good. People in the Office of Education suddenly felt impelled to prove that the expenditures were getting results. One of the early efforts was a study commissioned to Westinghouse to study Head Start. Much to the dismay of Head Start advocates, the study couldn’t document gains. As Congress fretted over lack of success, the effort intensified to show results. Resources from all sides have been put to the task of relating outcomes to specific inputs.

Greater accessibility of computers allowed us to develop larger and more sophisticated programs. Huge numbers of variables can be placed in the program to assist us in isolating specific actions and look at the changes which occur because of the program. Program evaluation has become more and more important.

We have been heavily impacted by the accountability drive and we haven’t performed nearly as well as we would like to perform. Tracking learning performance back to the instruction activity has not been an easy task.

I believe we have located the problem. It’s the kids. Kids just aren’t programmed right. They don’t properly differentiate when, where and how they learn. They can’t tell us that Program A conducted between 9:00 and 9:30 taught them this and Program B taught between 3:00 and 3:30 taught them that.

In fact, they are so poorly programmed that they can’t relate whether they are now using skills acquired last year or yesterday. They can’t even differentiate between the formal school learning and the out-of-school learning.

As accountability packages, kids are a mess. They integrate their learning into a single whole and discard any ability to describe where it came from.

The mind is an odd computer. Unlike other computers, it does its own filing. The mind seems to have recall of things at some times that it doesn’t have at other times. It seems to forget, but then we sometimes find it hasn’t really forgotten. It has buried something deep inside which keeps right on working in the depths of the mind.

I don’t intend to get off into a discussion of the mind and how it works. Suffice to say, it is a complex program of skills, data, memories, feelings, assimilation, integration techniques and unknowns to confound our attempts to catalog and describe the human brain. We don’t quite know what makes it tick.

Most of all we don’t know what motivates it. If someone discovers the surefire method to change attitudes, they can write their own ticket.

So what does all this have to do with this conference? Why do I poke fun at our efforts to show the specific effects of specific programs?

It seems to me that our efforts to relate pupil progress to special programs is not likely to be too successful. That doesn’t mean we should stop our efforts. But realistically, we need to view what we are doing. We need to avoid the overstated claims, the exaggerate promises, the development of false expectations.

It seems to me we need to remind ourselves often that the focus is the pupil, not the program. When we have direct responsibility for a program it is very difficult to avoid making the program the end product rather than a tool for learning. It is difficult not to build an evaluation system one believes will justify the program as the exclusive reason for the pupil’s progress.

There are probably good reasons for many pull-out programs but I suspect in many cases the prime purpose is to isolate costs and inputs so the program can be costed easier and managed simpler, rather than to create a better learning environment.

I understand there are sometimes even jealousies over claims of whose program has caused the gains that a pupil shows.

I hope this conference gives us a chance to back away from all this a little and look at the broad educational program.

I hope we can look at putting programs and moneys together so they are all efficiently and effectively contributing to a good learning program. My first reaction to the question about which program has to spend their money first is one of dismay. Somehow we need to know what needs to be done and pool all the available resources to get the job done.

I hope we can look at how each of the individual programs contributes to the whole learning environment. I doubt that any one of these programs is worth a tinker’s dam all by itself.

I hope we can look at the pupils’ needs and play down the program needs. I know the response; yes, but the program requires, or the feds say, or the State says … If we are ingenious enough to try to measure specific program performance, we surely can find ways to coordinate programs to focus on kids not programs. Let’s do it.

I hope you will find this conference a good experience, one you go home from with ideas on how to help kids, not programs.

Jack Frisk is Washington Deputy Superintendent of Public Instruction
Mixed Responses to Basic Education Act

by Lawrence J. Hauge

The total impact of the Basic Education Act (BEA) and its amendments cannot be assessed for many years. But a high percentage of Washington's administrators and school board leaders have some strong opinions about the effects of the BEA after just one year of its implementation. In a recent study, of which 87.4 per cent of 135 persons surveyed responded, the BEA received high marks for its overall impact.

The loss of certain policy and decision-making powers, and the local school board's ability "to ensure a quality educational program" are perceived as the most negative effects of the BEA's levy limitations and revised funding formula. There seems to be little doubt that curriculum and accountability improvements are occurring as a result of the BEA and the Student Learning Objectives laws. Adding foreign language to the basic skills and teacher/parent conferences to "total program offerings" were welcome amendments to the initial legislation.

While it was too early to assess the effects of the Student Learning Objectives law on quality of classroom instruction or improvement in student learning, the statute has caused teachers and administrators to put more emphasis on curriculum development. This curriculum improvement effort has resulted in a better definition of learning objectives and evaluation procedures. The volume of coursework as a result of the learning objectives program was considered excessive. Adding foreign languages to the basic skills list of subjects was welcomed, especially from the superintendents' perspective. Although it caused few program changes, it aided districts financially.

The most frequent negative responses to the BEA related to teacher and administrator frustration with paperwork. Some typical comments were: "confusion and frustration on the part of some teachers"; "another 'blanketly-blank' report to do"; "more paperwork for little benefit"; "tremendous increase in paperwork"; and "too many hands in the pot sure screw up a good recipe."

Administrative decision-making powers were also perceived as constrained by the BEA. A loss of staff is the result of the levy lid, declining student enrollment, and a revised state funding formula. Respondents commented that the funding limitations were resulting in "reduction in staffing—consequently programs"; "loss of young teachers"; and "reductions in force—both classified and certificated."

The most frequently expressed positive comments in the study fell into three categories: curricular, administrative, and fiscal. The respondents credited the BEA with curriculum planning improvements, increased shared decision making, the development of student learning objectives, improved assessment practices and reporting methods, and a greater awareness of the curriculum. Increased administrative effectiveness in accountability, staff planning, and goal setting. Fiscally, benefits identified included relief from special levy dependence, stability in anticipated revenues and more dollars for more staff.

In the Winter, 1980 issue of Context and Conflict, Dr. Ron Johnson, Assistant Superintendent for the Federal Way Schools, wrote about the positive fiscal impact the Basic Education Act (BEA) had in Federal Way. Federal Way, a district that "lived and died by the special levy system," has benefited significantly from the provisions of the Act. Other districts, especially those with a history of strong levy support, felt the opposite about the BEA because of the local funding limitations it has imposed.

A question asking for respondents' recommendations for specific changes in the Act brought some interesting comments. All three subgroups are concerned about how to fund those programs local district's consider important given the present funding formula and levy limitations. Typical comments were: "We can't make it at current levels of funding"; "Increase funding for activities and transportation"; "Change formula for levy lid"; and "Improve staff ratios."

Fundamental to the money concerns is the feeling that a statewide standardization of curriculum and instruction is occurring. This "standardization" or push to "mediocrity" is caused by the present funding formula, the special levy limitation in the BEA and the anticipated financial pinch at the State level in the next biennium.

While in this study there was general agreement that there should be a legislative moratorium on Basic Education Act changes, there was great concern that there will be a short fall in basic education funding. A study similar to this one following the third year of BEA implementation will serve as an interesting comparison as to just how great the impact of the shortfall and double-digit inflation will have on the BEA's guarantees and funding limitations. The nearly sixty percent positive marks given the Act in 1979 might well deflate in direct proportion to the purchasing power of those promised state dollars.
Let's Reduce Discipline and Burnout

By Janet R. Christian and S. Bruce Webster

School morale is directly related to two critical problems: student discipline and teacher burnout. Student discipline problems and teacher burnout are problems that result one from the other. Teachers get "burned out" as a result of dealing with student discipline problems. Both are partners in the escalating cycle of antagonism, created when teacher and student do not behave or perform as the other wishes. If we were to spend our efforts "healing" or "preventing" the reasons for these problems, we would not have to search for the time required to deal with and solve them.

Before full scale warfare erupts, we must try to allay the growing concerns about education's "workability" in an increasingly stressful world. We must increase student motivation and reduce discipline and stress problems. The discipline problems that we face in school today are often outside pressures and forces that are too much for kids to handle. So, they rebel and resist instead of cope. We attempt, as teachers, to understand and we do for the most part, but then something occurs — the "last straw" — and we find ourselves facing conflict, student alienation and teacher burnout; or worse. And worse is when we find ourselves beginning to hate the student instead of the behavior. We get to a point where we can no longer draw a line between what the kid does and what he really is. How can we separate in our mind the behavior from the person? Until we are able to, we will continue to identify the student with his actions, reject him and push him away and say, "You're not what I want you to be." The student will then continue the negative behavior and say, "No, I'm not what you want me to be, but neither are you what I want you to be, so there!" And the battle rages on.

Our cooperation in the disciplinary problems that we see today has got to be admitted before we can find a solution for them. It is often our resistance to their behavior that is the push for continuing that behavior. Are they telling us that we are not dealing with the cause of their frustration, or their apathy and anger? They cannot continue to grow up, to age, to become a part of the world, of society, unless and until they hear and learn about themselves, about their role in it all, about how they are to handle it.

If the problem is, indeed, the pressure from outside — from what awaits them in the future — how do we deal with that? Cajoling and battening down the hatches on our disciplinary procedures has not worked, cajoling and understanding has not worked. Increasing the skills training so they can see the applicability of school to "real life" has not worked. Our call for assistance from the "outside" yields more goal setting, career orientation, self-image and self-concept classes but has not yielded hoped for results. So what now? If we cannot reduce discipline problems by adding new curriculum and programs, we cannot do it by becoming stern and enforcing the "letter of the law" with stronger and stronger disciplinary measures.

In a recent research study conducted at the high school level, over 500 teenagers were interviewed on student fears. The study found that the number one fear of kids today is a fear of being rejected. The fear of not being adequate, fear of criticism, fear of being laughed at, fear of failure and even fear of having too much success — the fear of rejection are all inclusive. Therein lies the tremendous pressure students experience. They place themselves in a no-win situation and then shrivel up inside at the enormity of the task before themselves. Then they strike out, thinking they can bring change by rejecting first. And, underneath it all, they want us to care about them and not reject them. But, we see the things they do — the bad things they do — and we react on the intellect level with outrage at this violation of our values. And in the process, we continue the cycle of perceived rejection.

We need to react with our hearts. To see the call for help underneath the problems and deal with that call. Our job is to help these students see that there are other alternatives to get what they want, which is recognition and appreciation and help. We must, as teachers and educators, come to recognize that we are in a new time, a new age, and that the old methods of dealing and coping will not work now. If it requires that we stop a class to deal with a student who needs or is making the call for help, we have to have that flexibility. They are not going to learn because the rules say they must. They are not going to learn or even come to school unless school recognizes that the primary need is to help them overcome their fears. In a world of uncertain employment, where a college education may or may not mean career certainty, the value of education must be re-examined. Our role as teachers has got to include the addressing of human needs ... but ... this cannot be accomplished until we, as educators, demonstrate our ability to be trusted and to be trusting. The phrases that we live by mentally have got to be lived emotionally. When we hear, "People don't do things for or against you, they do them for themselves and it is your good fortune or bad fortune to be in the way at the time." We have to acknowledge that the students are not being behavior problems to spite us, but rather to protect themselves. We must always teach what we are and what others are to us. We must be trusting, and teach our students they are trustworthy. We must be honest, and teach our students to be honest. We must be caring and giving, and teach our students that we are worthy of their care and concern.

We will reduce stress when we reduce discipline problems. We will reduce discipline problems when we place acceptance, recognition of self-responsibility for actions and thoughts, and the appreciation of others before the contents of our curriculum.

Janet Christian and Bruce Webster are Educational Consultants with offices in Port Angeles and Seattle. Webster is the creator of the curriculum, "The Psychology of Self-Esteem."

What do you know about, "Teacher Burnout?"
“Maintaining Quality While Managing Scarcity” — Part I
by Dean Starr and Becky Scholl
(Dean Starr is Yakima School District Superintendent. Becky Scholl is Coordinator—Secondary Curriculum in the Yakima School District.)

“Maintaining Quality While Managing Scarcity” is the theme of the year for the Yakima School District and its community partnership as they join forces to meet present and future economic challenges. Basic education and major special educational programs are not funded at actual cost. The levy lid law has curtailed consistent community support of schools. We face a two-pronged energy crisis since, one, eastern Washington schools must use more energy because of climatic conditions, yet funding is equal across the state; and two, buildings must be made energy efficient, although initial construction stipulated only that they be practical to build. Finally, the current enrollment decline is not expected to reverse itself until the mid-eighties.

Positively facing these challenges, while maintaining and refining a quality educational program, has generated several areas of concern:

1. More is not better. Resources must be conserved for the future in harmony with nature. Americans accustomed to days of ever-expanding market and consumption are coming to the realization that those days are over and that in the field of education constant and continued growth in revenues and programs is just not there!

2. Educators must teach and model a scope of conservation practices throughout the community. Their impact is significant as they work at the cutting edge of society with children (citizens of tomorrow), the parents, and the community — our partnership.

3. Present funding formulas do not include factors to deal with inflation and spiraling energy costs. We must develop an awareness of the enormous cost which we have come to know as inflation. We have not begun to recognize the cost of energy due to our own environmental regulations and the scarcity of energy products.

4. State and federal governments face severe budget reductions. The federal government cannot continue to print money to solve everyone’s problems. The days of government throwing money at problems is essentially over.

There is a growing realization that money for programs must come from the people and that tax revenues cannot be generated unless the economy is healthy and productive.

5. We must maintain quality while adjusting to declining enrollment and the accompanying money shortfall. In Yakima we have attempted to meet this challenge by reassigning more than sixty teachers and administrators. We did this by matching qualified people to jobs and by avoiding a potential reduction in force situation.

6. We must also adjust to an increasing loss of allegiance to the public school system as a result of fewer couples opting to have children and an increasing number of older citizens.

7. The hiring of new teachers is at an all time low. All of us in the Yakima School District seem to be growing older and better together. This can mean increased educational quality for our students as well as increased cost through higher average salaries.

Maintaining a quality educational program in the face of scarcity requires a renewed commitment by all of us in the educational community. Together we must face and make major decisions as a school/community team.

“Maintaining Quality While Managing Scarcity” — Part II
by Helen Peterson and Becky Scholl

An emphasis on the management of scarcity impacts priorities and effects the promotion of quality in curriculum and instruction. Here is a sample of impacted organizational functions and services, and a description of ways Yakima School District is coping with reductions in a variety of areas.

INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS

An orderly process has been created to access a district textbook adoption fund which will provide for careful expenditure of text monies on fully piloted and scrutinized material. Instructional materials must be selected to match curriculum goals and must be chosen for longevity. A peripheral benefit to this process is the ability to exchange books between schools where student enrollment peaks in various grade levels at different times.

STAFF INSERVICE

A maturing staff with few new teachers has emphasized need for inservice education. Inservice was one budget area that received no cuts. The district-adopted student learning objectives implementation continues to receive high priority for inservice from this fund as do inservice opportunities which enable better coping with local, state and federal laws, i.e., child abuse and 94-142. This inservice fund does not support staff travel; emphasis is on bringing persons to this area for wider impact of our staff rather than sending a few members to an inservice opportunity with less impact on staff and possible higher expenditure.

STUDENT ENRICHMENT, EXTRA CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES, FIELD TRIPS, ETC.

Economic recession and resulting public school budget cuts have severely affected money available for activity programs
in the Yakima School District. Yakima is one district that funds the competitive athletic and fine arts programs; and consequently these budgets have been heavily impacted by mandated budget cuts. (Athletic equipment purchases and all activity travel are being reduced considerably.)

Teams are getting by with the barest minimum in new equipment; tighter, more restrictive guidelines prevail in travel by athletic teams and activity groups. Yakima's two high schools' teams and groups (i.e.: choral, debate, band, etc.) travel together whenever possible.

Junior high programs continue to utilize a shuttle busing system that generated considerable savings last year. Shuttle busing involves all school districts of the junior high athletic league: Selah, West Valley, Naches and Union Gap. For a series of games between West Valley Junior High and Wilson Junior High, for example, a bus will transport the West Valley 9th grade team to Wilson, pick up Wilson's 7th grade team and return to West Valley. At the conclusion of the 9th grade game, the route is reversed, all by the same bus.

Funds for field trips have also been reduced but program quality is being enhanced. Might we turn this reduction into a move for greater quality? Each educator is evaluating rethinking: What is the educational purpose of each proposed field trip, follow-up activities that extend the trip's value and the advantage of neighborhood field trips, walking field trips, etc.?

**PRE-SCHOOL AND PARENTING PROGRAMS**

To coordinate efforts to reach pre-school children and their parents, the Yakima Schools sponsors a Backyard Center Program. This program is neighborhood based. Parents get together in homes on a rotation basis for continuing educational and sharing. This program is staffed by two part-time teachers. It is relatively inexpensive when compared with the impact it is having for pre-school children and their parents.

**HOME/SCHOOL/COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP PROGRAMS**

As a part of the Bicentennial, the Yakima School Board renewed its commitment to a partnership endeavor with the home and community. This has resulted in improved communication, understanding and a valuable service and expertise. We feel that these partnerships and services must continue regardless of budgeting limitations. This effort has created an extensive volunteer program, district and school newsletters, many advisory committees and an elementary level consulting program to serve students and families.

**DEFINING CURRICULUM**

We are making a greater effort to clearly define curricular goals and benchmark student learnings. The development of a Planned Course Statement on the secondary level identifies course goals, objectives and materials for each subject area. While developing student learning objectives, criterion referenced tests and new record-keeping systems, a concerted effort is being made to limit paper work. Curriculum consultants are also meeting with teachers during planning periods at building sites rather than have large committees and provide substitutes during the schoolday.

**TECHNOLOGY**

A needs assessment prior to the purchasing of technologies has helped district staff prioritize programs and equipment purchases to meet needs through a slowly growing use of technology. The relative low cost of the microcomputer, coupled with its streamlined reporting capability, creates an effective means to provide more individualized instruction, improved record-keeping and reduced paperwork.

**CONCLUSION**

Maintaining quality in this time of scarcity is requiring Yakima School District educators to increase creative problem solving, reduce unprofitable services and acquire or develop resources more in harmony with the future.

(Dean Starr is Yakima School District Superintendent. Becky Scholl is Coordinator — Secondary Curriculum in the Yakima School District. Helen Peterson is Manager, Curriculum and Instruction, in the Yakima School District.)
The Mythology of Mathematics Teaching

by Jack Price

As with most activities that appear difficult, mathematics has a certain mystique. Over the years it has accumulated a set of myths that stress inauthenticity, one answer, one method, sit up straight and pay attention. I'd like to dispel some of these myths to show that mathematics is a human endeavor. As such it is subject to the frailties of humans. Perhaps mathematics does deserve to be placed on a pedestal but it may be there for the wrong reasons.

First myth: We know whom we are teaching. I submit we do not know. We can say the words “individualized instruction,” “diagnosis,” and whatever the new related buzz words are, but we don't understand them. While dangerous, let me reason from one example which I'm certain is repeated throughout the country. A major university-connected research organization studied the junior high mathematics programs in a large city here in the West. They tested all students before the program started. At the end of the program they asked the teachers to indicate a breakdown of the time spent on particular topics. There was nearly a perfect correlation between the topics that received the most time — and those the students knew already. Either the teachers didn't bother to find out what the students knew or they took the path of least resistance. Either is a tragedy bordering on mallefeasance.

Although I'm certain we all agree that PL 94-142 and the attendant time consuming paperwork and meetings are the bane of our school existence, there may be something to be learned there for the average and gifted child. IEP's require a close look at the child — something that I'm not entirely certain that we have been doing. For most, individualized instruction means everyone going through the same stuff just at a different rate. Individualization does not mean isolation. It means students achieving what they can and need to achieve through methods that are best for them.

Kids can be individualized in groups and learn accordingly. One of the best teachers I've ever seen utilized a group exam. He divided the class in carefully selected groups and let them have the test. They argued, discussed, and at the end all accepted the common paper or submitted a minority report. But they learned.

And yet some learn better alone and why shouldn't they be given that chance? The IEP in mathematics should prescribe not just what goes on in class but also where the child goes from there based on aptitude, interests, and aspirations. It's just good counseling. Too often if a child seems to need help we seem to help him. Individualized means personalized and when the teacher can look at the child as a person the child is on his/her way to better learning. I believe the goal of teaching should be to have each child leave school as he or she entered it — bright eyed, bushy tailed, teach me!

Let's avoid the world envisioned in this poem entitled "About School." I found it in a 1970 issue of Scholastic's SCOPE magazine.

ABOUT SCHOOL
He always wanted to say things. But no one understood.
He always wanted to explain things. But no one cared.
So he drew.

Sometimes he would just draw and it wasn't anything. He wanted to carve it in stone or write it in the sky.

He would lie out on the grass and look up in the sky and it would be only him and the sky and the things inside him that needed saying.

And it was after that, that he drew the picture. It was a beautiful picture.

He kept it under the pillow and would let no one see it. And he would look at it every night and think about it. And when it was dark, and his eyes were closed, he could still see it.

And it was all of him. And he loved it.

When he started school he brought it with him. Not to show to anyone, but just to have with like a friend.

It was funny about school.

He sat in a square, brown desk like all the other square, brown desks and he thought it should be red.

And his room was a square, brown room. Like all the other rooms. And it was tight and close. And stiff.

He hated to hold the pencil and the chalk, with his arm stiff and his feet flat on the floor, stiff, with the teacher watching and watching.

And then he had to write numbers. And they weren't anything. They were worse than the letters that could be something if you put them together.

And the numbers were tight and square and he hated the whole thing.

The teacher came and spoke to him. She told him to wear a tie like all the other boys. He said he didn't like them and she said it didn't matter.

After that they drew. And he drew all yellow and it was the way he felt about morning. And it was beautiful.

The teacher came and smiled at him. "What's this?" she said. "Why don't you draw something like Ken's drawing? Isn't that beautiful?"

It was all questions.

After that his mother bought him a tie and he always drew airplanes and rocket-ships like everyone else. And he threw the old picture away.

And when he lay out alone looking at the sky, it was big and blue and all of everything, but he wasn't anymore.

He was square inside and brown and his hands were stiff and he was like everyone else. And the thing inside him that needed saying didn't need saying anymore.

It had stopped pushing. It was crushed.

Stiff. Like everything else.

A well-known author? No, an 18-year-old named Alvis Horne. His home, doesn't it?

Second myth: We agree on what we are teaching. Ridiculous we can't even agree on such a basic thing as notation — or haven't you seen any texts lately? Likewise there is no general agreement on content in mathematics. Probably if we were to be honest and develop IEP's, each student's content would be different.

We are really not in the business of producing mathematicians and we shouldn't be. I believe that much of the decline in interest in mathematics, and the rest of the physical sciences for that matter, is due to an unreasonable preoccupation with structure and form and very little emphasis on function and substance. (If you don't believe that there is a decline in interest, you should have walked through the recent science fair. The preponderance of projects were in the life sciences and psychology.) It is difficult for students to see the beauty of the structure of an axiomatic system if they have to worry whether they did the algebraic manipulations correctly. In order to "discover" generalizations, the student must be able.
to apply some good old-fashioned mathematical skills. I would not suggest that we return to the rote recall methods.

Rather we should merge what we know in pedagogy with what we know about the development of mathematical skills to provide a student with the ability to do math as well as think about it. We are in the business of producing young people who can think — and this requires the ability to not think about something.

Back in 1957 I participated in one of the first NSF institutes for mathematics teachers. Eugene Northrop taught a course in Modern Trigonometry. It was developed by wrapping a real line around a unit circle. The final exam required us to redevelop the concepts by wrapping a real line around a unit square. This may not mean anything to the non-mathematics reader but it was an elegant way to approach trigonometry. There was beauty there because we could see the undergirding. We all knew about trigonometry, but it was beautiful because we got to a familiar place by an unfamiliar route. There is a lesson there for all of us.

Perhaps we should pause for a moment about exams and grading. Unfortunately most of us have the 100% syndrome. In baseball 30% (.300) is great; 66-2/3% (.200) is tremendous in bowling; and yet kids have to be 100% in mathematics — or at the very least 98%. At best a grade is a subjective assessment of the degree of accomplishment of a very tenuous set of objectives. This becomes even more ridiculous when a person committed to behavioral objectives assigns a grade based on completion of the objectives.

And if the student fails, what do we do to him or her? We make the student start over from the beginning instead of at the point where he or she lost contact. There must be hundreds of students out there — perhaps some of you — who never made it to second semester geometry because you had to take first semester over and over. It’s similar to the student who takes U.S. History in the 5th, 6th, and 11th grades and never gets past the Civil War. Why do we do that? Why not report what objectives the student has mastered and let him or her get on with the rest of them? If we truly personalize, we may even recognize that the student doesn’t need some of them. Why don’t we do this? It has a lot to do with myth number three.

Third myth: This is a multiple choice question. ______ is the best way to teach mathematics. The choices are: CAI, programmed instruction, laboratory/clinic, textbook/lecture, none of the above, all of the above, some of the above with some of the children some of the time. The myth is that there is one good way to teach mathematics. The answer obviously is the last choice: some of the above with some of the children some of the time. Each of the above has been a shibboleth at one time or another. The true word should probably be appropriateness. For drill and practice, maybe CAI is best; for background material, programmed instruction; concrete to abstract, probably the lab — but one particular method for all kids at all times, never!

For example, one of the most important concepts in mathematics is functions. For those of you not mathematics educators, simply put, a function is a relation between two sets such that for each member of the first there is a unique member of the second. \( C = 15n \) where \( C \) is cost and \( n \) is the number of postage stamps describes a function. For each \( n \) there is one \( C \). There are great functions in a shoe measuring device, postage costs, the Tower puzzle, or the gears in a rotary hand egg-beater. Lab is important here for hands-on experience.

Some students, though, can operate better with functions at the abstract level. Willie West was one such student. A number of years ago in The Mathematics Teacher, a professional journal of NCTM, a noted mathematician was attempting to define a real life situation for a function defined by a set of ordered pairs. In the example above the pairs would be \((1, 15), (2, 30), (3, 45)\) and the function would be \( C = 15n \) the cost of stamps.

The function that was being searched was \((0.1, 1), (0.2, 0.1), (0.3, 0)\). According to the mathematician, the real life situation was this. Suppose there were one gum ball in a gum ball machine. You hit it and the gum ball comes out: \((0.1, 1)\) no money, one gum ball. Then you put in one penny, no gum ball \((1, 0)\); 2 pennies, no gum ball \((2, 0)\) . . . and so on. Willie said, "That's not a function." / "Why?" I asked. / "Because," he said, "if you hit the machine again (no penny) you get no gum ball. This is the pair \((0, 0)\). Since we already had \((0, 1)\) in the set we have two second numbers for a first number. A function says there is a unique second number." Now that may not mean a lot to you, but to me it was beautiful. A black, handicapped kid in a broken down high school in Detroit punched a big hole in a theory proposed by a noted mathematician from a world famous "think tank."

That is what we want, the ability to think, to solve problems, to take an idea and twist it to gain a new relationship. There with only a brain, Willie won the shoot out.

Perhaps the results would be different for someone else in Northrup’s class or for Willie in someone else’s. But that is part of the teaching game. Teaching methods should be personalized to the teacher as the content is to the student. If we believe in personalized instruction for kids, we have to believe in a personal style for teachers and accept it. I believe teachers pushed into a mold become moldy.

This leads me quickly and briefly to another related myth, pre-service education. Ontogeny recapitulates phylogeny. Each new teacher seems to go through the teaching evolutionary chain. Why? Have we not progressed far enough to warrant changing the way we educate teachers? Innumerable studies show that teachers teach the way they are taught. I can recall a professor of education in a midwest university who began his methods course with the statement. "There are twenty different methods to teach a class. I'm going to tell you about them." Why can't we help teachers become aware of alternate ways to reach young people? Why must a teacher be doomed to repeat the mistakes of every new (and used) teacher from the dawn of recorded history?

Perhaps I can sum up the mythology of mathematics teaching by alluding to two famous myths — Procrustes and Prometheus. As you know, Procrustes was a giant who captured travelers and made them fit his iron bed by stretching them or chopping them off. Prometheus was the god who brought fire to the common people. Teachers can often become one or the other of these giants who stretch and chop our captives to fit the iron bed of curriculum or the fire-bringers who light the way so that students may attain the skills, concepts, and thinking abilities they so greatly need and deserve. We must help teachers become like Prometheus so that never again will an Alvis Horne have to worry about being square inside — and stiff and having his hopes and dreams snuffed out. We can do better, we must for all the Alvis Hornes out there who depend on us.

Jack Price is Superintendent of the Vista Unified School District in California.
Impact of Proposed Lau Remedies

Local School Districts are Alarmed by the Proliferation of Special Programs Which Place Demands on Limited Resources

by Ron Stephens

The Department of Education (DOE) has just concluded a series of hearings on proposed regulations for bilingual education to be enforced in all public schools in the nation by the Office of Civil Rights (OCR). Support for bilingual education is strong in Washington state. However, support for bilingual education has little to do with opposition to the proposed rules. A wide cross-section of the educational community have come out against the regulations which are a formalization of the Lau remedies developed following the U.S. Supreme Court decision in Lau v. Nichols, 414 US 563, 39 L.Ed. 2d 1, 94 S.Ct. 786 (1974). The objections to these rules and regulations are based on philosophical, practical and legal considerations in six areas:

1) The proliferation of special programs for special-class students is rapidly approaching the point at which learning opportunities of students in traditional school programs are affected negatively.

The student population served by traditional school curricula is unable to qualify as members of a special class such as bilingual, gifted, handicapped, etc. and is, therefore, ineligible for special programs. The result is a denial of equal educational opportunity that has already caused a significant exodus of children from middle class homes out of the public schools and into private schools. If the DOE in mandating bilingual transitional programs does not also take into account the impact this will have on the quality of, and the resources available to, traditional curricula, then public schools, especially in urban areas, are likely to become institutions solely serving ethnic and racial minorities, the disadvantaged and the handicapped, and the poor.

2) The regulations mandate a specific course of instruction (bilingual transitional education) at the federal level without federal funding, placing the financial burden for programs on the state and the local school district, both of which operate with limited resources.

Providing special programs necessitates reallocation of limited state and local resources aggravating the possibility of reduced quality and funding of the traditional school curriculum. These bilingual transitional programs are expensive as it is likely that in addition to a "regular" classroom teacher, a teacher of English as a Second Language (ESL), and a teacher in the non-English primary language must be provided.

National organizations of educators estimate the increased costs over what is presently being spent will run anywhere from $190 to $500 million annually. In Seattle Public Schools where some federal and state money is available, the district spent $1.7 million in 1979-80 in providing 64% of the over-baseline costs for bilingual programs out of local funds. The DOE has funded six grants for bilingual programs in Washington while 130 of the 300 local school districts in the state are providing bilingual transitional education to students. With federal funding incentives absent, the DOE is forced to resort to coercive measures to seek implementation of its national bilingual transitional educational priority. The OCR audits local schools and requires reallocation of existing resources for bilingual programs by threatening local school districts with the loss of other federal program funds if they refuse to comply. The DOE's lack of resolve in seeking adequate funds from the U.S. Congress makes it both unrealistic and impractical for the bilingual priority to be successfully implemented.

3) The DOE was not granted authority by the U.S. Congress to promulgate and adopt these rules and regulations as they mandate a particular program of instruction (bilingual transitional education) at the local school district level.

This federal curriculum mandate is expressly prohibited under Section 103(b) of the Department of Education Act (PL 96-88) which established the DOE:

No provision of a program administered by the Secretary or by any other officer of the Department shall be construed to authorize the Secretary or any such officer to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution, school, or school system, over any accrediting agency or association, or over the selection or content of library resources, textbooks, or other instructional materials by any educational institution or school system, except to the extent authorized by law.

The DOE maintains it is not in violation of Section 103(b), yet there is evidence that the U.S. Congress feels that the DOE has exceeded its authority and violated the intent of the Act. Representative John Ashbrook (R-Ohio) introduced an amendment to an appropriations bill prohibiting the OCR from using funds to enforce the Lau remedies. The amendment passed the House, 213 to 194. In the Senate, Senator James McClure (R-Ohio) introduced the “Local School Option Protection Act” which states:

Be it enacted . . . That the Secretary of Education is directed to immediately withdraw those proposed rules relating to limited-English proficient students published August 5, 1980 in Volume 45, No. 152 of the Federal Register.

Senator McClure's position is that "The Congress has made it perfectly clear that the Department was not to usurp local district power."

Finally, the DOE is involved in a similar suit filed by the Pennsylvania Department of Education challenging DOE regulations as beyond the Department's jurisdiction and authority.

4) The DOE's Lau regulations clearly exceed the remedial requirements authorized by the U.S. Supreme Court.

The high court required the San Francisco School District in Lau v. Nichols, 414 US 563, 39 L.Ed. 2d 1, 94 S.Ct. 786 (1974) to provide a "meaningful education" to students with limited-English proficiency. The Supreme Court was not asked to specify how to teach limited-English students of Chinese ancestry in that case and it did not do so. Rather, a unanimous court stated:

"Teaching English to the students of Chinese ancestry is one choice. Giving instructions to this group in Chinese is another. There may be others. 414 US 563 at 565.

5) The DOE's Lau regulations are beyond the authority granted the OCR by Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to remedy discrimination in public schools.
After auditing local district compliance with the rules, the OCR imposes a remedy for discrimination “on the grounds of race, color or national origin.” (Through a “voluntary compliance order” between OCR and the local district under threat of having other federal program funds withheld.) Since no district in Washington subject to an audit has been found in compliance and since the rules require bilingual transitional education, the only remedy the OCR allows is a bilingual transitional program that meets DOE standards. This is not a remedy for discrimination but, in reality, a federal program mandate.

Further, while the OCR doesn’t have to prove local school district intent to discriminate, it does have to (1) prove discriminatory effects, and (2) allow the local school district an opportunity to fashion its own remedy for the discrimination once proved. In practice, failure to comply to OCR’s satisfaction is assumed to be proof of discriminatory effects. So, a local school district out of compliance is assumed to be guilty of discriminating against limited-English-proficient students because of ethnic or national origin. This tactic allows the DOE to force implementation of its priority while ignoring its own responsibility to seek adequate funding and incentives for voluntary compliance. In short, Title VI allows the OCR to develop and enforce standards related to discrimination “on the ground of race, color or national origin” but does not allow the OCR to use its power to force implementation of a single national program to provide for the needs of limited-English-proficient students.

6) Local school districts in partnership with the state can better provide for the educational needs of limited-English-proficient students with greater flexibility and greater success than the federal government can with a single program compelled to be offered throughout the nation.

This is the essence of the rationale for local control of schools. Yet, in addition to the unstated considerations of election year politics, there seems to be the further assumption underlying these rules and the DOE’s approach: That if the rules are not on the books, local school districts and states will not provide a “meaningful education” to limited-English-proficient students. Any cursory examination of the existing efforts in bilingual education sharply indicates that such assumption is false and misleading.

Local school districts are required to provide for the educational needs of limited-English-proficient students under state law using a combination of state and local money. The State of Washington has enacted the Transitional Bilingual Instruction Act in 1979 (RCW 28A.58.800 through 810) and the Washington State Board of Education has promulgated rules and regulations for the Act’s administration.

The high court unmistakably left the choice of how to teach limited-English-proficient students up to the local school district when it added:

“Petitioner asks only that the local Board of Education be directed to apply its expertise to the problem and rectify the situation.” Id. at 565.

Thus, the Lau decision provides no legal justification for the DOE’s attempt to impose a specific curriculum on the public schools of America.

In the first year after this Act’s passage, 123 local school districts initiated and operated bilingual transitional programs. This year 130 local school districts are providing bilingual transitional programs under state standards. Further, the estimated state expenditures for the 1979-81 biennium are about $5.4 million based on service to 6,200 students at $585 per pupil in 1979-80 and $350 per pupil in 1980-81. (The current labor expenditure for 1979-80 is averaging $428 per pupil and does not include nonlabor costs absorbed by local school districts along with the difference between state per pupil allotments and actual costs per pupil.) Of greater significance is the fact that the budget request for bilingual programs under the Act for the 1981-83 biennium is $11.7 million indicating an increase of $5.3 million in total expenditures to allow for $529 per pupil in 1981-82, and $536 in 1982-83. This indicates a strong commitment in this state to bilingual education. Washington’s school districts agree with the statement made by Orby Holden of the Texas Association of School Boards that bilingual education is not opposed. Rather, we support the Washington state plan as the TASB supports the Texas state plan.

The crucial issue becomes whether control of bilingual education will be vested at the state or national level. On one hand, the DOE attempts to mandate the impossible knowing full well that the necessary funds are not available for local school districts to comply with these proposals. On the other hand, the DOE attempts to mandate one particular method of instruction knowing full well that there is no current research to substantiate that transitional bilingual methodology is superior to other educational methodology — including English as a Second Language and maintenance programs offered by some local school districts in Washington state.

The only national study of bilingual education was completed in 1977 by the American Institute for Research based in California. After studying 11,500 students over two years, researchers found that children in bilingual programs did no better at learning English or anything else than non-English speaking students in regular classrooms. While proponents of transitional bilingual education assert that this report is inadequate, they have no hard data with which to dispute its findings.

In response to this DOE requirement of bilingual transitional programs as the exclusive means for correcting language deficiencies of limited-English-proficient students, heads of a number of national educational organizations wrote DOE secretary Shirley Hufstedler as follows:

The simple educational fact is this: There is no one “best” way in which to teach all students, only different ways for different students under different circumstances. There is no single way to teach math or reading or writing or history or science or any other subject to all children, as an examination of different school systems and different schools of thought would quickly illustrate.

There certainly is no one “best” way in which to correct the “language deficiency” of all students who have little or no proficiency in English.

CONCLUSION

The DOE seems determined to usurp local control of local educational policy by agency fiat despite all the facts, evidence, legal principles, and practical considerations raised by opponents of DOE actions. Reasonable educators support bilingual education and efforts to eradicate discrimination in public schools. That is not the issue posed by these regulations. The issue is whether a federal program mandate of one unproven methodology in bilingual education is in the best interests of education. The issue is whether the DOE should be allowed to function as a super board of education for
American public schools. When neither legal nor educational justification exists to support its decisions, the continued viability and appropriateness of a federal Department of Education's existence is called into question.

Dr. Ron Stephens is School Law Specialist with the Washington State School Directors Association.
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Funding of Education Clinics Questioned

A number of organizations and school districts in the state are supporting an amendment to Chapter 180-56-WAC to restrict the financial support for operation of state-funded educational clinics (WACs 582-185-005 [2150] and 28A-97-010 [2100]). The concerns are as follows:

1. Even with the amendment, an enormous area for litigation exists. An example of public school transfer of educational experience is that public schools establish credit as representing a minimum of 60 hours teacher/student contact time with learner objectives firmly in mind. Contrarily, the education clinic, despite any given learner objectives or practical experience on the part of the student, can become a third party in a dispute between the admitting school and the student/parent/clinic who favors more advanced placement than the school feels it can give. A credit standard does not exist, and credits may be waived.

2. The admitting school is to examine the competency of the student. Are final tests, mid-term exams, and research papers sufficient? Are specially constructed tests demanded for certification (construction of which would consume a great deal of time/funds)? Testing problems may arise in areas of physical education, occupational credit, lab science, speech, health, etc. (emphasizing more possible areas of litigation).

3. As of 1982, the Yakima School District number of graduation credits required will be 66, grades 9-12. This legislation allows possible waiver of the state board mandated 45 credits. It is conceivable that simply by dropping from school and re-entering after some study at the educational clinic, a student could circumvent a good 20 credits or more of a district's education standard. It is felt that this cheapens the value of the graduation certificate. If it is beneficial to waive state board and district established graduation requirements, would it not be more fair and competitive if the public schools were given as much latitude as private industry?

4. Whereas the education clinic was heralded as one more way to attempt to catch the dropout student, in essence there seems to be a definite advertising campaign to attract students from the public school program to a streamlined education system. This is entirely opposite what the original legislation was intended to do.

5. This program costs too much! Education clinics are in direct competition for students for dollars. Public school students are funded at a per-hour level of less than $2. The minimum that education clinics receive is $5 per hour for small groups up to $16 per hour for singly tutored students. If public education were able to perform the same alternative school services with that same high funding, it seems possible that remarkable things could be accomplished.

Well over one million dollars is budgeted to education clinics. The vast majority of this budgeted amount happens to go to Educational Consultant, Inc., in Everett.

Rebecca Scholl, Coordinator Secondary Curriculum, Yakima School District

Reagan Sweep Generates Mixed Predictions for Education

Governor Reagan's election this month left political experts in disagreement about the future of the 1981 education money bill, the dismantling of the Department of Education (ED), tuition tax credits for private schools and "bloc grants" to consolidate and transfer federal funding control back to the States.

The consensus of the debate surrounding these issues is as follows:
• The 1981 continuing resolution now seems likely to be final appropriation for the current fiscal year.
• ED and its "legitimate functions" are expected to survive but quota and regulation excesses will not continue.
• Tuition tax credits now stand a chance of passing Congress . . . the real test is with the Supreme Court.
• Bloc grants and consideration of education programs are real possibilities.
Trapped*

I left an administrative position in a large bureaucracy in order to maximize my educational efforts and minimize the time I spent in executive roles. I believe small school districts have the potential for becoming exciting learning communities where discussions focus on ideas, not bureaucratic procedures, student abuse of disciplinary regulations or the teachers' union adversarial posture.

Now, however, I spend over half my time taking care of executive type responsibilities. Recently, I spent forty percent of a day filling out an application for Title IV-B funds, ten percent preparing for a teacher grievance hearing, fifteen percent evaluating a teacher, five percent mediating a dispute between smokers and nonsmokers, five percent suspending a student, five percent consulting with carpenters building a new porch to conform to federal handicapped regulations, five percent approving a proposed extra-curricular activity, ten percent writing an advertisement for new faculty. During my lunch hour I spent five percent of my day playing basketball with some students and faculty.

Educational leaders should spend ten percent of their time applying for grants, managing their institution's financial resources, solving personnel problems and filling out routine paper work. Another ten percent on PR and Board relationships. Five percent on overseeing the maintenance and transportation departments. Leaving seventy-five percent of the day for educational leadership tasks like:

A. Helping the Board set the major curricular objectives of the institution.
B. Evaluating student success in meeting those objectives.
C. Studying curricular relevance to changing societal and individual needs.
D. Following graduates into the work-a-day world to appraise their success.
E. Allocating resources in light of these findings.
F. Surveying and developing vocational opportunities for graduates.
G. Setting the tone of life in the institution, planning school wide educational activities such as interdisciplinary studies, discussions, investigations, programs and field trips. And,
H. Finally, it is most important that the educational leader model personal habits typical of the liberally educated — a balance of physical, intellectual, and artistic activities, pursuing a continued liberal education.

I was recently privileged to attend an authentic Russian meal put on by a home economics class — the conversation was high reaching and the lesson typified the ideals of a small community. I'd like to have time for more of this.

Dr. Louis L. Wildman  
Superintendent  
North River Consolidated Schools

*Editor's note: The following were excerpts from an article submitted by Dr. Wildman.

An Essential of Education — Preparing for Citizenship

The National Council for the Social Studies is calling for a strong interdisciplinary effort to determine the "essentials of education" and orchestrate a refocusing of the various pieces of the social studies upon education for citizenship.

Citizenship education could bring together the traditional courses of U.S. and global history and geography, and embrace many of the emerging emphases: multicultural and law-related education, life-skills development, environmental problems and energy issues, global-international perspectives.

Most educators long ago agreed that preparing citizens who take part in public affairs is a key goal of social studies education. Unfortunately, we have done little to seriously examine the concept or to encourage social studies professionals to give attention to this important notion at our meetings. The conference theme for the Fall 1980 meeting of the National Council for the Social Studies is, "Education for Participation: Whose Responsibility?" This theme will give conferences a chance to examine the idea and hear about participatory programs representing many strands of our field. The program involves organizations which have not been directly involved with NCSS for a number of years and groups which have been asked to participate for the first time.

Featured speakers are: Francis Fitzgerald, David Rockefeller, Ralph Tyler, Mary and Moon Landrieu, and three educators from the People's Republic of China.

In developing the program, NCSS has worked closely with a number of the professional organizations basic to our field, such as the American Political Science Association, the American Historical Association, the Organization of American Historians, the American Sociological Association, the Association of American Geographers, and others. Groups such as the National Commission on Resources for Youth, which has long been active in encouraging the development of youth involvement programs connected with the schools, will also take part in the conference. The National Trust for Historic Preservation will make presentations on its mission and on ways in which we can work to preserve our history. Their efforts often tie history together with local political action, since zoning changes and other political steps are frequently required to preserve the past from those who lack respect for it.

The American Bar Association, the Joint Council on Economic Education, the Center for Global Perspectives, the Close-Up Foundation, and the American Newspaper Publishers Association are also assisting in the development of the program by sponsoring special sessions on substantive issues of broad interest. Through its annual conference, NCSS is working to build new bridges with groups outside our normal network.

Todd Clark, President  
National Council of Social Studies
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Annual Conference
February 6 and 7
at Sea-Tac Red Lion

The theme of the 1981 W.S.A.S.C.D. Conference is Balancing: Curriculum Issues, Student Needs and Teacher Motivation. Main presenters will include: Dr. Barak Rosen- shine, University of Illinois; Dr. Barbara Day, President, ASCD; Dr. Marie Fielder, University of California. Chuck Blondino and his committee have put together more than thirty workshops on such topics as: gifted education, curriculum change, discipline and attendance, learning styles and teaching styles and brain research.

Educator of the Year Nomination

W.S.A.S.C.D. is receiving the nominations of teachers, administrators, support personnel and parents who have promoted quality education in Washington State. For nomination guidelines contact:

Jacqueline Ormsby
c/o Walla Walla School District
564 South Park Street
Walla Walla, WA 99362

Nominations are due January 10, 1981. Outstanding educators are selected by February 11, 1981.

Project LEADERSHIP

Professional development for Washington State’s school administrators is getting a boost by a program titled: Project Leadership. Project Leadership will consist of individually designed professional growth plans, statewide workshops, and more than thirty presenter guides and resource materials designed to meet identified inservice needs.

A grant from the National Institute of Education (NIE) to Washington Association of School Administrators (WASA), the University of Oregon and administrator associations in California, Oregon and Alaska will fund the development and implementation of Project Leadership.

As Project Leadership progresses, more news will be included in Context & Conflict. For further information contact Bill Lahan at WASA.

SPI Seeks Parent Involvement Models

The Superintendent of Public Instruction was charged under House Bill 1676 to prepare an inservice program plan for the education of school personnel and the parents of students. The objective of the program is to effectuate home-school cooperation and greater parent involvement.

Do you have a success story you’d like to share? If so, write Gary Ruel, SPI, Old Capitol Building, FG-11, Olympia, WA 98504.

How Do You Involve Parents in Your Schools?

Pictures contributed by Selah School District’s Family Centered Math Project.
St. Helens Simmers
As Curricula Erupts

Mount St. Helens' cataclysmic explosion in May is a
simmering memory now. But, the geologic Armageddon that
dropped tons of sand and ash, leveled hundreds of acres of
giant spruce trees, devastated a crystalline mountain lake and
stream and created a day-into-night apocalypse and holo-
caust its victims and survivors will never forget, has generated
a landslide of instructional media.

Following the May 18 eruption of the Washington
mountain, a sea of books dealing with the event and its effects were
published. Cottage industries sprouted manufacturing every-
thing from "pet" volcanoes to T-shirts. Desiring to take
advantage of the "teachable moment," educators attempted
with varying degrees of success to adopt many popular and
expensive photobooks to classroom use. Even the best efforts
have been difficult, since the material in the books was largely
inappropriate for classroom use. Recently, two curriculum
development projects were completed and have been identi-
fied as exemplary: The Mt. St. Helens' Curriculum Project
and the film, "Mt. St. Helens: Keeper of the Fire".

The Mt. St. Helens' Curriculum Project was born when two
Washington newspapers, The Longview Daily News and
The Columbian in Vancouver, both publishers of excellent
pictorial volcano books, began to receive requests for class-
room material dealing with Mt. St. Helens from Washington
teachers. Newspapers are not usually involved in curriculum
materials outside of newspaper in the schools, so both ap-
proached Educational Service District No. 112 which is a regional
educational agency serving the Vancouver-Longview area.
Recognizing the need, ESD 112 decided to initiate a curricu-
um project to develop essential materials and activities. Led
by curriculum specialist John Pope, a task force of eight
teachers worked with Joan LeMieux of the Cowlitz Teacher
Center; Larry Strickland and Dave Kennedy of the Office of
the Superintendent of Public Instruction of Washington
State; Dr. Robert Christman, of Western Washington Uni-
versity; Dr. Don Orlich of Washington State University; and
C. Lynn Olson, Curriculum Director of La Center School Dis-
trict; Tim Halt of the USGS; Jim Unterwegsner of USDA
Forest Service; the National Oceanic and Atmospheric
Administration; the University of Washington; and the
Pacific Science Center in Washington to develop a very com-
prehensive and useful curriculum.

When the volcano shuddered to life again the night of
October 18, with an eight mile high explosion of steam and
ash, the Mt. St. Helens Curriculum Materials Project was
ready with more than Language Arts, Social Studies and
Science activities for teaching about Mt. St. Helens and vol-
canoes. A Teacher's Guide, and a student tabloid in news-
paper format make up the curriculum. The Teacher's Guide
costs $7.50 and the student tabloid costs 35 cents. To order
the materials write to:
The Columbian
Educational Services
P.O. Box 180
Vancouver, WA 98666

For more information about the Mt. St. Helens Curriculum
Materials Project contact:
John Pope, Project Director
Educational Service District No. 112
1313 N.E. 154th Street
Vancouver, WA 98665

A film, Mt. St. Helens: Keeper of the Fire, has been pro-
duced by Northwest Media Association (158 Thomas Street,
Suite 4, Seattle, Wa 98109 [Area Code 206] 624-3030). This film
features more than spectacular footage of the May 18th
eruption. Indian folklore, volcanic history, a scientific
analysis of the event and Northwest volcanoes by "Fire and
Ice" author, Steven Malone, and an explanation of the Uni-
versity of Washington's seismograph station's research are also
included in this exceptional film. This film also includes the
dramatic three day climb by Otto Seiber, during which he
filmed an eruption while standing on the rim of the exploding
 crater.

Prices for the film are: 16mm — $500; 3/5 inch tape —
$375; 1/2 inch tape — $300. Check your county library; many
have already purchased this film.
Balancing: Curriculum Issues, Student Needs and Teacher Motivation

WASCD ANNUAL CONFERENCE
FEBRUARY 6-7 • SEA-TAC RED LION

A wide selection of topics integrated by the concepts “balancing” will be presented by colleagues, state and nationally recognized consultants.

For registration information contact:
Dick Harris
Kent School District
(206) 872-4215
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