

Florida State University Libraries

Faculty Publications

School of Teacher Education

2005

Shifting Tides in Teacher Education: English As An Example

John S. Simmons



**SHIFTING TIDES IN TEACHER EDUCATION:
ENGLISH AS AN EXAMPLE**

By

John S. Simmons

Dedication

I wish to dedicate this monograph to two individuals who have both contributed significantly to this text and to my overall personal and professional development. The first is the late Dwight Lowell Burton, one of the outstanding--and underappreciated-- educators of his era. The second is to my wife, Katherine Helmus Simmons, without whose assistance, guidance and inspiration, this book would not have been completed.

Introduction

The purpose of this text is to bring together a series of historical/cultural/political strands which, when integrated, provide the *raison d'etre* of a teacher education program which maintained its identity and purpose since 1947. At that time, a small women's college became the Florida State University, and its teacher education offerings began to increase and diversify. One of those strands resides in the author's belief that education, particularly public education, is a reflection of the society that authorizes and supports it. Another is that the endeavor of educators to produce *literate* citizens has always been a complex, often controversial one, never moreso than the early 21st century. The language of a democratically oriented people is, after all, both vital and dynamic; it is a vehicle for explanation, persuasion, pleasure, and catharsis. To teach effective means of understanding, interpreting, appreciating, and using that language in the "real world" continues to be an absorbing enterprise.

The growth and development of curricula pertaining to teacher education at public institutions of higher learning continues to be an engrossing task. One of the precepts this author has come to believe during nearly forty years as an English/Reading educator at Florida State University is that external forces, often far removed from the groves of academe, constitute powerful influences on the nature and direction of programs of study. A teacher educator ignores these forces at his or her peril. For example: many higher education researchers and theorists decry the

current use of the *Florida Comprehensive Academic Skills Test* (FCAT) as a significant instrument for assessing the scholastic achievement and aptitude of Florida's public school population. Yet, as this text is written, neither the state legislature nor the governor has made any discernible effort either to remove or modify this testing enterprise. In fact, both the governor and the legislature have been vocal in their support of it. Such tensions, as illustrated by this test, reflect how public education in general, and teacher education/curricula creation in particular, can exist in conflict with the mores and will of the community.

The above statement is not merely reflective of Florida; it is a nationwide problem. All programs of study--kindergarten through Grade Twelve, Harvard through Podunk U. -- have been affected by the social, economic, and/or political realities of the times. A pertinent, personal case in point: in the fall of 1957, the author began his teaching career and his doctorate at the University of Minnesota High School, where 10th through 12th grade English became his responsibility, in addition to the supervision of student teachers and participation in selected Research and Development programs carried on by the College of Education. On September 29th of that year, then-President Dwight D. Eisenhower sent elements of the 101st Airborne Division to Little Rock, Arkansas, to monitor the integration of African American students into Central High School, sending U.S. public education in a new, diverse, and controversial direction. Five days later (October 4th), the Soviet Union proclaimed to the world the launching into orbit of an unmanned space satellite known popularly as *Sputnik*—and another, quite different education direction was set in motion.

If that was not enough, at Syracuse University, a nationally respected English/Reading educator named Margaret Early published the results of statewide data from a New York study completed by one of her doctoral students that described the “deplorable” state of reading instruction currently being offered to junior high and high school students in that state.¹ Finally, 1957 was the year that the MIT computer authority Noam Chomsky published *Syntactic Structures*, a new and different grammar which, among other things, rekindled the flames of controversy as to what and how much grammatical lore should be served up to America’s youth and to what end.

All of the above were, one must admit, a lot for a first-year teacher to digest in the early months of his job. From that time to the present, the force of literacy demands; i.e., the answers society has articulated to the question, “What is English?” have had a series of effects on how the English/Reading educators have done *their* jobs. For 39 years, I was employed in that pursuit and came to accept *change* as the watchword of what I, my colleagues and doctoral students did for a living. We have encountered and have been influenced by three prominent literacy theories—functional, cultural, and computer—and have sought to include all of them into our programs of study. Needless to say, it hasn’t been easy.

One of the most formidable road blocks in our curricular path has been the intensive efforts of certain prominent educational reformers who have gained and left the education stage of the past 50+ years. The Arthur Bestors, Mortimer Adlers, Albert W. Lynds, Hyman Rickovers, Postman/Weingartners, Herbert Kohls, Frank

¹For ten years (1983-1993) Dr. Early was head of English Education at the University of Florida in Gainesville, Florida. Now retired, she lives in Gainesville.

Smiths, William Bennetts, Lynn Cheneys, E. D. Hersches, Rod Paiges, Reid Lyonses, *et al* have been taking their best shots at us in the name of one ideology or another. In Florida, during the 1980's, they had an outspoken ally in Miami Beach State Senator Jack Gordon who, for 20 or so years, made it his announced goal to shut down the Colleges of Education at both the University of Florida and Florida State University. For the record, both are still functioning *circa* 2005. Also present on that daunting stage have been apostles of Political Correctness and the fundamentalist conservatives, who have sought to place heavy restrictions on our commitment to the Students' Right to Read and to express themselves openly and unequivocally in speech and writing. Those censorship issues exist today and undoubtedly will in perpetuity. And, without question, what has happened to us has befallen literacy educators, coast to coast and border to border.

Through all of this, English Education at Florida State University has maintained its existence, its identity, and its integrity. As one who has lived throughout a substantial part of that existence, the author of the following memoir has come to believe, and assert, that is a story which needs to be told.

John S. Simmons

December, 2005

Chapter I - 1945 - 1958: Programmatic Infancy and Early Years

On the surface, what follows is a recounting of an academic/professional program—that of English Education, which has grown and developed since the earliest days of this 145-year-old institution. Close attention will be paid to the period, 1947 – date, when the Florida State College for Women became Florida State University. The broader purpose of this chronicle, however, is to demonstrate this author’s contention that this English Education program provides a significant reflection of certain trends in American public education in the nearly sixty-plus years since the end of World War II. In a sense, then, this teacher education/curriculum development/educational research program will be shown as a microcosm of an action-packed era in U.S. history.

During the postwar period, an issue which has recurred frequently and persistently has been that of Educational Reform. Reform can be seen as synonymous with *change*, and change is an undeniable feature of any organism and/or institution which is alive and functioning. That such change is a fact of life, few will dispute. It is in the nature of, need for, manifestations of, and results of change in American schooling that conflicts have arisen. The inexorable movement toward inclusiveness has remained as important a fact of education change as any in this 50-plus-year period.

The path to inclusiveness has by no means been a smooth one. In her well-researched text, *The Troubled Crusade: American Education, 1945-1980*, Teachers

College, Columbia professor Diane Ravitch provides this observation in her

Introduction:

In 1945, American education had the strengths and weaknesses of a highly decentralized, pyramidal system. Everyone could go to school, but the difference in quality between the best schools and the worst schools was enormous. There were first-rate school districts and outstanding preparatory schools which sent large numbers of their graduates to great institutions of higher education. But there were also poor schools with narrow offerings, located in poor areas, where few students prepared for college. Good schools and good teachers were not equally available to all children; access to higher education was not open on an equal basis to all talented youths. One's educational chances were limited by the accident of birth and by the color of one's skin.

As the nation emerged from the Second World War, its idealism and aspirations raised high, the inequitable features of American education seemed more unacceptable than at any time in the past, though the problem of unequal opportunity was no worse than before. At the very least, the American crusade against ignorance required that the opportunity for education be made available to all young people, without regard to race, creed, national origin, sex, or family background. The obstacles to change were formidable. Idealism and aspiration alone were not enough to shake loose the shackles of the past; not enough, perhaps, to win the day, but enough to stir the nation's conscience and to keep alive the campaign for equal educational opportunity until the

right political and social circumstances made success possible. (from *The Troubled Crusade: American Education 1945-1980*, by Diane Ravitch, N.Y: Basic Books, Inc., 1983, pages xii, xiii)

To be sure, much more educational activity has ensued since 1980, but the conflicting theories which have undergirded these more recent reform attempts are, in a general sense, quite consistent with those considered in Dr. Ravitch's monograph. From an early 21st century, these significant events/reflections can, in a true nutshell, be noted—in no particular order:

1. The growing impact of technology, from Hiroshima to the Super Computer, on teaching and learning
2. The opening of doors, at all levels of schooling, to people of modest financial means
3. The Equal Rights movement, from Jackie Robinson to the undeniable glass ceilings still in evidence
4. The role of the Federal government in supporting, directing, and monitoring educational initiatives
5. The attempts of all school agencies to deal with the educational needs of the culturally disadvantaged/different
6. The need to provide for the dramatically increased student populations at all levels

Obviously, there are others, but the six mentioned above will provide plenty of grist for any educational historian's mill.

The place of Florida State University and in particular, English Education, represents a symbolic reflection of roads both taken and not taken since the Japanese surrender in August, 1945. In the years and decades before that momentous event, Florida State was “the girls’ school” and stood beside the University of Florida (the boys’ school) and Florida A & M (the African-Americans’ school) as the agencies of higher education in the state. The School of Education at this women’s institution was the second oldest of its colleges. For decades it had been a respected teacher-training center with heavy emphasis on grades K-8, the junior high component not widely implemented by war’s end. Within its curriculum, subject matter-oriented courses were distinctly limited. Graduate programs were essentially non-existent, and vigorous research endeavors also were not pursued. An act of the 1947 Florida Legislature, coupled with the G.I. Bill of Rights and the emerging influx of new State residents, changed all that.

Philosophically, the College of Education (COE) curriculum was dominated by Core Curriculum specialists, those who saw that curriculum as a manifestation of Deweyan, Jamesian “Progressive Education.” That curricular outlook, a product of the post-World War I and Great Depression years, was clearly losing its influence among university educators. The senior COE faculty members of the late 1940’s, however, clung to Progressive beliefs and controlled offerings in curricular theory well into the next decade. The fact is that in terms of the “big picture” in U.S. universities and Colleges of Education, this egalitarian, pragmatic view of the ways in which children and young adults should be educated was on its way out.

The real wake-up call for reform of COE outlooks came in a kind of political one-two punch in 1957. On September 29th of that year, then-President Dwight D. Eisenhower ordered, albeit reluctantly, troops to Little Rock, Arkansas, where they assisted in the racial integration of Central High School. This act expressed the intention of the executive branch of the U.S. government to implement the *Brown vs. Kansas* Supreme Court decision of 1954. It set in motion a whole new thrust in educational reform, one which would eventually have profound effects on all COE programs, as well as the colleges and universities in which they existed.

The Little Rock episode had hardly exited the headlines and evening news broadcasts when, on October 4th, Soviet nuclear scientists sent into orbit an unmanned space vehicle dubbed by the world media as “Sputnik”. This dramatic breakthrough in scientific achievement had an immediate effect on educational spokespersons, among other national leaders, coast to coast. Because of its recent entry into the ranks of research-oriented universities, Florida State was actually in a better position to make curricular adjustment than could older, more entrenched institutions of higher learning.

One of the first initiatives taken by Dr. Doak S. Campbell, the Florida State president in 1947, was to seek out leaders of university programs in the natural and physical sciences. During the late 1940’s and throughout the 1950’s, Campbell recruited a cohort of promising, young, scientific scholar-researchers, largely from prestigious northeastern mid-western universities. These new faculty members had hardly set up shop than they were writing research proposals to U.S. governmental

and major private philanthropic agencies. By 1957, they already accumulated an excellent track record in securing such outside support.

President Campbell indeed sought to strengthen all of his colleges, reminding a University of Florida-dominated legislature of the new, expanded role his university was being called upon to play. Colleges such as Business and Music developed appropriate offerings rapidly during those early years. One College whose progress was not so rapid was that of Education. Several factors contributed to this slower process of evolution.

Of these, one cultural phenomenon stands out: the nature of the College. In public instruction, Colleges of Education have always been complex organisms. They are entrusted with generating research that leads to curricular improvement. They also serve the various public school systems within their states. They function-- indeed exist--at the behest of their state legislatures and attendant bureaucratic agencies. They are sensitive to major political episodes, Brown vs. Kansas and Sputnik being but two of the more dramatic ones. Above all, their programs, goals, and decisions exist within the context of the communities in which they are located. To offer an obvious contrast: if the biology department of a university is conducting cutting-edge, highly visible studies involving such areas as evaluation, or genetic theory, the leaders of local fundamentalist churches can complain to their hearts' content (especially when such research is externally subsidized). When, on the other hand, a COE attempts to promote new curricular programs in almost any areas—biology, history, civics, health, literature, humanities, linguistics, etc.—community leaders, local and otherwise, can and often do offer adversarial pronouncements.

Clergy, chambers of commerce, patriotic organizations, district school boards, local politicians, even school administrators and faculty members may raise vociferous—and lethal—objections. In 1983, for example, a study jointly conducted by the NASSP and ALA² revealed that, from 1980-1982, over 30% of censorship challenges came from administrators, faculty, and staff of schools in a wide range of American communities. To say that Colleges of Education ignore these challenges at their peril is to state the obvious.

A more significant reason for the delayed improvement of the COE was the lack of enlightened, decisive leadership of the College. It was not until the mid-1950's that the COE began to demonstrate visible change in its curricular, pedagogical, and research efforts. The person most responsible for this movement away from the *status quo* was Dr. Model L. Stone, a man of singular vision, energy, and courage. Born of humble origins in a small Florida Panhandle community, Dr. Stone completed his undergraduate work on an athletic scholarship at the University of Florida. He entered the U.S. Navy during World War II, rising to a position of leadership in the V-12 program. After the war, he completed his doctoral degree at George Peabody College in 1947 and returned to North Florida where, after teaching and administrative duties in the Leon County schools, he joined the newly-expanded Florida State COE faculty. In February 1952, he was named Acting Dean of the College. When a permanent dean was named, Dr. Stone served as Associate Dean, a position he held from 1953-1956. On April 1, 1956, he was appointed permanent Dean.

² NASSP is National Association of Schools and Secondary Principals; ALA is the American Library Association.

In moving the COE in a direction compatible with post-war change, Mode Stone faced formidable obstacles, one of which was the commitment of several key, senior faculty to core curriculum theories of the 1930's and 40's. Four of these professors had completed their doctoral studies at Ohio State University under Dr. Harold Albery who, with his OSU colleagues, remained one of the bulwarks of Progressive Education as described earlier in the Ravitch chronicle. These senior faculty had designed both the elementary and secondary teacher education programs for undergraduates and were the principal authors of those graduate programs being offered by the College to a rapidly increasing number of students.

It was readily apparent to the new Dean that Progressive Education was *not* the wave of the future. One of his immediate goals was to modernize curricular and pedagogical studies within the College. This required that he seek support from the Legislature in order to recruit the kinds of dynamic faculty members whose counterparts were already hard at work in the University's College of Arts and Sciences. In gaining these finances, he utilized his savvy political acumen in dealing with the legislative leadership, known in that era as the "Pork Chop Gang." These all-male legislators were elected from small, rural, hardscrabble districts in North and Central Florida and were able to retain that leadership—over the growing legislative contingents from Central and South Florida—well into the 1970's. With this group, Mode Stone was well-connected and used that influence to enhance his College throughout his eleven years as dean.

In seeking to replace the Core Curriculum emphases of the several COE programs of study, the dean had invaluable assistance from some hires which had

been made before his appointment in 1956. Among these, Dr. Russell Kropp (U. of Illinois) was helping Statistics/Research leader Hazen Curtis to broaden and intensify doctoral research efforts and to procure funds for research in the College. Dr. Richard Skretting, a U. of Iowa Ph.D., was given the task of revamping Social Studies Education; Dr. Raymond Schultz (U. of Wisconsin) had assumed headship of Higher Education; and Dr. Dwight L. Burton (U. of Minnesota) had already made significant improvements in English Education. Soon after becoming Dean, Dr. Stone hired Eugene Nichols (U. of Illinois) to lead Math Education, and Dr. Stanley Marshall (Syracuse U.) to head Science Education.

Clearly, the central figure in the English Education story, Dwight Lowell Burton founded the program in 1956 and then led it to a position of national prominence in the years that followed. Burton's rise to success as an educator/scholar represents an only-in-America tale. Born in 1922 in desperately poor circumstances in Virginia, Minnesota, he survived the Depression years in a boom-then-bust northern Minnesota region, condescendingly referred to by Twin Cities residents as the "Iron Ranche", a callous allusion to the poorly educated Central European, Northern Italian immigrants who lived and toiled in the Mesabi Iron Ore district of the state. Burton's father was a failed professional baseball player and odd-jobs man who spent most of his earnings on cheap whiskey. His mother took in washing. Dwight, however, was imbued with outstanding literacy skills and an intense desire to rise above his impoverished circumstances. He attended the University of Minnesota on a small scholarship, completed a nose-to-the-grindstone four-year degree, earning a Bachelor's degree with honors in 1943, with a certificate in secondary level English

(grades 7-12). During his undergraduate years, Burton fell under the influence of the individual who, more than any other, would direct his professional future: Dr. Dora V. (for Valentine) Smith, head of the University's English Education.

Dora V. Smith was a far-sighted leader in her field for over 40 years. She was an early apostle of Progressivism, especially as presented in *An Experience Curriculum in English*, a 1935 manifesto written by W. Wilbur Hatfield, secretary of the National Council of Teachers of English. (NCTE) Founded in 1911, NCTE remains the oldest subject matter organization in the United States. By contrast, the International Reading Association (IRA) began in 1952. Dr. Hatfield was NCTE's first executive secretary and first editor of the *English Journal*, relinquishing the latter post as late as 1954.

Dr. Smith was an NCTE leader for more than 50 years. Her 1941 monograph, *Communication: The Miracle of Shared Living* became a valuable Progressivist curricular guide for English Language Arts teachers at all levels. But Dora V. Smith's perspective transcended the Deweyan Life Adjustment philosophy. She was probably the first U.S. educator to initiate serious study of literature for children and adolescents. She became an enthusiastic proponent of the "Reader Response" literary theory laid out in *Literature as Exploration* by Louise Rosenblatt of New York University in 1938. After lying dormant for nearly half a century, the Rosenblatt text is now held in high esteem by university teachers and scholars the world over. NCTE's five-volume series, *The English Language Arts 1956-65*), which featured Dr. Smith as its director and senior editor, reflected English curricular theory in transition—from Progressive to more Academic Rigor (my term) emphases.

The most important contribution of Dora V. Smith's contributions to her field, however, lay in the doctoral students whose programs of study/research she directed during the quarter century, 1938-1963. Briefly, selectively, and in somewhat random order they are as follows:

1. Arno L. Jewett – Former English Language Arts specialist, U.S. Office of Education
2. G. Robert Carlsen – Former NCTE president; head of English Education, State University of Iowa; authority in adolescent (Young Adult) literature
3. Richard S. Alm – Head of English Education, University of Hawaii; former *English Journal* editor
4. Ingrid Strom – Head of English Education, Indiana University; charter member, Conference on English Education; authority on English curricula for early adolescents
5. Virginia Alwin – Head of English Education, Northern Arizona University; key contributor to NCTE Curriculum Commission series, *The English Language Arts*
6. Naomi Chase – Head of Elementary Education, University of Minnesota; authority on children's literature and elementary language arts
7. Stanley B. Kegler – Former head, English Education, University of Minnesota; former Associate Dean, Minnesota DOE; former Vice-President for University Affairs; chief researcher, USOE "Project English" Curriculum Center on Linguistics

8. Jean Malmstrom – Head of English Education, Western Michigan University; authority on regional dialects, USA
9. Oscar Haugh – Head of English Education, University of Kansas; first editor *English Education* (NCTE)
10. Dwight Burton – The focus of this monograph

During the latter half of the 20th century, these ten names were frequently noted in documents related to the teaching of English as well as teacher education, curriculum innovation, and research in that field. And now, the focus will be on Dwight Burton.

Soon after graduation from University of Minnesota, he enlisted in the US Army, completed Officers' Candidate School, and served in the European Theater of Operations. As an infantry lieutenant, Burton fought in major operations in Aachen and at the Siegfried Line. Wounded in combat, he was on medical leave on the French Riviera when Nazi Germany unconditionally surrendered on May 8, 1945.

With his military service behind him, Burton found a teaching job in a Superior, Wisconsin high school, situated in a tough, inner city section of that lower middle class Great Lakes port city. His tenure there was brief indeed; in 1947, Dora V. Smith invited him to join the English faculty at University (of Minnesota) High School and to begin graduate studies in English Education as her advisee. When Burton arrived, Robert Carlsen was University High (U-High) English Department head and Kegler, Alm, Alwin, and Strom were involved as English teachers, grades 7-12. He became Department head in 1950, completed his doctorate in 1951, and after completing a further year heading the U-High English faculty, accepted a position offered by President Doak Campbell as Assistant Professor of Curriculum

Studies at the Florida State University. Beginning in the academic year 1952-1953, his starting salary was the lordly sum of \$5,000 a year.

The next seven years would prove to be eventful ones for Burton, for English Education, the entire teacher education effort at Florida State University (FSU), and indeed the life of the entire university. During that period, Dean Stone further augmented his faculty. In addition to Burton, he recruited Dr. J. Stanley Marshall and Dr. Ernest Burkman, Science Education; Dr. Eugene R. Nichols and Dr. Robert Kalin, Mathematics Education; Dr. Steven Knesevich, Educational Administration; and Dr. F. J. King, Educational Research – all future leaders in their fields. The departments of English, Science, Social Studies, Mathematics, and Foreign Language Education were established. In certain cases, new and highly trained faculty, as noted earlier, replaced older instructors, most of whom had not earned doctoral degrees in their content areas and none of whom enjoyed national visibility.

During his first two years, Dr. Burton “partnered” with Ms. Blanche Trezevant, an elderly former high school English teacher from rural Louisiana, who had taught what passed for the undergraduate secondary English methods course as well as a secondary Reading course, also for undergraduates.³ As he assumed leadership of this program, Burton redesigned the Methods course and added further offerings, first at the undergraduate and then the graduate levels. He also contributed to the refinement of secondary level student teaching supervision.

One of the most significant aspects of the transition effected throughout the 1950’s was the creation of a close relationship between the newly formed subject

³ Try as he might, the author has never discovered why or even when this course came to be listed as an “English Education” offering. Over the years, its ownership has remained a mystery.

matter departments and their counterparts in Arts and Sciences. Enlightened leadership provided by both University and College administrators was a critical factor in these evolving alliances. Even more so were the aggressive initiatives taken by the new COE department heads, especially true of Drs. Nichols, Marshall, and Burton. By the early 1960's, a large number of alliances for curriculum and research endeavors were underway, many of which were catalyzed by the availability of new financial support programs offered by the Federal Government. The development of this spirit of cooperation and mutual respect at the intracollegiate level has seldom been found in most large, research-oriented universities. It can be identified as a most important reason for the extended success of these new COE departments.

It must be noted, at this point, the unique place of the English discipline in those curricular reforms underway in the other content area studies in the college. While the other subjects look inexorably to future (witness the vital role played by the laboratory in the sciences), English is, to a considerable degree, linked to the past. The study of literature is firmly connected to the Great Books whether illustrated by Periclean drama or Victorian fiction. Modern composition theory continues to have deep roots in Aristotle's *Rhetoric* and *Poetics*. Finally, Latinate grammar (revitalized by 18th century British grammarians and their American disciple, Noah Webster) maintains to this day a stranglehold on school grammar in the U.S., Noam Chomsky's linguistic scholarship notwithstanding.

Dwight Burton's early endeavors stand as a clear indication of this academic/curricular tension. One of his first moves when appointed in 1995 editor of the *English Journal* was to reach out to selected senior English department

members to solicit their contributions. While this widely read periodical focused largely on English as taught, learned, and studied in grades 7 – 12, pedagogical statements on such standards as *David Copperfield*, *Oedipus Rex*, “Paradise Lost”, *The Scarlet Letter*, and several Shakespearian plays were welcomed by public school English teachers. Burton, himself an excellent literary critic, was well aware of the popularity of such contributions. Because of this interest, more than a few English department professors happily offered literary essays for *English Journal* consideration. By the end of the decade, Burton had been given a joint appointment in English and had developed a close working relationship with the English chair and several professional members. He was also being asked to join, as a voting member, the doctoral committees of English students. In February 1964, the following letter appeared in the *St. Petersburg Times* (Florida):

Teaching Writing In Florida

I should like to applaud your editorial (“The Most Basic ‘Science’”) on the need to improve the teaching of writing in our schools. Nearly all of us professionally concerned with the teaching of writing, from graduate school to elementary school, are aware of the problem. We are taking steps to solve it.

Students graduating from Florida universities with certification in English will definitely not fall among the “third of English teachers in secondary schools unfit to teach their subject.” They are among the best prepared in the country. At Florida State University, the Department of English and the Department of English Education cooperate thoroughly to turn out future teachers fully informed about modern linguistic concepts and

modern techniques for applying them to the teaching of writing. The head of our Department of English Education is Dr. Dwight Burton, nationally recognized as the editor of the *English Journal*, organ of the 90,000-member National Council of Teachers of English.

We are taking steps to provide practicing teacher of English with an opportunity to u-date their professional knowledge. Our course, “Linguistics and the Teaching of Writing,” is being taught by commuting professors in four counties this year. And next summer a graduate-level Summer Institute for Teachers of English will be held at Florida State University. Information concerning the Institute, which has been endorsed by Thomas Bailey, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, and by Paul Jacobs, Language Arts Consultant, is already in the hands of all county superintendents.

Paul Stoakes, Director

Summer Institute for Teachers of English

Florida State University

(*St. Petersburg Times*, February 16, 1964, p. 9)

All of the above is not to imply that this English Education department head had abandoned his Progressivist, Dora V. Smith roots. His individual *Journal* contributions were forward-looking indeed, especially in the areas of teaching literature, writing, and critical reading. His Methods course for undergraduates emphasized response-oriented literature study, adolescent reading interests, sociolinguistic strategies, and subject-sensitive writing approaches. Moreover, his interest in Adolescent literature (now called Young Adult or YA literature) became

quickly and dramatically evident. In 1956, he introduced in his *Journal* a permanent column, “Junior Books Roundup,” a series of reviews of newly published novels for young people. Even more telling was his 1958 textbook, *Teaching Literature in the High School* (Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1958). This text, in providing the first critical review of Adolescent/Young Adult Literature in English Education, gained immediate currency with classroom teachers, graduate students, secondary curricular supervisors, and college/university teacher educators throughout the country. It was twice revised (1964 and 1975) and was a standard reference on secondary school literature pedagogy well into the 1980’s. Today, NCTE’s Assembly on Literature for Adolescents, National (ALAN) is the Council’s largest sub-group. To a considerable extent, it owes its formulation and current popularity to Burton’s scholarship begun more than fifty years earlier.

Before leaving these early years of the program’s development, an additional factor in its progress, indeed in that of teacher education in the latter half of the 20th century needs to be described. Earlier in this chapter, the decline of Progressive Education, particularly as delineated in the Ravitch text, was noted. As opposition to this movement escalated in the 1940’s and 50’s, this criticism took the form of a “great debate” in American education during which many teachers trained in liberal arts and sciences disciplines found it increasingly difficult to teach within this “life adjustment” approach.

The “great debate” accelerated between 1949 and the mid-1950’s when books like Mortimer Smith’s *And Madly Teach* (1949) complained that progressive education (as represented by the life adjustment movement) had become “the official

philosophy of American public education” and characterized teachers, administrators and schools of education as having a “truly amazingly uninformative opinion regarding the aims, the content and the methods of education”. Rhetoric such as this prompted the formation of organizations like the Council for Basic Education which entered the fray in 1956 and championed educational traditionalism and conservatism.

The membership of the Council for Basic Education was made up largely of professors teaching at various universities, editors, journalists and several self-appointed critics who feared the takeover of all public education by Deweyan apostles and, as they saw it, the inevitable 'watering down' of the curriculum:

The Council for Basic Education was established in the belief that the purpose of education is the harmonious development of the mind, the will, and the conscience of each individual so that he may use to the fullest his intrinsic powers and shoulder the responsibilities of citizenship. . . It insists that only by the maintenance-of high academic' standards can the ideal of democratic education be realized. (James Lynch and Bertrand Evans, 1963, p. 24)

In several monographs which led to the founding of the Council for Basic Education, *And Madly Teach* (Smith, 1949) and *Educational Wastelands* (Bestor, 1953), Albert W. Lynd, *Quakery in the Public Schools* (Little Brown & Co., 1953 and Lynch & Evans, *High School English Textbooks* (Little, Brown & Co., 1963), the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE) was upbraided as being one of the chief

proponents of creeping mediocrity in public school curriculum development.

As the postwar American society settled down to a period of unparalleled prosperity, tempered by the growing uneasiness of Cold War confrontations on several continents, the need for reassessing the rubrics of literacy as provided to the children and adolescents entering public schools became more evident. The growth in affluence, the evolution of suburbia, the availability of the GI Bill of Rights to young men and women from all walks of life, all led to the dramatic increase in the demand for, and creation of, higher education opportunities from coast to coast and border to border.

As possibilities of receiving college degrees became a reality, and funds for tuition, etc., became available, one of the emerging *curricular* needs was that of literacy enhancement, i.e., training, which would assist this “breed” of college student with the abilities to read dense subject-matter textbooks and to meet the formidable writing demands of Freshman Composition and term papers in academic courses. All of these new priorities helped to sound the death knell of Progressivism in general and the Hatfield-oriented *Experience Curriculum* brand of literacy teaching in particular.

Among the several targets of this elitist criticism, none was more prominent than that of U.S. Colleges of Education. These institutions have continued to be the focus of antagonistic groups, from both ends of the political spectrum. Over the decades, such criticisms have continued to erupt, taking various shapes, occasionally going to fanatical lengths, and often led by highly acerbic spokespersons. Finally, given the fact that English Educators are responsible of two of the three Literacy

vertices, they continue to bear the brunt of the kinds of attacks leveled on their predecessors by the Smith's, Bestor's, Lynd's, *et al* of an earlier time.

Before moving on to a review of the role of English Education at Florida State University in the storied decade of the 1960's, one more issue which all mid-century Florida educators had to face needs to be included. When Dwight Burton accepted the 1952 appointment at this Deep South institution, he probably had no idea of the political cauldron into which he was to become immersed. Although *Brown vs. Kansas* was still two years in the offing, the fires of resistance to racial desegregation were smoldering in Florida as indeed they were in every state of the Old Confederacy. And already certain politicians would, in the early 1960's take their gubernatorial stands on one side or the other, were already making their political voices heard. On the massive resistance side were Orval Faubus (Arkansas), Ross Barnett (Mississippi), George Wallace (Alabama), John McKeithen (Louisiana), Marvin Griffin (Georgia), and George Timmerman (South Carolina). Their "cause" was surely given a boost by the election of write-in candidate J. Strom Thurmond of South Carolina to the U.S. Senate in November 1954. Thurmond's election gave credence to the belief that the old segregationist spirit was still alive and well in Dixie.

On the other side of the issue, however, a few advocates were, albeit cautiously, arising. Principal among them were Ralph Yarborough (Texas), Ernest Vandiver (Georgia), Luther Hodges (North Carolina) – and LeRoy Collins of Florida.⁴ Mr. Collins returned (after serving in World War II) to the Florida

⁴ For an excellent biography of this outstanding Floridian, see Tom Wagdy, *Governor LeRoy Collins of Florida: Spokesman of the New South*. Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press, 1985.

legislature in 1947 where he quickly became leader in proposing progressive reform measures for his state. He was a close ally of another moderate/progressive, Dan McCarty, then-president of the Florida Senate. McCarty won the gubernatorial election of 1952 and inaugurated a series of social and economic reforms which were hailed by many but opposed by the strongly conservative element of the legislature. Unfortunately, the newly installed governor suffered a major heart attack in February 1953 and could no longer provide effective leadership during the ensuing legislative session—all much to the consternation of Senator Collins and his progressive colleagues.

At the age of 41, Governor McCarty died in September 1953, and, in accordance with the State constitution, Charley E. Johns, the president of the Senate, became the acting governor. Johns, a staunch segregationist from Northeast Florida, quickly set about removing most McCarty appointees, and abandoning much of the late governor's proposed legislation. A special election was scheduled for November 1954.

By that time, the progressive/conservative battle lines were drawn. LeRoy Collins and Charley Johns, the leaders of their respective factions, squared off in the all-important Democratic primary. In that era, the Democratic primary in Florida was, in fact, *the* election for all statewide offices. It was not until the 1966 general election that a Republican candidate, Claude Kirk (who was elected governor) gained victory in a general election. In any event, Collins swept to a decisive win over the acting governor and spent the next two years essentially restoring the McCarty-proposed legislative agenda. During that period, however, the U.S.

Supreme Court rendered its landmark decision on school desegregation, and the issue of race quickly became the number one consideration in the general election of 1956.

Everyone in Florida knew where LeRoy Collins stood on the racial integration issue. Despite vociferous opposition from five other candidates, Collins claimed a first-ballot victory in the September primary and then overwhelmed a little-known Republican opponent in the November general election. The fact of his two-phase success at the ballot box was eloquent testimony to his popularity with Floridians throughout the state.

In the months and years which followed, the governor took the lead in moving a reluctant, sometimes hostile state toward the establishment of civil rights for its minority citizens. Many old friends and colleagues felt betrayed, and the final four years of the decade were filled with acrimonious debate in both public and private sectors. The ultimate result of this racial bickering led to the 1960 election of Farris Bryant, a mild segregationist but always pragmatic politician from North Florida.

No topic, during that period was more hotly argued than school desegregation, and nowhere was it more of a confrontational issue than in North Florida. It is generally known that, pursuant to World War I, the central and southeastern regions of the state became increasingly inhabited by “Yankees”, largely from the New England, Mid-Atlantic, and Mid-Western states. To many of these new residents, racial integration had been a fact of life. Not so to the white citizens who lived from Pensacola on the west to Jacksonville on the east, and

stretching roughly to Ocala at the southern margin. At that time, the majority of those Florida residents were unequivocally pro-segregation, especially in regard to their public schools.

A final note on Senator Charley Johns: Since the 1954 special election took place long before the “resign to run” legislation was enacted, the acting governor retained his seat in the Florida Senate. Soon after the 1960 election of Governor Bryant, Johns was able to create a special committee to investigate and flush out Communists in public service. As a sort of corn pone Joseph McCarthy, he took a particular interest in the three senior institutions of higher learning: Florida State, Florida A & M, and the University of Florida. And in the manner of the late Wisconsin senator, his investigation turned up *no* such “commies” – although he accused a fairly sizeable number of individuals as being likely “pinkos”. When that endeavor proved unsuccessful, Senator Johns shifted his attention to homosexuals, again with a particular focus on the University System. As part of his witch hunt, he persuaded the legislature in 1962 to pass a statute requiring all public employees to sign a loyal oath declaring that they were neither Communistic in political orientation nor homosexual. Added to this statute was the requirement that all public employees be fingerprinted. As a new hire in September 1962, I found these edicts singularly distasteful. Meanwhile, the crusading senator ultimately acknowledged a lack of success in his efforts. Not long afterward, he retired from public life.

At Florida State, there were straws in the wind. President Campbell presented a public disposition of cautious resistance to integration. His two

immediate successors, Robert Strozier (1959-61) and Gordon Blackwell (1961-66) were social liberals as were the majority of recently hired tenure-earning faculty members. Interestingly, in the College of Education, old southern stalwart Mode Stone went about the hiring of men and women largely from northern institutions, most of whom were by and large unsympathetic to the cause of continued segregation. A roll call of the key appointees of the early 1950's clearly reflects that fact: in Social Studies, J. Richard Skretting (U. of Iowa); in Educational Research, Russell Kropp (U. of Illinois); in Science, J. Stanley Marshall (Syracuse University); in Higher Education, Raymond Schultz (U. of Wisconsin); in Guidance and Counseling, Harold Cottingham (Indiana University); in Educational Administration, Steven Knezevich (U. of Iowa); in Mathematics Education, Eugene Nichols (U. of Illinois); and Dwight Burton (U. of Minnesota).

Burton's political heritage was evolved from Iron Range Democratic Farmer/Labor Party origins. His heroes were such Minnesota political liberals as Floyd B. Olson, Hubert H. Humphrey, and later Orville E. Freeman, Eugene R. McCarthy, Walter Mondale, and Wendell Anderson. Had Burton lived longer, undoubtedly the late Paul Wellstone would be added to that roster. Thus, Dwight Burton was active in the "Atlanta Uprising" of 1952 in which NCTE passed a resolution eliminating from its list of potential annual convention sites those cities which did not offer totally integrated facilities and services. On the sly, he assisted the all-black Tallahassee High School (Lincoln) in the form of free consultantship and text materials which, as *English Journal* editor, he received in considerable volume from major commercial publishing firms. He also contributed to the Lincoln

High School professional library, *English Journals* and other NCTE publications which he received gratuitously. In our very first conversation, at the 1959 NCTE Convention in Denver, he noted the much-publicized integration at the University of Georgia in 1958 and stated emphatically that the all-white walls at FSU were coming down in the not-too-distant future. Given the great admiration I held at the time for my Boston University classmate of 1953, Martin Luther King, Jr., I was duly impressed.

In the very early 1960's, Tallahassee, the only Confederate state capitol east of the Mississippi River *never* occupied by Union troops, was engulfed in racial strife. Public facilities came first, and educational institutions soon followed. To an unabashed Northern liberal like Dwight Burton, this was all good news, although not a position he often espoused from university podiums.

And so, as the decade of the 50s came to a close, several factors coalesced in such a manner as would have far-reaching ramifications for English Education at Florida State and, in part, for teacher education generally. Subject matter-based pedagogy increased in methods and related courses. School integration in the Deep South was on the move. The event of Sputnik catalyzed federal support for education programs. Curricular innovation became the watchword in large numbers of Education schools, and a new direction in the teaching of English was in that vanguard. Dwight Burton's leadership was visible nationally, and the program he had inaugurated appeared ready to kick into high gear.

Chapter II - 1958 - 1969: A Flurry of Activity

As has been stated in the previous chapter, the Little Rock Central/post-Sputnik fallout reverberated throughout the nation for the next decade and, in the case of the former event, continues to make its presence felt today. Soon after the early October Sputnik launch, a started U.S. Congress passed the (1958) National Defense Education Act, a mammoth (for those days) financial shot in the arm for public education. The heavy thrust of this support was initially directed to upper grades (7-12) enhancement, with heavy emphasis on beefing up programs of study in Science, Mathematics, and Foreign Languages. Within this Act, a new agency, the National Science Foundation, came into being, and an ever alert, newly appointed Science Education department head, Stanley Marshall, quickly submitted proposals which brought large sums of money into that program. With added initiatives composed by fellow Science Educators Ernest Burkman, Phillip Fordyce, George Dawson, and Kenneth Tobin, funding from NSF has provided that program with the means to attract national visibility into the current century.

Initially left out of this new federal windfall, leaders of the English Education discipline began to raise their voices as those needing and deserving similar consideration. A main channel of such requests came through the combined efforts of four major academic/professional organizations: National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE), the university academics oriented Modern Language Association (MLA), the College English Association (CEA), and the American Studies Association (ASA). Still in its relative infancy, the International Reading Association

(IRA) was not ready to weigh in to this campaign. In the final quarter of the past century, it has become a player in the Federal Funding sweepstakes.

As the decade of the 50's wound down, Dwight Burton was building a program at Florida State which would soon become ranked among the country's very best. Thus his voice was heard among those in the English discipline, urging support from Uncle Sam. And he was doing so pretty much on his own. As has been noted previously, Burton's colleague for his first eight years was Ms. Tresevant who performed her tasks faithfully but was largely unaware of the curricular ferment of the 1950's. Upon receiving doctoral directive status (two years after arriving on campus), Burton was able to augment his teaching staff with a series of Ph.D. candidates who helped with undergraduate Methods, supervised student teachers, and taught in the Laboratory Demonstration School, commonly known as Florida High. (NOTE: That school's former mascot, "the Demon" did not originate in any preoccupation with the supernatural or occult; it represented an abbreviation of "Demonstration".)

In any event, as the number of undergraduate courses grew, and two new graduate courses appeared, the need for additional instructional/supervisory personnel became a pressing one. One temporary addition, former Minnesota colleague Stanley Kegler, helped for a year, as did Burton's first successful doctoral student Harold Covell, who then returned to his native Canada in 1955, eventually to become the director of Reading at the University of British Columbia in Vancouver. Then came Arthur Stephenson (Steve) Dunning about whom more will be discussed subsequently. Dunning's degree completion and departure in 1959 was followed by

the appointment of three doctoral students: William Evans, who assisted until 1961; Robert Bennett, who left in 1962; and Nathan Blount in 1963. These individuals proved to be excellent emerging scholars, wrote noteworthy dissertations, taught effectively, and went on to positions of leadership in the decade of the 60's and following. Another invaluable adjunct, Lois Arnold, finished her degree and returned to Pinellas County (Florida) where she served as Supervisor of Language Arts. In addition to completing a highly useful dissertation on teaching written composition, Ms. Arnold also assumed the duties of *English Journal* editorial assistant, a task whose rewards often were late hours and eyestrain.

While the assistance described above provided the program with work of high quality, two factors of the 1960's era led to an inevitable expansion of the English Education faculty. (This was true of the other teacher education departments in the College; they competed intensely for new faculty lines for which Dean Stone campaigned ceaselessly with an unwilling Legislature.)

The first need that became an overwhelming one was the rapid increase in student enrollments, first at the undergraduate and later at the graduate levels. By the mid 1960's, Florida State was graduating over 150 English teachers per year, and its MA/Ph.D. programs included over 50 graduate students. With demands for staff development consultation, in Florida and elsewhere, and (encouraged) participation in professional activity at the state and national levels growing, new faculty appointments were vital.

A second, and more politically compelling need was that of increasingly available federal support for the teaching of English which, by 1960, had caught the

attention of research-based universities in all 50 states. The sequence of events that led to this new source of largesse represents one of great import in the history of U.S. education. Florida State's English Education program figured prominently in these new, federally sponsored ventures.

As the academic leaders of Humanities and Social Sciences became attentive to the results of the NDEA, they set to work concocting strategies to procure, for their areas, a piece of the action. First among these was the organization and conduct of the Basic Issues Conference in 1958. Held at Carnegie Mellon University in Pittsburgh, it was attended by representatives of the four professional organizations mentioned earlier in this chapter. It produced a statement of resolution which included several major contentions:

The National Council of Teachers of English became preoccupied with galvanising support for change in the English curriculum. J.N. Hook and John Gerber joined with George Winchester Stone of the Modern Language Association in arranging a series of conferences on the pressing needs of the English curriculum. Eventually the American Studies Association and the College English Association joined the effort. Of the 28 participants invited to attend this conference series, 23 were college or university professors of English. This heavy preponderance of college English teachers is significant and would show up again at the Dartmouth Seminar in the 1960's

The strong academic tone of the conference became clear in its main document (described in *The Basic Issues in the Teaching of English*, in *English Journal*, September 1959). Participants developed a list of 35 basic

issues, each framed as a key question and amplified by related questions--in this way the conference sessions called for continued collaboration and dialogue. Of these questions, the first two are the most significant and general:

1. *What is "English"?* We agree generally that English composition, language, and literature are within our province, but we are uncertain whether our boundaries should include world literature in translation, public speaking, journalism, listening, remedial reading...Some of these activities admittedly promote the social development of the individual. But does excessive emphasis on them result in the neglect of that great body of literature which can point the individual's development in more significant directions?
2. *Can basic programs in English be devised that are sequential and cumulative from the kindergarten through the graduate school?* Can agreement be reached upon a body of knowledge and set of skills as standard at certain points in the curriculum, making due allowance for the flexibility of planning, individual differences, and patterns of growth?...What assumptions, if any, should the teacher *at any level* be able to make about the training his students have received at lower levels? How much responsibility does the teacher at any level have to prepare his students for the next higher level?

With these two questions and their answers, a trend was established in the theorising about the teaching of English, which would last for the better part of ten years. The answer to Basic Issue No. 1 set in motion a curriculum concept called the 'tri-component,' or 'tripod' model; i.e. English is language, literature and composition -- and *nothing else*. This model was also to become the lightning rod for federal support in the next decade. The response to Basic Issue No. 2 was provided in the work of Jerome Bruner in theory and the work of several Curriculum Study Centres in practice. The main text to merge from the conference was *Issues, Problems, and Approaches in the Teaching of English* by George Winchester Stone (1961), but the bulk of the book is a series of articles on linguistic and literary study, none of which were outcomes of the Basic Issues conference.⁵

This conference, among other things, represented the first real attempt at cooperation between the "academics" and "professionals" in the world of English teaching. It also seemed to have caused a hiatus, albeit temporary, in CBE sniping; for the next 15 years or so, the Arthur Bestors, Mortimer Smiths, Albert W. Lynds, Clifton Fadimans, *et al*, sheathed their editorial claws. These educational spokespersons from all corners of the U.S. apparently recognized the pressure brought about by Sputnik. Apparently, they seemed to appreciate the meeting of

⁵ *Teaching and Learning English Worldwide*, ed. by James Britton, Robert E. Shafer, and Ken Watson. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters LTD, 1990, pgs. 97-98.

minds between the associations representing college/university English study and those representing English as taught in the public schools.

This combining of educational forces set in motion a concerted drive for federal dollars. Although not present at the Conference, Dwight Burton, as editor of the *English Journal*, was provided with a thorough review/description of its nature, content, features, and pronouncements. His close ties with the FSU English department, noted previously, further strengthened his position. He was, therefore, well prepared to join in the ensuing efforts for federal assistance.

Soon after this historic meeting ended the U.S. Office of Education opened its purse strings a little for those in the field of English. Through a Cooperative Research program, this office offered funding opportunities in three areas:

1. Individual grants for teaching/learning experimental projects
2. Curriculum Study Centers for elementary and secondary level specialists
(topic specific ones)
3. Demonstration Centers for experimental curricula in specific public school.

Under this aegis, the first English Curriculum Study Center, popularly known as "Project English" was funded in 1959 at the University of Oregon. Albert Kitzhaber, a highly regarded rhetorical scholar, directed that project. The focal point of this pioneering effort was the creation of a new (and academically tilted) English program of studies for grades 9 through 12. Over the next six years, 21 more Project English centers appeared nationwide. Coincidentally, a Demonstration Center opened in a

junior high school in Euclid, Ohio, under the direction of Case-Western Reserve University. In the early 1960's, three more of these were funded, each treating a specific curricular component; e.g., literature, linguistics, or rhetoric, each at a specific level--elementary, junior, or senior high school.

Most germane to this chronology, however, were three Cooperative Research proposals approved between 1959 and 1961. MIT professor Noam Chomsky's *Syntactic Structures*, a text which introduced a grammatical theory labeled "Transformational-Generative", literally burst on the linguistics scene in 1957. It was actually the most celebrated of several new theoretical treatments of English linguistics. A number of linguistics instructors and English Educators were soon developing experimental designs for the transmission of this content to courses of study for children and young adults. Of these, three were quickly funded:

1. Approaches to teaching basic English grammar and usage for speakers of non-standard dialects, by Du San Su-Lin at Claflin College, Florence, South Carolina
2. Transformational elements of syntactic structures spoken and written by children, grades one through six, by Dr. Roy C. O'Donnell, at Mt. Olive Junior College, North Carolina⁶
3. Transformational elements of written prose of 4th, 8th, and 12th graders, by Dr. Kellogg W. Hunt at the Laboratory/Demonstration School at Florida State⁷

⁶ Dr. O'Donnell would, in 1966, join the English Education program at Florida State and work collaboratively with Kellogg Hunt.

Of the three named above, those by O'Donnell and Hunt would receive NCTE Outstanding Research awards (1963, 1964).

The English teaching profession, through its NCTE leaders, continued to pressure the Federal government for recognition and support in the years following Little Rock Central, Sputnik, and the Basic Issues Conference. As has been stated earlier, the initial NDEA chiefly supported science, mathematics, and foreign languages, subjects assumed to be most vital to national defense. NCTE Executive Committees felt that English was no less deserving of support and so informed Congressional committees during the late fifties and early sixties. Individual members of NCTE Executive Committees, however, cautioned against dangers of federal control. In general, they wanted the federal government to provide financial assistance for activities beyond the reach of communities and states, but they opposed any centralization of power in academic matters.

At their 1960 convention the members of NCTE passed a resolution to (1) support all national efforts to obtain support for the teaching of English and the other humanities on a national scale; (2) direct its Executive Committee to inform the nation's leaders in government, business, and education of the Council's mounting concern over the neglect of English and the other humanities in current educational efforts; and (3) direct the Executive Committee to inform the Congress of the United States and the United States Office of Education of the compelling need for an

⁷ Dr. Hunt, originally a senior faculty member of the Florida State English Department specializing in Victorian Literature, was encouraged by Dwight Burton to change the focus of his academic interests.

extension of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 to include English and the humanities as a vital first step toward improving instruction in English and of stimulating program development in the important area.

The Executive Committee responded speedily to the directive, naming a ten-member Committee on National Interest, chaired by then-NCTE Executive Secretary James Squire. In the next few months this Committee prepared, and the Council published, *The National Interest and the Teaching of English*, a 140-page book printed attractively in two colors, its claims substantiated by succinct but readable tables of statistics. Advice and cooperation, especially in critical reading of chapter drafts, were provided by the American Council of Learned Societies, the American Council on Education, the College English Association, the American Studies Association, and particularly the Modern Language Association, whose secretary, G. W. Stone, was a member of the NCTE committee.

The book attracted considerable attention and was given wide publicity. Its sales were 10,000 copies; free copies were sent to members of Congress, to USOE officials, to state education departments, and to key media figures. It was reprinted in full in the *Congressional Record*. Its thirty-three recommendations urged, among other things institutes for elementary and secondary school teachers, study of ways to improve articulation, establishment of regional demonstration centers, pilot programs in teacher education, graduate-level programs designed to meet teachers' needs rather than to cater to the enthusiasms of professors of English and education, large-scale experimental projects (especially in linguistics), creation of regional centers for English instruction, support of basic research, and help in recruiting more teachers of

~~W~~ith Burton's help, he wrote the proposal which eventually became known as the "Hunt Study."

English.⁸ The 1961 publication of this monograph had a salutary effect on Federal assistance to the English teaching profession.

Back at Florida State, added responsibilities required added personnel, in the form of tenure-earning positions, support staff, and teaching/supervising doctoral level students. In 1962, Burton was, after ten years of requests, allowed to hire an assistant professor, tenure-earning line. This individual was me, having just finished my doctorate in English Education in 1962 at the University of Minnesota. This addition came from the same modest background as Burton. I had completed my BA in English Literature at Boston University; had served as a lieutenant, infantry, in the U.S. Army during the Korean conflict; and had taught secondary English and Reading for five years at the University (of Minnesota) High School. There I was advised by Burton's long-time Minnesota colleague, Stanley Kegler. I brought to my new position one added aptitude: I had gained a substantial background in reading education, had written my dissertation on secondary reading programs, and had been co-advised by Guy L. Bond, a major figure in Reading for over 40 years. Thus Burton's longstanding problem with the staffing of his "Reading in Secondary Schools" course was solved, at least temporarily.

I arrived in Tallahassee, Florida, in tumultuous times: the tensions caused by the building of the Berlin Wall were barely reduced. Moreover, worldwide attention was focussed on the University of Mississippi and the forcible matriculation of James Meredith, a qualified African American. Nowhere were the latter tensions any more pronounced than in this Deep South, semi-segregated North Florida community of

⁸ See *The National Interest and the Teaching of English*, Committee on the National Interest. Urbana, III:NCTE, 1961.

Tallahassee. These shock waves had hardly subsided when President Kennedy, in a televised broadcast, informed the nation of the Soviet missile-building venture in Fidel Castro's Cuba. Since Florida, at its southernmost tip, lies only 90 miles from Cuba, fears that a nuclear war at close range was imminent reverberated through the state. At the time, I was a captain in a U.S. Army Reserve unit of Military Police which was placed on alert during those frightening days. Ultimately, and thankfully, the Soviets blinked, and the expanding program in English Education became my central concern.

It should also be mentioned that Dean Stone made an additional appointment to English Education in fall, 1962. Dr. Otis McBride had been appointed Florida State's first Dean of Men in 1943. A retired Air Force colonel, Dr. McBride was of invaluable assistance in monitoring the early cohorts of male students, many of them ex-G.I.'s, in the heretofore all-female student population of FSU. In 1951, then-President, Gordon Blackwell appointed a new Men's Dean, and Dean Stone placed Dr. McBride in the Department of Audio Visual Instruction. The latter individual soon expressed discomfort in his new role, and in the fall of the next year, he was appointed to the English Education group. (Dr. McBride had written his dissertation at George Peabody College on the teaching of English in ante-bellum Southern high schools.)

While clearly unstudied in the contemporary status of English Education, Otis McBride provided considerable assistance to the department in undergraduate advisement, supervision of student teachers, and service on some Master's examining committees. He also willingly served as departmental representative on several

College committees and as a faculty senator. In 1965, he accepted a position as Media Center Coordinator at Colorado University, a position he occupied until retirement.

At Florida State, the enhancement of graduate study in English Education became an important consideration. That the doctoral program, in particular, needed further emphasis was made clear by the outcomes of the Allerton Park Conference held in late October 1962. Held on the University of Illinois campus, it was composed almost entirely of heads of academic English departments in major U.S. universities. Three "outsider" invitees were present: J.N. Hook, immediate past Executive Secretary, NCTE, professor of English, University of Illinois, and local Conference co-chair; James R. Squire, current NCTE Executive Secretary and professor of English, University of Illinois; and Dwight L. Burton, professor and head, English Education, Florida State University.

Robert W. Rogers, head of the English Department at the University of Illinois, addressed eighty chairmen and other representatives of college and university departments of English who gathered in the library of the Allerton mansion near Monticello, Illinois:

Rogers noted in his opening remarks....:"Collectively we represent large resources of learning, prestige, and wealth....What we do here, or fail to do, will be widely noticed....If we declare that the most prestigious members of English departments should work in programs specifically designed for teachers, we must be prepared to "encourage" our own luminaries to do so. It

we declare for a Ph.D. in the teaching of English, we must return to our own campuses and get the slow-moving curricula machinery; going. If we assert that notable contributions to the work of training teachers make for valid claims to promotions, we must practice this precept in our own departments."

John H. Fisher provided an even wider context for the Allerton discussions:

"I submit that until we in college departments can come to grips sincerely and realistically with the uses of literature and the relationship between literary study and the teaching of literacy, we can take no meaningful part in a national program for the improvement of English." Among the eleven resolutions adopted by the seminar participants was a call for the chairmen of college and university English departments to organize a "permanent national association" of chairmen of departments in American colleges and universities. Through the Association of Departments of English ADE, as it is now known, more than half of the departments in the United States have been able to establish a continuing dialogue on the problems of administration, the supply of and demand for faculty, and the undergraduate and graduate curriculums. The Allerton Conference demonstrated the most effective kind of federal support--from a federally-sponsored seminar emerged a self-supporting, responsible professional association.⁹

In addition, it urged English Education leaders, through attendees Hook, Squire, and Burton to move full speed ahead in developing English Education programs in consort with, but not administered by, Departments of English. This new

⁹Michael Shugrue, *English in a Decade of Change*. NY: Pegasus Books, 1968, pgs. 39-40.

consideration was called Association of Departments of English (ADE) The dramatic increase in Federal support would allow Burton to offer graduate fellowships to a now-burgeoning number of prospective doctoral students. The largest of these hiring programs would be the Project English Curriculum Study Center.

The Project English Study Centers soon gained great visibility across the nation. As noted earlier, by 1965, twenty-two were in place. In the fall of 1963, the News Bureau at Florida State University issued this news release:

TALLAHASSEE, Aug. 31 -- Some 8000 junior high school students in four metropolitan centers of Florida will participate in an experiment to determine what kind of English curriculum works best for the seventh, eighth and ninth grades.

Florida State University has been awarded a grant of \$202,525 for the four-year study and will set up one of eight English curriculum study centers in the country, according to Dr. Dwight L. Burton, head of the Department of English Education at FSU and director of the study.

The funds are from the U.S. Office of Education and the program is part of "Project English." The Florida center will be the only one of eight concerned with the curriculum for junior highs, Burton said.

The junior high school, a relatively-late-comer in the school system, is a kind of "educational no-man's land," Burton said, "with neither the traditions of the elementary school nor of the high school fastened upon it."

Part of the importance of a good English curriculum in these grades lies in the fact that pupils enrolled in the seventh grade usually encounter the subject "English" for the first time and for the first time receive instruction in English from a teacher presumably trained in this field, he said.

The curriculum center will have as associate directors Dr. Kellogg W. Hunt, professor of English at FSU, and Paul Jacobs, coordinator of English for the Florida Department of Education. Dr. John Simmons, assistant professor of English education and instructor at the University School, will be a research associate.

Two separate junior high schools will be selected from each of four school systems. Escambia County will participate under the direction of Charles Partin, associate superintendent of schools; Duval County, Miss Mabel Talmage, supervisor of English; Pinellas county, Miss Lois Arnold, coordinator of English; and Dade County, Mrs. Elizabeth White, supervisor of English.

The first year of the study, which is beginning immediately, will consist of preparation of experimental curricula to be tried out in the schools.

Three different approaches to the teaching of English will be tried, Dr. Burton said. One will be based on a series of topics or themes significant in human experience; another on blocs of subject matter in literature, linguistics and written composition; and the third on sequential steps in learning to write, read literature and understand language structure.

Experimental teaching of the materials to various groups of junior high school students will begin in September 1964. Eighteen teachers in each county will participate in the teaching. Finally, after a three-year trial, students will be tested to determine the most effective curriculum.¹⁰

One final note on the Florida State Project English Center: Of the 22 centers funded, it was the only one whose goal was to test approach rather than develop materials. To do so, it created three experimental curricular strands: the tripod, the thematically centered, and the learning centered, the latter strand based on the scholarship of Jean Piaget and Jerome Bruner (*The Purposes of Education*, 1960).

Staffing this project with competent curriculum writers, plus handling the increased student population noted earlier, gave Burton both the duty and the opportunity to hire new department adjuncts. Thus in the first three years of Center activity, new staffers joined the department. They were:

1. William Ojala - doctoral student, research associate
2. Helen O'Hara - doctoral student, research associate
3. William H. Agee - doctoral student, graduate assistant
4. Richard Graves - doctoral student, graduate assistant
5. Alvin D. Alley - doctoral student, graduate assistant
6. Carolyn McNeil - master's student, graduate assistant
7. Herb Karl - doctoral student, graduate assistant

¹⁰ Office of Information Services, News Bureau, Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida, April 6, 1963.

8. Sandra Johnson - master's student, graduate assistant
9. James E. Davis - doctoral student, graduate assistant
10. Michael Angelotti - doctoral student, Lab School English teacher
11. Peter Dunn-Rankin - doctoral student, graduate assistant
12. Bryant Fillion - doctoral student, graduate assistant
13. Robert Fichtenau - doctoral student, graduate assistant
14. Robert Sanchez - A Master's and Bachelor's English Ed student, he taught briefly at the Demonstration School and then entered a career as an outstanding reporter for the *Miami Herald*, from which he retired after 35 years of service.
15. Daniel A. Lindley, Jr. - with degrees from Yale and Harvard, Lindley left his position as head of English at the University of Chicago Laboratory School to enter the doctoral program. When he completed his degree in 1969, he joined the Yale faculty.

In time, all students named above, with the exceptions of Ms. McNeil and Johnson, went on to complete their doctoral programs and procure faculty appointments at several major institutions. Among these institutions are Arizona State, Auburn, Illinois, Georgia, Oklahoma, Hawaii, University of South Florida, and Ohio University. As members of the English Education faculty/staff, all twelve contributed to the development, revising, editing, composing, orienting (of Project English classroom teachers), supervising of the classroom instruction, and evaluating

of the total Project. By the time the Project closed in 1970, much had been written about its contents and outcomes.

The added English Education staff members, especially Ojala, Lindley and Karl, assisted in the teaching and advising of undergraduates, and student teacher supervising throughout the 1960's. Together with the tenured faculty, they taught courses, including those that were added during the decade. These were:

1. Backgrounds for Teaching Literature (undergraduate)
2. Seminar in English Education (graduate)
3. Contemporary Literature for Teachers (graduate)
4. Teaching Journalism in the High School (undergraduate)
5. Supervising Student Publications (undergraduate)

The latter two courses became the responsibility of Dr. Laurence Campbell. Dr. Campbell had been Dean of Florida State's School of Journalism until it was discontinued by an act of the Florida Legislature in 1959. Campbell had taught courses for the Educational Foundations program until, in 1963, he was transferred to the English Education program to introduce two courses into the undergraduate course of studies. By the middle of the decade, with the addition of the courses listed above, the total number of English Education enrollees grew to over 200 per year.

Following the *National Interest* publication, the Allerton Park Conference, and the addition of the Project English Curriculum Study Center, other externally sponsored activities began to appear. Individual NDEA fellowships became available

to new graduate students. By the end of the decade, over 50 of these had been or were being used by such graduate students in English Education to subsidize their studies. In 1964, Dr. Francis G. Townsend, English Department head, requested a separate Graduate Seminar section be taught by the English Education graduate faculty for inexperienced English graduate students who had been hired to teach Freshman English. Later in the decade, the English Department assigned Webb Salmon, former head of Columbus High School (Indiana) English Department and newly hired Director of Freshman Composition, to teach their own Methods courses-- another example of the close working relationship between English and English Education at Florida State.

In 1965, when NCTE and MLA jointly sponsored an English Institute Materials Center, (EIMC), the FSU English Education Project English Center became involved. Meeting each of the next three years at MLA headquarters in New York, representatives of selected Project English centers submitted sample unit materials to be reviewed, reproduced, and distributed to newly funded Summer Institutes for teachers of English, Reading, and Humanities. This was another NDEA program that began in June 1965 and was continued for a five-year period.

Shortly after arriving in Tallahassee, I began to contribute, as per Burton's expectations, in secondary level reading pedagogy. After publishing three articles based on my dissertation, I played the role of stand-in reader of his paper, "Reading Skills in English," an invited essay included in a *Perspectives in Reading* series, a new venture published by International Reading Association. Eventually, IRA produced eight of these collections; Burton's essay appeared in *Perspectives II*:

Reading in the Secondary School (1964). At the actual reading in Chicago (October 1963), I was asked to appear on the Spring 1964 Annual Conference as a speaker. At that Philadelphia meeting, I was invited to become a member of the Association's Membership Committee and to contribute a piece on reading vocabulary development to *Perspectives in Reading IV: Developing Study Skills in Secondary Schools* -- that publication to be aired at the Fall 1964 NCTE Convention in Cleveland. In early 1965, I was invited by the USOE to serve as Regional Evaluator of the initial series of NDEA Summer Reading Institutes. In addition, with the previously noted doctoral student, Helen (O'Hara) Rosenblum, I published *Reading Improvement Handbook*, a critical review of commercially published reading materials for secondary school classroom teachers and supervisors (1965). Thus, my involvement in Reading pedagogy was off and running.

In those early 60's years, our participation in national activity was highlighted by our leadership role in the newly formed Conference on English Education (CEE). Sponsored by NCTE, this organization originally met in March 1963 at Indiana University. Soon after the Allerton Park Conference, Burton and his colleague/friend, J.N. "Nick" Hook began to plan this new Conference, primarily to provide a venue for those college/university faculty members in charge of English Education programs. NCTE, USOE, and the recently configured ADE happily underwrote this organizational meeting. As Conference co-chair, Burton assigned me the role of a seminar leader.

A surprisingly large and enthusiastic group of educators attended the Bloomington meeting. An imposing number of state and (large) district English

Language Arts supervisors joined the professors from institutions of higher learning both large and small. From the outset, CEE was an active and successful addition to the English teaching profession.

At the second meeting of CEE, at the University of Illinois in March 1964, Dwight Burton gave the keynote address to a significantly larger number of Conference registrants. This presentation, "English Education As a Scholarly Discipline," established a new identity for the public school English teaching enterprise, K-14, one which dramatically reflected the transition of that enterprise from its Progressive Education past to one of scholarly bearing. A few salient statements from that text follow:

I suggest that the demanding discipline of English education encompasses six facets: (1) English linguistics, (2) rhetoric, (3) literature, (4) research technique, (5) nature of learning, (6) philosophy and sociology of American education. I am not so naïve as to suppose that our scholarship in any one of these facets will necessarily equal in depth that of the person who limits his work to that facet, and whose help we may need frequently in our work. But our scholarship in each should go well beyond casual acquaintance and should represent serious, formal study. It is this combination of learning that makes of English education a unique discipline and gives the scholar in the field his competence in dealing with curriculum and methodology in English. No doctoral program can provide the candidate with thorough

preparation in all of these fields, but the doctorate should lay foundations in all of them and may lead to true specialization in one or more...

Broad knowledge, then, is the key to competence in English linguistics for the scholar in English education. This necessary breadth of view of English language study is well put by Priscilla Tyler as she suggests that we "teach language not only as the mechanistic invention of man but as the conserver and mirror of culture. Language not only represents the meaning which a society or individual discovers in terms of verbal signals but is a memory device by which the meanings men have discovered and accumulated in words are kept as the images by which men live are kept as in a storehouse. Names for daily chores and household equipment as well as the images by which men live are all stored in the speech of a region or the writings of a period. Language is the tapestry of culture representing the people who use it and have made it. The substance of language is subject to the same kinds of classification as any other kind of cultural artifact. We can organize language by time, place, and nationality in the way we do other kinds of human behavior"¹¹...

The revival of rhetoric in the classroom will be a boon if we do not fall into an earlier trap of assuming that formal instruction in rhetorical principles will automatically carry over into more effective writing and speaking. Yet we can see clearly that in recent years the teaching of rhetoric has sunk into an unfortunate decline in many schools, a decline epitomized in the use, as

textbooks in expression, of handbooks containing a conglomeration of do's and don't's in alphabetical order. Mere practice in speaking and writing, with attention to the sheerest of practical matters, is not enough. There must be a definite structure in teaching, a subject matter which will demand greater knowledge of the process, the psychology of composition, the practices of effective writers, such as the information coming from the studies of Francis Christensen,¹² and the role emotional elements play in the formulation of logical propositions. The central aim in the teaching of rhetoric has been put succinctly, I think, by Wayne Booth: "...development of rhetorical stance, a stance which depends on discovering and maintaining in any writing situation a proper balance among the three elements that are at work in any communicative effort: the available arguments about the subject itself, the interests and peculiarities of the audience, and the voice, the implied character, of the speaker"¹³ ...

Despite what I have said about the primacy of the formal approach to literature, archetypal analysis, led by such critics as Northrop Frye, Maud Bodkin, and Leslie Fiedler, may be on the way to becoming a particularly significant approach in our time. Archetypal criticism seeks to find the common bases on which writer and reader can communicate, to "decode the secret language in literary works so that it may have for us a more

¹¹ Pricilla Tyler, "New Concepts and Content for the English Curriculum," *English Leaflet*, LXI (Midwinter, 1962), 9. See also Arnold Lazarus, "A Contextual Criticism," *English Journal*, LII (December, 1963), 701 ff.

¹² See Francis Christensen, "Notes Toward a New Rhetoric," *College English*, XXV (October, 1963), 7-18.

rational meaning."¹⁴ Perhaps, again, the nature of modern literature accounts for the acceleration of interest in the archetypal approach. We think of Eliot's concern with the myth of hero in a ravished land; Camus' preoccupation, natural perhaps with the existentialist, with the myth of Sisyphus; Wolfe's vision of the quest; MacLeish's retelling of the story of Job. Symptomatic, perhaps, is the awarding of the National Book Award for fiction of 1963 to John Updike's *The Centaur*, a book I referred to as "ridiculous" in my graduate seminar two days before the awards were announced. (Kind fate had me out of town at the time of the next meeting of the seminar!) Archetypal study is fruitful, too, with children's literature or literature for adolescents. A doctoral student in our department, Mrs. Helen Rosenblum is completing a study on Jung's fusion-of-opposites archetypes in fairy tales. I have found that high school and college students seem fascinated with archetypes and patterns of ritual as they appear in literature. Tracing of the loss of paradise myth from the ancient Greeks through *Robinson Crusoe*, Wordsworth, and Robert Frost, for example, is of more significance to the students than learning a chronological list of names, movements, and influences...

Research in the teaching of English must necessarily remain, to some extent, an interdisciplinary effort in which the English education specialist may be a coordinator. Yet the various conferences on research in the teaching of English so far held under Project English, in three of four of which I have

¹³ Wayne C. Booth, "The Rhetorical Stance," *College Composition and Communication*, XIV (October, 1963), 141.

¹⁴ Northrup Frye, *The Anatomy of Criticism: Four Essays*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1957, p. 29.

participate, have convinced me that we cannot merely bring together people who know English and people who know research design if results are to be maximal. The English education specialist, though he should be ready to call on the psychometrician and statistician at times, must be something of a psychometrician and statistician in his own right. Knowledge of measures of central tendency and of variation and of such techniques as analysis of variance and covariance and factor analysis is not, after all, so esoteric and so demanding in quantitative procedures that able graduate students cannot master it at elementary levels even if they have little formal training in mathematics.

The most vital quality in experimental research, perhaps, is imagination. Often graduate students drop a potentially significant study for one that is highly manageable and fits neatly into some statistical design. We can make a major contribution, I think, in initiating frontier studies in the more intangible, qualitative aspects of learning, for example the role of imagination in the literary experience...

A major reason for triviality in experimental research is the lack of techniques for measuring progress in some of the aspects of English we think more important. Testing in English has fallen on the sere and yellow. Scores on many commonly used standardized tests are virtually meaningless in really appraising an English program. Clearly, the frontier of measurement in

English is one on which activity by English education scholar, working with psychologists and test experts, is imperative.¹⁵

The above quotes clearly reflect a vast departure from the *Experience Curriculum in English* days of the Progressive era. Those of us who sat in the audience as representatives of the Florida State program felt a sense of pride in being led by a scholar of Burton's magnitude. We were also proud to be part of such scholarly endeavors.

During that same academic year, Burton produced the second edition of *Literature Study in the High Schools*, published by Holt, Rinehart & Winston (HRW) and, in 1965, with me as co-author, published *Teaching English in Today's High Schools: A Collection of Essay*, also by HRW. By the end of 1965, both texts were in wide use, coast to coast. That same year, having just completed a three-year stint as NCTE "Distinguished Lecturer," he submitted his resignation as editor of *English Journal*. The responsibilities demanded by the Department, his own publishing schedule, plus the anticipation of further professional duties, all were instrumental in this decision.

The "further professional duties" quickly came into being. In 1962, having accepted the role of opening the membership of the Florida Council of Teachers of English (FCTE) to minority groups' participation, Burton assisted in the monitoring of subsequent annual meetings at Sarasota, Hollywood, and Clearwater (1963-1965) as being fully integrated ones. (In doing so, he made good on a promise made during

¹⁵ Dwight L. Burton, English Education as Scholarly Discipline," *The Changing Role of English Education*, ed. by Stanley B. Kegler. Urbana, Ill: NCTE, 1964, pgs. 2-3.

his 1953 FCTE presidency). He also completed work on a revised edition of the Florida Department of Education Bulletin (#55), *English in Florida Secondary Schools*, a publication whose writing committees he had chaired in 1962. Finally, he completed work on a USOE grant proposal for an "Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program" whose nature, content, and achievement will be discussed later.

As late as 1966, Burton was still carrying the duties of Ph.D. major advisor without assistance--and the number of those doctoral students had increased during the decade. It was not until the next academic year, 1966-1967, that I was given authority to assist him with that burden. And finally, in late 1965, the NCTE Executive Committee appointed Dwight Burton Second Vice-President and Program Chair for the annual conference at Houston in November 1966. That time-consuming, politically sensitive responsibility led to his asking some of us Department members and doctoral students to take up the slack with teaching, advising, supervising, and staff development tasks. In the case of Ojala, O'Hara (now Mrs. Harry Rosenblum), Agee, Karl, Lindley, and Davis, such duties were in addition to their doctoral students and Project English tasks. And I pitched in, serving unofficially as Director of the Project English Curriculum Study, then in its third year of operation. Kellogg Hunt served as Associate Director, as well.

From the perspective of English Education at Florida State, the second half of the 1960's, was to be a study in contrasts. The events that took place in the world at large have become one of the darker chapters in U.S. history. The deepening of the Vietnam conflict, with its divisive effect on the American people, probably heads the list. The radicalization of the Civil rights movement, from the non-violent approach

of Martin Luther King, Jr., Roy Wilkins, Ralph Abernathy, Vernon Jordan, *et al* to the angry, confrontational posture of groups led by Stokley Carmichael, Eldridge Cleaver, H. Rap Brown, Bobby Seale, and, later, the Rev. Louis Farrakhan must run a close second. The backlash of frightened, presumably disenfranchised white citizens was still another. This reaction was clearly reflected in the November 1966 elections wherein Lurleen Wallace, Lester Maddox, Claude Kirk, and last-but-not-least Ronald Reagan claimed victories in gubernatorial elections. These as well as the 46 member Republican gains in the House of Representatives virtually signaled the end of the New Frontier/Great Society programs, and those involved in universities then benefiting from all that Federal support soon felt the sting. The 1968 "surrender" by President Johnson, the assassinations of Martin Luther King and Robert Kennedy, the Chicago uprising at the Democrats' National convention, and the hairline victory of Richard Nixon--with a boost from both the radical left and the campaign of Alabama's George C. Wallace--signaled the beginning of the long, inexorable movement of the U.S. electorate to the right.

The atmosphere in the Florida State English Education program was, however, very different. In fall 1966, the Department added a permanent faculty member, Dr. Roy C. O'Donnell, an award-winning linguistics scholar/teacher (mentioned previously). O'Donnell began a close relationship with literature scholar-turned-linguist Kellogg Hunt. Together, they helped refine the language components of the Project English curriculum, introduced four new courses in Language and Language Learning, and recruited four new faculty members to the linguistics cohort of the English department. By 1970, that academic component could be fairly

compared in stature and breadth of offerings to the Universities of Michigan, Texas, Indiana, and UCLA.

The study of English Linguistics at Florida State soon figured in yet another innovative graduate program. In fall 1966, Burton's long-time colleague, "Nick" Hook, established a first-ever program at Illinois, once again with Federal resources. The Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program (EXTFP) brought together 15 bright young English Education teacher/scholars from all sections of the country. A year-long course sequence, drawn from English department, College of Education curricula, provided this carefully selected group with a program culminating in the Master's Degree and/or the residence work for the Ph.D. The participants, at the conclusion of their year's work, produced a collection of essays, *The Growing Edge of English* through NCTE which offered some of the futuristic concepts they had gained through their intensive study of English pedagogy. One of the close observers of this development was (no surprise) Dwight L. Burton of FSU.

And so it was that in the fall of 1967, an EXTFP became part of the graduate program at Florida State University. Once again, the EXTFP program brought together faculty members from both English and English Education. A most noteworthy addition to that faculty was Dr. James McCrimmon. A Scottish immigrant, McCrimmon had, for several years been the Director of Writing at the University of Illinois. From 1952 to 1987, his freshman composition text, *Writing With a Purpose* (Houghton Mifflin Co.) was the Number One seller in U.S. colleges and universities. Burton persuaded him, in 1967, to leave his position as Writer in Residence at Houghton Mifflin Co., reasoning that the winters in Tallahassee were

considerably more pleasant than cold, damp, snowy Boston. To say that the recruiting of McCrimmon was a boon to the English/English Education faculties is an obvious understatement.

The creation of this EXTFP had to be reconciled with the movement of the entire Florida University system from its previous trimester to a quarter system calendar. It was, as begun in Fall Quarter 1967, an amalgam of newly developed standard--but all adjusted--courses of study. Those courses, with parenthetical inclusion of their instructors, were:

Fall Quarter

1. Modern Grammar I (Hunt/ O'Donnell)
2. Modern Rhetoric (McCrimmon)
3. Instruction and Supervision in Secondary Reading (Simmons)
4. Problems & Trends in Secondary English Curricula I (Burton)

Winter Quarter

1. Modern Grammar II (Hunt)
2. Composition for Teachers (McCrimmon)
3. Language Learning: theory and Research (O'Donnell)
4. Problems & Trends...II (Burton)

Spring Quarter

1. Literature for Young People (Simmons)
2. Critical Literary Theory for Teachers (Standley)
3. Semantics and Sociolinguistics (Hunt)
4. Practicum in Supervision of Instruction (Burton & staff)

Candidates for the Masters degree in English or English Education had still to complete nine hours of course work to meet minimal credit requirements. Doctoral candidates (there were always three or four) had to complete the same number to use the program as residency requirement. Advisors were urged to have the candidates for either degree to elect English content courses for these course completions, the only exception being those who were also seeking Reading Specialist certification in the State of Florida.

The program brought to Tallahassee carefully selected junior and senior high school English teachers. Several had (temporarily) left their posts as English department heads of those schools. All opted for either the MA/MS or Ph.D. in English Education. All were paid \$4,000, were given free tuition and materials, and travel/expenses, if desired, to the annual fall meeting of the Florida Council of Teachers of English in Orlando. Two participants, chosen by lot, attended the CEE meeting that spring in Boulder, Colorado. From this group, as well as the groups of

the two succeeding years, an imposing number of professional leaders emanated. One member was (then) Ms. Claudia C. Holland who, in February 1968, became Mrs. Dwight L. Burton.

The program gained support for the next two academic years. It was the envy of all universities in the region, the only one to be represented in the Southeastern United States. On a personal note, to have been a member of that teaching faculty remains one of the highlights of my teaching career.

In summer 1967, I taught Composition for Teachers at a University of Kentucky NDEA Institute. The director of that Institute, Ms. Lizette Van Gelder, graciously tutored me that summer in the art of NDEA Summer Institute grant-proposal writing. Under her guidance, I was able to compose a proposal for a Summer Institute for Trainers of English Teachers, which was funded and conducted at Florida State in 1968. Eighteen college/university English methods teachers, largely from southeastern institutions (but also representing Montana and Utah) completed their work in that lively Institute.

While at Kentucky in 1967, I was invited by the Singer/Random House editorial staff to spend the long Fourth of July weekend in New York City working on a text revision. In 1966, Dr. Burton and I had edited a 10th grade literature text, in four paperback volumes, and part of a grade 9 - 12 series. In order to enter that series in the Texas competitive bidding process, each year's texts had to be condensed into one hardbound volume. From his Tallahassee home, Dr. Burton informed me that it would be his pleasure for me to represent us in that revision process. In complying, I went to New York to work with the editor assigned to the task by Singer/Random

House. Her name was Toni Morrison, then a single parent who was about the task of writing her first novel, *The Bluest Eye*. It was published in 1970--and her exciting career as a world-famous author was launched which has culminated, as we all know, in her receiving the Nobel Prize for Literature (2000). I take great pride in having worked with her. During that period (March 1968), she was asked to speak at the CEE meeting in Boulder, Colorado.

An event of great national import, one in which we did *not* participate was the Anglo American Seminar on the teaching of English, which took place in August 1966. This two-week conference, held on the campus of Dartmouth College in Hanover, New Hampshire, involved a serious, often heated series of sessions among leading scholars, English Educators, and professional organization officials from the United Kingdom, Canada, and the United States. Spearheaded by NCTE's James Squire, the Canadian Council's Merron Chorny, and NATE's British spokesperson, Frank Whitehead, the Seminar was sponsored by USOE, NCTE, and MLA, with smaller amounts provided by the Canadians and the British. Ultimately, the meeting devolved into a debate between the largely "academic English" American participants and a more student-centered approach espoused--often vociferously--by the UK and Canadian contingents. An invitation to this landmark international meeting had been extended to Dwight Burton, who due to a summer illness and general exhaustion, declined. Graduate students at Florida State and many of U.S. institutions, however, were soon assigned the reading of some of the 1,000 plus pages of reports, session summaries, and position papers which were published as a result of the Seminar. The academic model for English curricula, which had emanated from the Basic Issues

Conference of 1958, was vigorously questioned by several Seminar authors and never did regain its position of central influence on U.S. public school English Language Arts curricula.

During those heady years, I was chosen to be program chair of the sixth annual (spring) meeting of CEE held on the campus of Colorado University, Boulder. With federal funds still available, a record number of educators attended. (As mentioned previously, we were able to underwrite the participation of two EXTFP members, drawn by lot). At the meeting of the Executive Committee, the board members officially commended me for creating "the best program to date." I had included a distinctly international tone with a Dartmouth Seminar, English Educator from Exeter University (UK) J. W. Patrick Creber appearing at two General Sessions. The meeting ended with a Saturday luncheon. In the session following the meal, a clash of ideologies emerged, focussing on the question of which English linguistics philosophy should be taught to American adolescents. In adversarial positions were Dr. Frank Zidonis, a transformational-generative grammarian from Ohio State and Dr. Neil Postman, a semanticist/sociolinguist from New York University. The venerable Professor Emeritus Robert C. Pooley (Wisconsin) presided over the often heated dialogue, and reactor Dr. Hans Guth, San Jose State, added intensity. A former member of the Hitler Youth and escapee from Nazi Germany, Guth pleaded with the audience to eschew an emphasis on the impersonal, computer-driven formula of the Chomskian new grammar. It was a fitting end to an exciting conference. Ironically, on the Sunday evening after the meeting's close, then-President Lyndon B. Johnson announced on national television that he would neither seek, nor would he

accept, his party's nomination for a second term in office--a sad (for many educators) ending to what had been a great professional weekend.

In fall 1968, FSU's College of Education Dean (Stanley) Marshall appointed quite unexpectedly another member to our departmental faculty. For over 20 years, Ms. Juanita de Vette had served as librarian/media center coordinator at the Laboratory/Demonstration School (Florida High). In 1958, she contributed to Stephen Dunning's doctoral study on the Junior (Young Adult) novel--as an "expert librarian." With the emergence of new technologies of the 1960's, Ms. de Vette found it increasingly difficult to keep pace, especially in a K-12 library. A 1966 SACS evaluation of the Lab School had pointed out glaring deficiencies in her library. In 1968, therefore, Dean Marshall hired a recently trained Library Science graduate to take over.

Ms. de Vette was assigned to teach two, usually large, sections of Children's Literature to undergraduates in the Elementary Education program. This she did conscientiously although, soon after her transfer, the College hired Dr. Carol Lynch Brown. Dr Brown had completed an Elementary Language Arts degree, with a specialization in Children's Literature. In 1974, Ms. de Vette retired and, two years later, died of cancer. She was mourned by many friends and former colleagues.

With the election of Richard Nixon to the Presidency in 1968, the halcyon days of federal support for English, social science, and humanities programs quickly began to evaporate. English and history scholars left their consultants' roles at USOE to be replaced largely by behavioral psychologists. The EXTFP program at Florida State expired after three consecutive years of operation. (It was the only one to have

been so extended). The project English Center also closed down in June 1970. The beginning of the new decade saw the end of federally sponsored programs available to English Educators at Florida State and, indeed, throughout the nation.

This memorable interlude had, however, left its mark on the profession, and nowhere could that emblem be seen more clearly than by the number of doctoral scholars produced at the Tallahassee institution. By 1970, these graduates had become faculty members at Auburn University, University of Georgia, University of Illinois, Yale University, Dartmouth College, University of Wisconsin, Ohio University, Dillard University, University of Michigan, and Arizona State University, and were English Language Arts supervisors in the states of Florida, Michigan, and California. One further graduate deserves recognition at this point. It was noted in the following press release from the University Office of Information Services (1968):

TALLAHASSEE, Jan. 16--Florida's Teacher of the Year, Miss Barbara Goleman of Miami-Jackson High School, visited her alma mater, Florida State University, this week.

After an appearance before the Cabinet in the Capitol building, Miss Goleman was guest of honor at a luncheon attended by FSU's President John E. Champion, members of the Cabinet, educators and officers of the Alumni Association. Her parents, Mr. and Mrs. Dwight Goleman of Lakeland, also were on hand. She is their only child. Asked if she has always wanted to be a

teacher, her father, who is in the automobile financing business, replied no-- that she had left college intending to become a journalist.

At Florida State, she switched to English education; she stayed after graduation to get her master's degree in 1954 and has been teaching English at Miami-Jackson since that time.

In announcing that she had been chosen State Teacher of the Year, Commissioner of Education Floyd Christian pointed out that Miss Goleman has been in the forefront of change during her years at Miami-Jackson. At the start of her tenure the school served a middle-class neighborhood, then Cuban refugees came and today the school is 92 percent Negro.¹⁶

Obviously, this was a high honor. Moreover, later that year, Ms. Goleman was chosen by the USOE as *National Teacher of the Year*, the only Floridian ever to be singled out for this esteemed designation. Later in her career, she was appointed English Language Arts supervisor. After her retirement in 1995, a new Miami high school was named in her honor. Throughout her career, Ms. Goleman always referred to Dwight Burton as her mentor.

A report published in 1970 by an MLA committee identified the doctoral program at Florida State, together with those at Stanford and New York University, as the three best in the United States. Also, it should be noted that during the decade of the 1960's, College of Education critics, so strident in their attacks produced during the previous fifteen years, had, at least for awhile, fallen silent. It there were

¹⁶ Office of Information Services, News Bureau, Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida, January 16, 1968.

disputants to Dwight Burton's 1964 Keynote Address, their outcries were very difficult to discern. They would, however, re-emerge at a later time.

During the latter years of that fabled decade of the 60s, it was apparent that the English Education program at Florida State University had enjoyed a period of remarkable growth. It is fair to say that no U.S. University or college could boast of a stature in that discipline superior to that housed at FSU. Though the federal support which had fueled that rise was soon to be eliminated, the programs it had supported in the FSU/Burton era have continued to resonate nationally to the present day.

Chapter III - 1970's and 1980's – Retrenchment and New Views of Literacy

Hard times fell on English Education at Florida State, and indeed a pall was cast on all public education throughout the United States. It might be of some solace, however, to note the progress which had been made in English Education programs, progress in which Florida State figured prominently. Shugrue offers this summary:

The Place of English Education

Better teacher preparation programs, greater involvement with schools and two-year colleges, and new emphasis on excellence in teaching must lead college English departments to examine the role of the specialist in English Education. While only a few universities-New York University and Florida State University, for example-have well-established, separate departments of English Education, many large departments of English have made appointments to their own faculties or given joint appointments with Education to professors whose special interest is English Education. Although more departments wish to make similar appointments each year from the small pool of available specialists, the college teaching community has only begun to give proper recognition to the college teacher who is professionally interested in teaching methods and materials, curriculum development, the supervision of student teachers, and articulation with the schools. If departments wish to improve their programs for the preparation of English teachers for the schools, they will have to offer to the specialist in English Education greater opportunities for advancement and a voice in setting

departmental policies. If the graduate departments wish to implement the recommendation of the Allen report on the Ph.D. calling for supervised practice teaching, they will need to draw upon the special skills of the specialist in English Education. Ironically enough, the faculty member who is perhaps most clearly fulfilling the department's responsibility to influence American public education often suffers from the condescension of his peers. He is accepted reluctantly, promoted slowly, and accused of neglecting the erudite special field in which he did his advanced work in English. His research is considered "unimportant" or "second-rate" by other members of the department. Even though he is often expected to have met all of the standard requirements for the Ph.D. in English, he must take additional work to learn enough about curriculum building, teaching techniques, statistics, and supervision to do justice to the students whom he will serve. Only a few universities such as Florida State, Minnesota, Nebraska, and Stanford have established graduate programs in English Education which regularly produce distinguished professors of English Education.

Through the efforts of the Conference on English Education, a section of the NCTE, the field of English Education is gaining strength in departments of English and new doctoral programs to prepare specialists are currently being planned in several institutions. In 1967 the CEE authorized Dwight Burton of Florida State to poll one hundred leading specialists about their own educational backgrounds, their recommendations for establishing graduate programs in English Education, and their ideas of the functions of specialists

in English Education in the college department of English. A conference of professors of English and of Education, graduate deans and deans of education, and school teachers and administrators held in May 1968 led to specific recommendations which will assist any departments wishing to make full use of the professor of English Education or to establish graduate programs in English Education leading to the master's degree or the doctorate. The recommendations are designed not only to outline the kind of preparation which should be required of the English Education specialists and his role in both departments, but to help establish a climate in which joint appointments have the enthusiastic approval of both departments, as at Stanford or Northwestern, for example, and in which promotion, salary increments, and recognition by colleagues and by the administration are as available to the man in English Education as to the specialist in linguistics, in Shakespeare, or in Milton. Through the recommendations and conferences of the CEE, graduate departments have the opportunity to establish programs which will produce scholar-teachers qualified to work with prospective teachers for the schools, junior and community colleges, and colleges and universities and to generate curriculum revision in teacher preparation at all levels.

Institutions have an unusual opportunity to develop programs for the preparation and improvement of teachers through the Education Professions Development Act of 1967. The Act, which amends the Higher Education Act of 1965 and replaces Title XI of NDEA, provides funds not only to attract qualified persons to the field of education and to provide fellowships in higher

education, but also to establish programs to train persons who are serving or preparing to serve as teachers, administrators, or educational specialists in institutions of higher education. Particularly in 1969 and 1970 fund will be available to cover the costs of courses of study, either for short terms or regular academic-year programs, and for fellowships. Although there have been limited funds available to assist students preparing for careers in college teaching through 1968, the thrust of federal support has been toward the reeducation of teachers, administrators, and supervisors for the schools, both through the NDEA institutes in English which began in 1965 and through such other programs as the Prospective and Experienced Teacher Fellowship Programs authorized by the Higher Education Act of 1965. In 1967-1968, for example, academic-year programs in English for teachers, administrators, and supervisors were held on six campuses. While Arizona State University conducted a program for teachers of the disadvantaged in grades seven through twelve in the southwestern United States, Florida State worked with twenty-five prospective supervisors in grades seven through twelve in Florida, and the University of Illinois at Urbana brought together twenty prospective secondary English department chairmen from across the United States. In the summer of 1968, eighty-five institutes, including six for college teachers of teachers, demonstrated the wide range of inservice programs available for American English teachers. EPDA will now extend many of these opportunities to the entire college teaching community. (Michael Shugrue, *English in a Decade of Change*, NY: Pegasus, Inc., 1968)

Unfortunately, Shugrue's hope that the EPDA legislation would "extend opportunities" for English Educators never transpired. On the contrary, the early 70's saw a retrenchment of enormous proportions. Under Nixon's leadership, the USOE dissolved most of the extant programs for subject matter teachers, supervisors, and teacher educators. The behavioralists who assumed that new direction utilized the rubric of *Accountability* to promote programs which featured Individually Prescribed Instruction. The design of courses of instruction which were patterned after Behavioral Objectives (which stressed outcomes which were narrow, capable of being measured quantitatively, and which often referred to elementary and secondary level students as "products") replaced more flexible, humanistically-oriented materials such as those produced in the Project English centers. One USOE project titled Tri-Universities Project was funded early in the decade. English Educators from Indiana, Illinois, and Purdue Universities combined their talents to produce a series of instructional materials which attempted to imbue standard secondary English content with the IPI approach. Within three years, it closed down; few of its products were used in any sustained sense by the school systems which received them. Meanwhile, all NDEA Summer Institutes, as well as Experienced Teacher and individual scholarship programs were eliminated. Only Right to Read and Career Education programs, the latter being the brainchild of Mr. Nixon's second USOE Commissioner, Sidney Marland, were provided with any substantial support. Throughout the decade, testing programs emerged, most titled "Minimum Competencies" in the three basic areas of reading, writing, and mathematical computation.

To be fair, as the 1970's progressed, the entire country was going through a period of radical, at times frightening change. The war in Vietnam caused national conflicts, riots, and domestic upheavals to break out and was eventually—and humiliatingly—lost. Clashes between those supporting and those opposing this war led to violent confrontations in urban areas and on college campuses. Demands for “law and order” caused police authorities to run amuck on occasion. The Civil Rights Movement, so promising in its early phase, turned ugly. Groups of militant, often anarchistic students caused war-like incidents on some of the great institutions; e.g. the U. of California-Berkeley, Columbia, Wisconsin, Cornell, and several others. In that era of uprising, Florida State University was not spared.

Economic conditions suddenly deteriorated, primarily because the U.S. could not support a costly war in a far-off land and sustain Great Society programs simultaneously. In 1973-74, an Arab oil embargo, largely caused by opposition to U.S. support of Israel, demonstrated vividly our dependence on foreign petroleum sources. Those who exploit sources of that vital commodity within the continental United States found themselves violently opposed by environmentalists. All of the above depleted federal resources as well as the optimistic spirit of the recent past. Lacking federal aid, states were forced to cut back on programs across the board. Of those programs, none was harder hit than public education—kindergarten through graduate school.

Few universities were hit harder in the shift in national economic fortunes than Florida State University. While ascending in the ranks of the national research institutions, most programs contributing to that expanding reputation were doing so

on federal largesse. Also, the next twelve years saw the opening of six state universities in Florida: the University of South Florida in 1960; Florida Atlantic University in 1964; the Florida Technical University, now U. of Central Florida, in 1967; the University of West Florida, also in 1967; the University of North Florida and Florida International Universities, both in 1972. With the exception of the UWF in Pensacola, the others were situated in large and growing urban areas of the state. And with the exception of UNF in Jacksonville, they represented communities in central and south Florida. Those latter institutions were proposed and promoted by rapidly increasing cohorts of legislators from those regions, a change brought about by reapportionment. Gone were the numbers and the power of the northern “Pork Chop Gang.” What was left were legislative contingents populated with men and women who, while frequently proud alums of FSU or UF, were duty-bound to represent their burgeoning constituencies. A further influence on the three “old schools” was the presence of a community junior college roster which more than doubled in number during the decade. By 1980, for example, Miami Dade Community College would exist on four campuses and would number over 60,000 students. To say that the increase in higher education sites in Florida was a threat to enrollment at Florida State in the far north of the state, would be to state the obvious.

Within the University, student registrations were shifting as well. The College of Business grew dramatically in registration. The College of Communications, now separated from the School of Theater, also witnessed sizeable growth, especially in its Public Relations degree program. Proportionate numbers of enrollees in such service-oriented colleges as Education, Social Work, and Nursing

registered sharp declines. Moreover, the loss of Federal resources led to an even greater reduction of new Graduate Education candidates. In short, a once-substantial student pool had shrunk in size. Only Science Education, where NSF funds were still relatively plentiful, was able to maintain its graduate research efforts.

The federally influenced movement toward behaviorally-oriented curricula, research, and teacher training was reflected in the COE. In 1968, then-Dean Stanley Marshall hired the famed learning theorist Robert Gagné to a professorship in the college. At the same time, he recruited Dr. Robert Morgan, another prominent learning specialist, from the U.S. Office of Education. In 1969, he hired another learning theorist, the well-respected Leslie Briggs, to join Gagné and Morgan. All three professors brought staff associates with them to Tallahassee, and by 1973, the program in Educational Foundations had gained national visibility.

With the advent of this new, enhanced area of professional study, the English Education program was cut back significantly. Dr. Roy O'Donnell left for U. of Georgia; William Ojala and Herb Karl with degrees now completed, found assistant professorships at Arizona State and the U. of South Florida, respectively. Dan Lindley, after a brief appointment at Yale, became the "Education Department" at Dartmouth College. Burton became the Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies and was removed from all instructional duties, although he continued to serve on doctoral committees. Almost by default, I was appointed English Education Department Head in 1971, a position I held for two years. In 1973, Kellogg Hunt retired, largely due to the loss of three linguists from the English department along with his colleague Roy O'Donnell. Now there was one bona fide English linguistics

professor in the Department. By the end of the decade, there would be none.

During my department headship, I was primarily involved in two activities: staffing a depleted instructors' corps with graduate assistants, two of whom were volunteers. We had added a tenure-earning person, Dr. Gordon C. Brossell who had, in 1971, finished his doctoral work at Northwestern University. Dr. Campbell was also available, but his specialty—journalism education—was not of interest to our students, and his lack of a driver's license precluded his supervising student teachers. My second task was service on three College committees, and to chair one, all devoted to creation of a plan for reorganizing the College of Education. Begun in 1969 by then-Dean Marshall, the reorganization movement took off in earnest in 1971 under the direction of recently appointed Dean Phillip Fordyce. Recruited by Marshall from a suburban Chicago high school in 1963, Fordyce had performed the duties of Science Education administrative assistant under Marshall. He moved up when Marshall was appointed Associate Dean in 1966, then Dean in 1967. When Marshall was made first acting University President in February 1969 and then permanent President in June of that year, Fordyce became Dean of the College of Education. Fordyce's first, and soon all-consuming task, was to reorganize his College. In performing this undertaking, he was closely observed by his long-time mentor, President Marshall, who would, two years later, use it as a model for reorganizing the total University operating structure.

Before describing the College reorganization and its impact on English Education, one facet of the undergraduate program merits some consideration. At Florida State, as at most large universities, the student teaching component was/has

been treated as a stepchild. For undergraduates completing their degree of certification efforts, the student teaching trimester or quarter or semester assignment is not only a requirement; it is the culminating experience of the entire program. While each of the University's 22 departments which offer certification elements require an entire term be spent in one elementary, middle, junior, or senior high school, many of them have done an adequate job of supervising their students at this critical juncture. As I write this, Florida State has been one of the very few institutions of higher learning, public or private, which negotiates with the entire state in its student teacher placement process. With the opening of the newer universities (all of which offered teacher education) and the hard economic times which beset the 70s, especially the spike in fuel costs, some colleges, notably the University of Florida, began reining in the geographic areas in which they placed their student teachers. They also sharply reduced the actual teaching time these young people had to perform teaching duties. Throughout *that* aspect of retrenchment activity, Florida State continued to allow its student teaching applicants full range of statewide choice.

The manner in which each program actually meets its supervising responsibilities varies greatly. Throughout the 60s, the Office of Student Teaching provided the bulk of supervision. It did so through the observations (as well as placements) made by nine Regional Coordinators who resided in large communities across the state and, through judicious placements, were almost always within easy driving distance of their charges. All of these supervisors, by and large senior faculty members, were generalists. This put them at some disadvantage with secondary school student teachers. With these upper grade beginners, supervision was of a

strictly general nature, with little regard to content being taught.

To compensate for this shortcoming, each subject matter teacher education program was offered the opportunity of making one or two observatory visits. Not ideal, but at least Methods teachers, if they so desired, could follow their students into the field and, among other things, discern what and how much of their pedagogical lore had been internalized by these students, as related to the “real life” crucible of the public school middle, junior, or senior high school English classrooms.

At this point in the narrative, I choose to avail myself of an autobiographical digression. Most of my two years in the U.S. Army was spent giving basic instruction in a variety of military topics. I was even ordered by one regimental commander to provide a one-week Methods of Instruction workshop (MOI) for selected groups of non-commissioned officers (in fact, my first Methods course). During my five years of junior/senior level English teaching at University High School, I was assigned the task of supervising as many as 20 student teachers a year—as a cooperating teacher. I didn’t like the Minnesota approach at all: one hour per day of teaching, assigned over three quarters at three different grade levels and usually at three different school sites. A typical English student teacher at Minnesota would attend a nine o’clock Shakespeare class, teach his/her ninth grade English class a U. High from 10 – 11 am, and then attend another course, in Advanced Writing, or Romantic Poetry, or whatever, at noon. These people never got the feel of a public school, in the dawn-to-dusk manner of an employed teacher; they never became truly connected to their students; they never experienced the utter fatigue of a demanding five-periods-a-day, five-days-a-week regiment felt by most *committed* teachers at

about 4 o'clock on Friday afternoon—often accompanied by the realization that, at 7 pm, they had to be in the school gymnasium to sell tickets to the basketball game, then to chaperon the dance put on by the 10th grade class which they had been assigned to advise. From my first year at Florida State, I warned my pre-student teachers, “Don’t plan social events for your evenings or weekends. If your cooperating teacher attends PTO meeting, so do you. If he/she supervises an after-school field trip *of any kind*, so will you. If there are 7 am, or 4:30 pm parent conferences to be conducted, it’s part of your task to sit in, etc., etc. And don’t ever forget the piles of research papers now sitting on the kitchen table in your apartment. They must be returned, carefully graded, Monday morning.” I called that my *Fatherly Chat*. Today, 40 years after its initial use, former students still remind me of it.

There were times, in the 70’s and following, that those teacher educators who were committed to their supervisory roles were hard pressed to make good on those commitments. In 1971, the Division of Continuing Education took back the nine positions through which the University had staffed their Regional Coordinator contingent. That reduction produced a new corps of three such agents: one on the Lower East Coast, to cover Palm Beach, Broward, and Dade counties; one in Central Florida, to coordinate operations from Cape Canaveral to Tampa Bay; and one working out of the Student Teaching office in Tallahassee whose beat stretched from Jacksonville to Pensacola and including three South Georgia districts. In order to compensate, at least partially, for the loss, Dean Fordyce increased the travel budget for all teachers of programs which assigned department members to supervise

downstate. One department which did spend more time in off-campus supervision was English Education.

In the summer of 1971, I received a University Council for Instruction grant to redesign the *Manual for Student Teaching*, a project which stressed new strategies to maximize the services offered in the field by subject matter personnel. One facet of this strategy was the establishment of a rotation placement system: in the English Education program, for example, one Lower East, and two Central Florida counties would be chosen in each of the three quarters, augmented of course by increased local area placement (*local* came to mean a commuting area from Jackson to Suwanee Counties and including three in South Georgia). In Fall Quarter, 1971, following this plan, “Centers” were established for English Education student teachers in Orange and Pinellas counties and one in Thomas County, Georgia.

Within each center, one or two schools would be chosen (if two, a high school and contiguous middle school) which would then be “saturated” with Florida State students. In this arrangement, it was not uncommon for a relatively large high school English department to host as many as eight of our undergraduate beginners. Under the plan I devised, a University supervisor would spend up to a week at a given school site and would repeat such visits on at least two more occasions during the quarter. Through that arrangement, such supervisors spent more time in a given school site than in an automobile, driving from St. Petersburg Beach to Tarpon Springs.

As part of the *quid pro quo* for a schools accommodating these numbers, my plan offered them a pre-school orientation session and “several” (three to five) in-

service workshops, to be held during school hours while the student teachers ran their classes. The topics were both generic; e.g., systematic observation techniques, or content-specific; e.g., Young Adult literature, modern grammar, etc. All of this meant full days in those schools, but the opportunities for observing our students more frequently, as well as conferring with their cooperating teachers more comprehensively were the payoff. Finally, an overall evaluation session was held with those teachers at quarter's end. One by-product of this approach was the enhancement of the teachers' interest in the staff development capabilities of the FSU English Education faculty.

This approach was popular with Regional Coordinators who were largely freed from the responsibility of observing our students. We utilized that approach until 1981 when the University System returned to the semester system, and further funding constraints were mandated. During that ten-year period, however, it served the program well. Of main concern to all programs in the College at that time, however, was the completion of a reorganization under the direction of Dean Fordyce. In that process, "departments" became "programs", which were in turn subsumed under three large "divisions". English Education was combined with Foreign Language Education (now titled "Multilingual/Multicultural Education"); Reading, and Elementary Language Arts and called "Language Education". This new configuration became part of a "Division of Instructional Design and Personnel Development (DIPID)", a grouping which yoked together more than a third of the College faculty. In this program framework, we competed with the other three erstwhile departments for faculty lines, graduate assistantships, space, secretarial and

student assistant support, and the small amount of discretionary funds allotted to us. The program faculty elected as leader, C. Glennon Rowell, Professor of Elementary Language Arts and Reading. A conscientious professional, Dr. Rowell did his best to distribute resources fairly during his five-year tenure as Leader.

The reorganizational structure became operational in Fall Quarter 1973. That year also saw the hiring of a new senior English Education faculty member, Dr. William J. (Jim) Hoetker. A Washington University of St. Louis Ph.D., Hoetker had held professorial rank in English at the University of Illinois. While there, Hoetker had spent most of this time participating in the Central Middle Education Regional English Laboratory, a federally funded regional research/development enterprise. When that center was disbanded in 1971, Hoetker sensed that the time had come to move on. His primary areas of interest were in the teaching of drama and the reconciliations of systems approach to English Language Arts curricula. He also displayed a keen interest in the utilization of computer technology in English instructional activity, an interest which would grow in the ensuing years.

Over the next 17 years, the English Education program carried on with three full-time faculty members. In 1975, Burton returned to teaching, from his administrative post, to become a department head. Our undergraduate offerings remained fairly constant over the years although we added an undergraduate secondary reading course mandated by the State Department of Education in 1974. In fact, the DOE asked me to generate a syllabus outline for that course, which was used in one form or another at all nine state universities for the next ten years. The undergraduate Teaching English Linguistics course suffered measurably during those

years. Both O'Donnell and Hunt had left. For a few years, it was taught by Michael Angelotti, a doctoral student and chairman of the Florida High English department. When he completed his doctorate under Burton and left for Texas Tech University later in the decade, I taught the language/language learning, a utility man/pinch hitter in the truest sense of the word.

During the decade we added a graduate level course in teaching writing in secondary schools, adding an undergraduate counterpart in 1978. We also changed the graduate offering "Contemporary Literature for Teachers" to "Reader Response to Literature" in 1976, and in 1979, added "Technology in the Teaching of English," a course then and now open to both undergraduate and graduate students. The graduate program limped along, populated by students who somehow scraped together the means of sustaining themselves while completing the Masters' and/or Doctoral degree. Most of the Masters' degree students were from local or nearby schools. We had some luminaries in that group, however, and their names and achievements are listed below:

1. Bryant Fillion, Ph.D., 1970; winner of an NCTE Research Award, to the U. of Illinois
2. Frank O'Hare, Ph.D., 1972, winner of another NCTE Research Award, eventually Director of Writing at Ohio State University
3. Dean Memering, 1973, Director of Writing, Central Michigan University
4. Albert Somers, 1973, Director of English Education, Furman University
5. Ronald Evans, 1973, Director of English Education, later acting Dean, University of West Florida

6. Margaret Howell, 1973, Supervisor of Language Arts and Reading, Pinellas County (Florida)
7. William Lewis, 1974, Director of English Education, University of Central Michigan
8. Vernon Roberts, 1975, Director of English Education, Kent State University (Ohio)
9. Albert Muller, 1975, Assistant Head of English, East Carolina University
10. Bessie (Pettigrew) Berman, 1976, Director of English Education, Winthrop College (South Carolina)
11. Mary Beth Culp, 1977, Director of English Education, University of South Alabama
12. Daniel McQuagge, 1977, Director of English Education, Delta State University (Mississippi)
13. Sarah M. Clemens, 1978, Head of English, now Provost, Chipola Junior College (Florida)
14. Charles A. Suhor, 1979, Deputy Executive Director, NCTE

In 1973, a graduate student completed his Master's degree and then followed a decidedly different career. Bernard Couvillion, a member of the Christian Brothers Order, and an English teacher at Brother Martin (Catholic) High School in New Orleans, joined three other members of his Order as beginning an MA students in English Education during the Summer Session of 1971. Eventually two of these Brother Martin English teachers finished their degrees and returned to their institutions. A third, H. Edward Deluzain, dropped out of the order, married an FSU

English Education graduate student, and finished his Ph.D., under my direction, in 1976.

Brother Couvillion, however, went to a position of eminence in the hierarchy of the Roman Catholic Church. As I write this, he is the Superior General of the Brothers of the Sacred Heart and has held that title for the past ten years. He presently resides in Rome where he is responsible for the establishment of Christian Brothers Schools worldwide, as well as the selection, training, and certifying of all Christian Brotherhood teachers. In a word, he is in charge of Catholic education in the grades below university level.

While Florida State's English Educators necessarily reduced their involvement in national professional activity, the State of Florida, through its 1972 Accountability Act, provided opportunities for lots of service, especially as related to literacy skills of young people and the re-education of the State's upper grade content area teachers in those areas. The Teacher Education Center (TEC) element of that Act allowed the several school districts in the State, individually or through the consortia among certain clusters of small counties, to use state funds in providing in-service training for classroom teachers at all levels. For the most part, those districts turned to large state universities to offer that instruction. The greatest demand made by those districts was in developmental and corrective reading, a need felt keenly by large numbers of middle, junior, and senior high classroom teachers whose undergraduate training in reading teaching had, by and large, been non-existent. The Florida branch of National Right to Read program, operating from the Department of Education, facilitated hundreds of workshops in every corner of Florida. My

background in secondary reading instruction was exploited fully in TEC work over the next eight years. Given the fact that monies for such service, at least at our institution, passed from the district to the central university administration, it should be clear that my extensive involvement did *not* lead to my financial enrichment; in fact, I was never paid for any of those labors.

Interest in enhancing literacy training for teachers, especially those at upper grade levels, was exacerbated by another feature of the Accountability Act: that of statewide testing. In 1972, groundwork was laid for the development and implementation of a three-phase testing instrument, objective in style, in the areas of Reading, Language, and Mathematical Computation. An additional proviso of this legislation was that the instrument would test the “Minimum Competencies” of Florida public school student at Grades three, five, eight, and elementary. Authors of the legislation added one further element to the testing structure, a “Functional Literacy” test to be completed by all grade 11 students, in addition to the Minimum Competency one. What distinguished this testing element from the others was the decision that a pre-determined score on the Functional Literacy test would be used as a credential in granting—of withholding—the high school diploma. Several civic groups, especially the NAACP, lobbied against this mandate. A true political hot potato, it was decided, *for* the State of Florida, at the Third U.S. District Court of Appeals in Atlanta in 1983.

The tests were development under a contract between the State and the Educational Testing Service in Princeton, N.J. They were finally completed and field tested in fall of 1977. For better or worse, they became the first such statewide multi-

grade level testing program ever administered in the U.S. And they served as a model: by 1980, all 50 states had in place, or were developing, a similar testing apparatus.

Given the fact that two of the three Basic Competencies in all five tests were concerned with literacy, English and Reading Educators were soon in great demand by county administrators who sought assistance for their teachers in Reading, Language, and Writing. TEC money provided lots of assistance in underwriting such instruction. The chief State official responsible for the entire operation was Ralph D. Turlington, long-time Florida House of Representatives member from Alachua County. A Harvard MBA, Turlington had established himself as an authority in funding public education during his 24 years in the House. In 1973, he had been appointed Acting Commissioner of Education by then-Governor Reuben Askew and won the post handily in the election of 1974. On a personal note, I had been asked to work on the 1974 campaign, mostly as a speech writer, by Francis N. (Pete) Millett, Jr., an old Massachusetts friend whom Turlington had appointed as his second-in-command when first assuming the Commissioner's post in 1973.

The testing mania grew in intensity in the middle of the decade. In 1977, with all in place, questions arose from educators as to the validity of the test instruments. Of the voluminous concerns raised, several were leveled at the reading and writing components. Some of the more troubling inquiries were:

1. Was the "Language" segment of 3rd, 5th, 8th, and 11th grade Minimum Competencies set really about "Language". Its contents seemed to reveal knowledge of reading vocabulary and writing. In terms of *Language* per se, it

dwelted on the nomenclature of Latinate (“traditional”) grammar and had nothing to do with linguistic processes. (Little wonder: the test items were constructed by psychometricians with no input from linguists or psycholinguists.)

2. Was the claim that the Language segment truly related to a student’s *writing* skills? This became an issue of increased concern, given the fact that, in responding to this segment, students were not required to *write the first word*.
3. What was the origin of the content reflected in the tests? Clearly, it was *not* extrapolated from the subject matter which made up the bulk of course materials traditionally taught in Florida schools, grades 5-12.
4. Were the levels of reading difficulty in the tests, as analyzed by the most basic readability formulae (Dala/Chall, Spache, Fry), commensurate with their test counterparts? Those 11th grade segments, Minimum Competency and Functional Literacy, ranged from 4th to 6th grade. This was not lost on those critics who charged that none of the tests truly reflected the reading abilities of Florida students at those four grade levels.
5. Did the Functional Literacy test truly measure those reading capacities? It purposed to measure those reading skills needed to participate successfully in the everyday tasks of adults. In fact, the content was little more than an extension of that found in the other tests. This issue was a particularly critical one given the fact that this test score had been included as a credential for graduation.

The writing element of literacy, as “tested”, in the instruments first used in

1977, was subjected to increasing scrutiny in the years that followed. The change in label from *Language* to *Writing* in 1976 only exacerbated the problem. National attention on the apparent composition deficiencies of young people was brought into the limelight, to a considerable degree, by the publication on December 8, 1975 of *Newsweek* magazine. The cover story in that issue was, “Why Johnny Can’t Write” and presented a scathing indictment of writing instruction in the U.S. Focusing on abysmally low writing scores yielded by the 1976 *National Assessment of Educational Progress* (NAEP) test of students’ academic abilities, grades 3, 6, 9, and 12 (with a complementary set of scores made by a cohort of volunteer adults) the conclusion was reached that this was indeed a glaring weakness. This contention was further supported by the decline, 20-year decline in writing abilities of young people stated by the authors of the *Scholastic Aptitude Test*. A lengthy, pointed summary of the inadequacies in current upper grade writing instruction, as well as the slipshod methods used to evaluate students’ writing, painted a dreary picture of that very basic educational mission. The uproar, from the U.S. Congress, many state legislatures, and large numbers of aroused citizens was loud and intensely critical.

In Florida, a legislature ostensibly committed to educational accountability/enhancement responded, led by the energetic Miami Beach, State Senator Jack Gordon. In early 1978, the Assessment/Evaluation Bureau of the DOE began work on a “Product Writing Test”, borrowing on some pioneering work in that endeavor begun earlier in California. A consultant from the University of South Florida was joined, and then supplanted, by FSU’s Drs. Brossell and Hoetker who set about redesigning the instrument, with particular emphasis on those topics most

germane to the lives, scholastic and otherwise, of young people, who would write about them as part of the testing procedure.

Legislation on the writing component of public education in Florida, spearheaded by Senator Gordon, was enacted through the late 1970's and on into the next decade. Brossell and Hoetker became involved in the carrying out of those initiatives and provided a good deal of research data generated by early field testing of the Product Writing component. For the next five to eight years, their stamp could be found on most of the writing research and development promulgated by the Florida Department of Education.

Service to the State, in addition to English Education's contribution to TEC instruction, declined during the 1970's, largely due to the travel restrictions caused by reduced budgets. In 1969-70, I served as President of FCTE.¹⁷ I was awarded the Council's Honor Award in 1972 and continued to serve in a variety of capacities throughout the remainder of the decade and beyond. Three of our doctoral graduates, Gail West (University of Central Florida) in 1974; Gerri Turbow (Duval County Public Schools) in 1975; and Mike Angelotti (who returned from Texas Tech to preside) in 1976 added an FSU English Education touch to the leadership of that organization. Lower district budgets caused by the general economic slowdown of the 1970's had an impact, but a smaller, still-functioning Florida Council continued to meet and publish its *Newsletter* and *Florida English Journal* through those hard times.

¹⁷ The 1969 annual conference of Florida Council of Teachers of English (FCTE) at Daytona Beach, over which I presided was quite sparsely attended, largely due to the fall-out from a statewide teacher walkout in 1968.

The English Education program did enter the technology arena during the decade of the 1970's. In 1975, the Exxon Foundation provided a grant for the conversion of a recent undergraduate course addition, Reading in Secondary Schools to a computerized format. The course, which I designed and English Education still owns, was introduced in 1974, becoming part of a legislatively mandated secondary certification requirement. Working with colleagues from the Instructional Design program, and with the help of two graduate assistants, I reconstructed the course into nine instructional modules to be entered into the computer system then located in FSU's Tully Gymnasium basement. In Spring Quarter, 1976, three sections of the course were listed in the University *Schedule of Classes*, two open to Florida State undergraduates, the other to a group from nearby Florida A & M. Students in all those sections could utilize any of the 28 stations available in Tully Computer Center from 8 AM to 5 PM, and work their way through the nine modules at their own pace. Commissioner Turlington spent an afternoon in May checking out the program. Exxon received the Final Report in fall 1976, and informed us that the project was judged to be a "success". No follow-up was ever attempted.

Budget constraints kept the English Education program members from extensive participation in professional organizations at the national level. I was appointed to the CEE Executive Committee from 1970 to 1973 and attended their annual Spring Conferences through the rest of the decade. The Career Education-Vocational Center at the University sponsored my NCTE travel from 1973-1975. When conferences were within reasonable proximity, several of us would negotiate the trip in someone's personal auto, dividing up the expenses. Through this tactic, a

few of our doctoral students were able to explore opportunities at those colleges and universities advertising vacancies in the field. The State Department writing grants secured by Drs. Brossell and Hoetker provided them with some travel funds over the last three years of the decade. I found it necessary to suspend my involvement with International Reading Association (IRA) for most of that period, although I had served on the editorial board of the *Journal of Reading* (now the *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*) from 1968-1970.

Another professional direction which originated in the 1970's was that of international activity. Although the IRA was "international" in scope, it was, from its beginnings in 1952, almost entirely American in leadership, publications, and conferencing. In 1974, however, I was invited by the US Department of Defense Schools to teach my secondary reading course to thirty U.S. teachers at high schools and middle schools in the European theater. We met for five weeks in July at Magdalen College, Oxford University in the English Cotswolds. For me, it was a most rewarding professional and cultural experience. Two years later, I assisted a friend and colleague, Dr. Robert Shafer of Arizona State University, in the founding of the International Assembly on the Teaching of English, a sub-group of NCTE, at the annual conference in Chicago. In fall quarter 1978, I was chosen to teach three undergraduate "straight English" courses at Florida State's London Study Center, an enterprise begun in 1973 and serving as a companion center to the University's Study Center in Florence, Italy, begun several years earlier. It would be an understatement to note that these opportunities whetted my appetite for teaching and research opportunities overseas. Finally, in spring 1979, I was invited to discuss the

“American Point of View” on English teaching at a meeting of the newly formed International Federation on the Teaching of English. An Australian based enterprise, this second meeting was held in Ottawa, Canada, on the campus of Charlton University, and was attended by representatives of ten countries from the English speaking world.

In 1975, Burton published his third (and final) edition of *Literature Study in the High Schools*. Drs. Hoetker and Brossell published a number of research reports and analyses from their work on various State sponsored writing research and development activities, a commitment which lasted through the next decade. With co-authors Robert Shafer and (former FSU doctoral student) Gail West, I published the methods text, *Decisions About the Teaching of English* (Allyn Bacon) in 1976. In 1977, I was chief curriculum consultant on a four-volume paperback American literature text by Scholastic, Inc. I was also retained by that company as an editorial board member of their high school magazine, *Literary Cavalcade*, an appointment which lasted until 1988. In 1979, I co-authored *Reading with a Purpose*, a senior high work text on functional literary skills, with Harcourt Brace Jovanovich. My co-author, Deputy Commissioner Millett, used his background as an attorney to guide the authenticity of that production’s language.

The tumultuous events of the first half of the 1970’s culminated in the Presidential election, in 1976, of a little known Georgia governor, Jimmy Carter. While his intentions were genuine, the new President’s performance in office was ineffectual. Double digit inflation had a deleterious effect on the economy, and wrangling with the Democratic Congress didn’t help. The President handled the U.S.

turnover of the Panama Canal Zone clumsily. His televised addresses to the American people on that decision didn't go over well. In 1978, the Republican Party scored major gains in the Congress, in gubernatorial races, and in state legislatures. Meanwhile, the Carter administration provided very little help to public education. His Health, Education and Welfare Secretary, Joseph Califano, was fixated on his crusade to end cigarette smoking in the United States which, while worthwhile, did nothing to restore any of the Great Society Education support which we all sorely missed.

The English Education program, along with *all* programs housed in the FSU College of Education, went through another reorganization in 1978. When President Marshall completed his 1974 University restructuring, he had placed clusters of colleges under one of seven divisions. Each division was led by a Provost, and Dean Fordyce became one of these seven leaders. Taking his place as Dean of the COE was Dr. James L. "Jack" Gant, who moved over from a position in the State bureaucracy. After receiving his undergraduate degree from Florida A & M University, Gant went to work in the Department of Education. While there, he completed his Ph.D. in Higher Education at FSU in 1972. In the summer of 1974, he became the first African-American to be named to a deanship at FSU. He soon set about dismantling the division arrangement and, in 1978, inaugurated six large departments of roughly equal size in terms of faculty members. His reorganization was approved by recently appointed University president, Dr. Bernard L. Sliger.

President Marshall had resigned in 1976. At that time, the University faced a severe financial crisis. The athletic program was in shambles, faculty morale, as

reflected by a 1975 Faculty Senate sponsored survey with heavy blame placed on the central administration. A further fact was the vote of the Florida State faculty for representation under the United Faculties of Florida, an AFL-CIO subgroup, in the University-wide Collective Bargaining ballot of 1975. President Marshall and his followers lobbied for a “No Agent” option, and when all nine state universities chose (some by wide margins) UFF as bargaining agent, it was clear that, at least at FSU, confidence in President Marshall’s leadership had greatly diminished. Dr. Sliger had come from the Business vice presidency at Louisiana State University and had been appointed Executive Vice President in 1973. He became the permanent president in 1977 and served in that position until his retirement in 1990.

As a result of the Gant reorganization, English Education became a program in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction which housed all subject area teacher education programs within the College whose undergraduate emphasis was in preparation of upper grade levels.¹⁸ English Education was represented by four professors: Burton, Brossell, Hoetker, and myself. When Burton was elected the first C & I Department Head, his services as an instructor, supervisor, and advisor were substantially lost to the program. The courses taught, both at the undergraduate and graduate levels, continued. One casualty, however, was the movement of the secondary reading course to the Reading and Special Education Department. I continued to teach those courses and was given a joint appointment in reading.

The death knell of the Carter Presidency was sounded in 1979 when Shiite

¹⁸ Many undergraduate teacher education programs existed, in areas of study outside the COE. Among them were Speech, Music, Nursing, Industrial Arts, Theater, Library, Home Economics, Art, and some smaller ones.

Muslim extremists, led by their fanatical Iranian mullahs, invaded the U.S. Embassy in Tehran. They made 44 American diplomatic employees their hostages. These prisoners were detained until January 1981. In the interim, Ronald Reagan, an outspoken conservative, former Hollywood actor and California governor, defeated Jimmy Carter in a 1980 landslide, to become the next U.S. President. On that November night, seven moderate-to-liberal U.S. senators (Birch Bayh from Indiana, Gaylord Nelson from Wisconsin, John Culver from Iowa, George McGovern from South Dakota, Herman Talmadge from Georgia, Frank Church from Idaho, and Warren Magnuson of Washington) were all turned out of office. As the new President claimed, it was “Morning in American.” Ironically, Florida bucked the rising conservative tide of the latter half of the decade. In 1978, former State Senator Bob Graham, a staunch pro-education politician followed the pro-education Reubin Askew to the Governor’s mansion in Tallahassee. Elected as well, to a second term, was Ralph Turlington. Together, those two advocates would lead the fight for education enhancement in Florida for the next eight years.

During this disappointing decade, one event took place which would eventually prove to be a shot in the arm for hundreds of Florida teachers although its direct effects would not be felt until midway through the 1980’s. In 1974 at the University of California at Berkeley, James Gray, a former high school English teacher and then a lecturer in the School of Education, came up with a new idea. Disappointed in what he labeled the “top-down” writing strategies proposed in most Project English curricula, he proposed a new staff development program. In the summer of 1974, with help from the Ford Foundation and the National Endowment

for the Humanities, he brought together twenty-two what he called “exemplary” secondary and elementary classroom teachers on the Berkeley campus. There he conducted the inaugural session of the Bay Area Writing Project. The major tenets of this writing workshop were:

1. Teachers who teach writing should themselves be **(can't read word)**
2. Teachers have a wealth of ideas for writing instruction which they should be given the opportunity to share with others
3. Teachers can read and ingest published research about writing. They should also initiate action research on the teaching and evaluation of writing and should share those data with peers on a regular basis
4. Once they have completed their summer workshop, teachers should share what they have learned with those employed at their schools, and building principals should support these in-service efforts.

The Bay Area Project enjoyed immediate and widely heralded success.

Despite the lack of traditional funding sources (USOE, Ford Foundation, etc.) the Project spread rapidly across the country. In all probability, its “we’ll do it on a shoestring” determination became one of its most compelling features. Eventually, it became the National Writing Project and did receive more support from the National Endowment for the Humanities. Moreover, local and district school officials, once they learned of the Project’s nationwide popularity with classroom teachers (especially those at the elementary school level), lobbied their school boards and local business establishments for small donations. Universities formed partnerships with groups of teachers who were, in fact, the primary initiators of virtually all of the new

chapters. Those involved universities also provided meeting sites for the summer institutes and usually funded an interested faculty member to act as co-director, and facilitator of both the summer program and its regular meetings during the ensuing school year. From the outset, however, this was an in-service enterprise for the teachers, of the teachers, and by the teachers.

Over the next 15 years, the program reached state school systems, large and small. As stated in an internationally popular text, published in 1990:

This in-service model of education has now expanded to more than 150 sites in 43 states and 7 foreign countries. Approximately 2,000 teachers are trained each summer in NWP summer institutes and in turn they train more than 70,000 each year. More than a decade later, the effects of the NWP are being described and lauded: in a 1984 article, Mark F. Goldberg maintains that the National Writing Project “may well be the most successful in-service effort in history”; The Council for Basic Education has endorsed the NWP as “perhaps the most successful and certainly the most far-reaching of all the recent initiatives to improve the condition of writing in American schools and colleges.” (*Teaching and Learning English Worldwide*, edited by James Britton, Robert E. Shafer, and Ken Watson. Clevedon, Avon England: Multilingual Matters LTD, 1990, p. 120)

One final reflection of the Project’s impact: in 1985, James Gray was asked to preside over the inauguration of a British NWP. At a meeting of international educators held at the University of East Anglia in Norwich, England (March 1985), Gray welcomed UK counterparts to this writing enhancement movement—a bit of a

turnaround from past initiatives.

In 1983, Helen Guttinger, a former high school adjunct teacher and professor of education at the University of Florida's P.K. Yonge Laboratory School, together with a group of North Central Florida classroom teachers, established a National Writing Project Summer Institute on the University of Florida Gainesville campus. More on this activity in the next chapter.

The decade of the 1970's marked a decided diminution of English Educators' participation in national enterprises, at Florida State and indeed across the United States. When the heretofore general Federal support for most literacy based research and development efforts evaporated, most states, their budgets already stretched by inflationary factors, were unable to take up the slack. Innovative curricular ventures, such as Project English and the EXTFP were axed early in the decade. Thus support for new doctoral student shrank drastically and faculty presence in national conferencing was greatly curtailed. But the FSU program endured. The national reputation it had gained over the past 20 years continued to attract those graduate students who could find support hither and yon. Contributions to the State's school districts, through TEC and Writing Assessment channels maintained its strong reputation among Florida's English teachers. Finally, by 1978, English Education programs in four of the State's eight other universities were being maintained by English Education Ph.D.'s from Florida State University. Thus as the next decade began, the program continued on, bloodied but unbowed.

Chapter IV - 1980's: Return of Some Old Standbys

For the nation and indeed the State of Florida, the decade began on a high note. The people elected Ronald Reagan as President of the US in a landslide. The hostages came home. The wasteful, meandering remains of the Great Society programs were put to rest. To an apparent majority, it was time once again to feel pride in being an American and, particularly, to return to the paths of rugged individualism.

In a very real sense, this new optimism, commingled with a kind of yearning for (at least some aspects of) the “good old days”, produced some new pressures on American schooling in general and prevalent English Education philosophy in particular. Some of the watchwords of the previous decade, among them “*Minimum Competencies*” (italics mine), the Right to Read, Career Education, and especially Functional Literacy were quickly disparaged. The somewhat pedestrian curricular directions of the 1970's no longer represented Ronald Reagan's America. Soon, the goal of intellectual and cultural enhancement took center stage. This radical change in direction happened with both abruptness and intensity. Clearly, to keep up with this rapid shift in emphases, the English Education program at Florida State needed to abandon some of its earlier mission statements and approaches and move in a whole new direction. Unlike the pressure for excellence which marked the Kennedy-Johnson years, this movement was *not* accompanied by a host of federally sponsored funding programs which would provide aid and encouragement to this sudden about-face.

The Reagan administration brought in a cadre of cultural elitists who set to work at once to do away with an educational philosophy dedicated to placing help for the less fortunate on the far back burner. Commissioner Terrel Bell immediately established a task force under John Gardner which, in 1981, produced a document titled *A Nation at Risk*. This report became required reading throughout the fifty states. It decried a nation's educational system "drowning in a sea of mediocrity" and urged a rededication to the quest for "excellence" in public school curricula. That report was followed in 1983 with a text edited by the esteemed former commissioner Ernest Boyer, underwritten by the Carnegie Foundation, and titled *High School*. As did the Gardner report, *High School* painted a picture of a minimum competency upper grade curriculum and called for the re-institution of high academic standards in the secondary schools of the nation.

As these reports were having their impact on the several state education establishments, Commissioner Bell was laying the groundwork for the cultural literacy. He appointed William Bennett to head the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH). Armed with data from the second NAEP report, which reflected declining scores in reading, history, literature and writing (among others), Bennett began an intensive campaign to raise the cultural and intellectual levels of public school curricula, grades K-14. For this endeavor, he recruited a group of conservative academics: Diane Ravitch, Chester Finn, Lyn Cheney, and a Yale professor of hermeneutics named E. D. Hirsch, Jr. Bennett was the senior author of the 1984 NEH pamphlet, *To Reclaim a Legacy*, whose main thrust was to reveal the dramatic decline in the academic content of high school programs of study. The thesis of all position

papers emanating from the NEH in the early 80's was that the egalitarian minimum competency/functional literacy apostles of the previous fifteen years had led to a near obliteration of curricula which introduced and emphasized the cultural heritage of Western civilization to the youth of the country. The followers of Bell and Bennett related this decline to the downward spiral of US productivity and success on world economic markets: i.e., Japanese and West German business leaders had surpassed the Americans in their markets largely due to the vigorous curricula which they imposed on their children and adolescents.

One of Bennett's primary targets in his 1984 publication was the gross, even sinful ineptness of Colleges of Education as they attempted to train truly qualified public school teachers. The introductory blast from his chapter titled "Schools" presents eloquent testimony of his sentiments:

"The only thing I remember from my teacher preparation is getting through it," says history teacher Howard Safier of Fairfax High School in Los Angeles. "It was worthless, almost worthless."

For decades, countless teachers across the country have been making similar complaints. Although they agree almost universally that carefully supervised practice teaching is valuable, and although many can recall an education course or two—usually taught by someone with recent classroom experience—that offered useful insights, teachers repeatedly speak of time wasted when they describe their professional preparation. They view many of the requirements imposed upon them as arbitrary and unjustified, and analysts of American education have long agreed. In the 1950's, historian Arthur

Bestor, in a sustained critique, called teacher preparation “a fraud upon the teachers themselves and upon society as a whole.” In the 1960’s, an educator James B. Conant concluded that certification procedures, which require prospective teachers to complete specific courses in education, were “bankrupt.”

Nonetheless, people who wish to be teachers in our public schools are still required to take courses that many deem useless. A researcher who recently interviewed a group of teachers-to-be noted that none of them objected to being pulled out of classes in education in order to answer his questions. “They agreed,” the researcher reported, “that the classes didn’t matter much.”

How is it that we have so long prepared our teachers in ways that so many find inadequate? Part of the answer lies in the way teacher education evolved in the United States. The nineteenth-century academies and normal schools that provided the first programs for prospective teachers grew up outside the American college system. Liberal arts faculties had little interest in teacher preparation; and even when normal schools transformed themselves into colleges, and even when colleges and universities introduced education curricula, coursework aimed at preparing teachers remained apart from other programs.

Separated from the rest of the higher education enterprise, education faculties advanced the idea that theirs was a separate discipline with a distinct body of knowledge. The courses that came to comprise the teacher education

curriculum did little, however, to make that body of knowledge seem substantial. A survey conducted in the 1930s showed a high level of discontent with education courses on the part of non-education faculty members, who said that separate courses in education were a waste and that future teachers could better spend their time in general studies or in study of the subjects they would teach. But complaints were of no avail. By the time of the survey, most states had made courses in education mandatory for certification. The idea of education as a unique discipline that all who would teach should study had been institutionalized in the most powerful way possible: It had been given the force of law.

Textbooks used to teach education courses today show why there is frequent discontent with the way teachers are prepared. Attempting to make a little material go a long way, the writers of these textbooks typically parse the subject matter finely so that it can be presented in different ways on different but nonetheless repetitious lists. What is simple is made complicated. Suppose a teacher wants to show children how to use the directory that is on the front page of most newspapers. According to one textbook, there are *twelve* different steps involved in teaching and applying such a skill.

Borrowing subjects from fields in which they are not expert, textbook writers often reduce subtle interpretations to arbitrary categories. They tell future teachers that there are exactly *four* types of thinking or *three* ways of developing concepts. Controversial—even obviously incorrect—ideas are made to appear as though there were no debate about them. Setting a good

example, one textbook declares, is not an effective way to teach values.

(William Bennett, *To Reclaim a Legacy*. Washington, D.C.; National Endowment for the Humanities, 1984, p. 41)

Thus the attacks on colleges of education which had died out by the late 1950's were renewed as the new decade began. Such criticism could be heard in the State of Florida kindled this time by the prominent legislator Jack Gordon, an individual already noted for his leadership on education matters. Actually, Gordon's charges were specifically leveled against Colleges of Education at the University of Florida and Florida State. As Chairman of the Florida Senate Ways and Means Committee, Gordon called for the abolition of those two Colleges in April 1980, as reported in the Tallahassee *Democrat*:

Gordon Takes Aim at FSU, UF Programs

Sen. Jack Gordon, D-Miami Beach, Monday called for the abolition of education colleges at Florida State University and the University of Florida.

Under the plan Gordon offered, an amount of money equal to the 1980-81 education college budgets at FSU and UF would be available for the universities' colleges of arts and sciences to use for quality improvements.

The proposal, included in a bill now being filed, reflects Gordon's well-known belief that programs in the university system should better respond to the needs of the state's urban centers.

"I think it's insane for FSU to send interns to (South Florida) . . .to get some taste of what it's like to teach at a major metropolitan area," said Gordon, the chairman of the Senate Ways and Means Committee.

He is recommending phasing out the education colleges by 1985. Neither FSU nor UF would offer any doctoral or bachelor's degrees in education after that time.

However, master's programs in teaching would be established at the colleges of arts and sciences at FSU and UF.

That way, Gordon said, school boards could choose between graduates with teacher training limited to the master's level, and those who had teacher training at the undergraduate level.

Currently, all nine state universities, most of which are located in areas more populous than Tallahassee or Gainesville, have colleges of education. Gordon would not abolish the education school at Florida A & M University, he said, because it is "service-oriented."

"And if in fact there was any need for education in that area, why no A & M?" he asked.

One FSU official Monday said he was not ready to respond to Gordon's suggestion that an amount of money the size of this budget year's education budget--more than \$4 million—be used for quality improvements elsewhere in the university.

"This is a new idea to us. We haven't seen his proposal and I'm sure we'll be looking at it with interest," said Pat Hogan, FSU's vice president for university relations.

George Bedell, a vice chancellor for the university system, commented: "You have to hand it to Sen. Gordon. He has a very fertile

imagination . . . I think a key question would be whether students who go to the residential institutions such as UF and FSU shouldn't have the opportunity to choose teacher education as a major."

Officials in the education schools at FSU and UF contended that their programs were of value to the state. Limiting offerings to a master's teaching degree, they said, is not educationally wise.

"The state has made a major investment in the facilities at Florida State University and it is a good place in which to train teachers," said Russell Kropp, director of planning and a professor at FSU's College of Education.

"We draw students from all over the state. It's not a local undertaking with local students."

Emmett Williams, an associate dean of education at UF, argued that teacher training was valuable at the undergraduate level and that dismantling highly developed colleges at FSU and UF would be far from a simple matter.

"We don't want to get into a brawl with (Sen. Gordon), but we do want to talk to him" Williams said.

According to Regents figures, last year 16,269 Florida students enrolled in the state's education colleges at the undergraduate and graduate levels.

FSU has more than 1,200 undergraduate education majors, Kropp estimated. At UF the number exceeds 900.

When informed of Gordon's proposal, Rep. Herb Morgan, D-Tallahassee, said he wondered whether the senator was "stirring the pot" of urban dissatisfaction with the state's allocation of educational facilities.

Morgan predicted the proposal would not pass the Legislature.

"There's no need to stir the pot," Gordon said. "The pot's boiling very hard. The questions of equity for urban higher education are becoming clearer every day." (Jonathan Peterson, "Gordon Takes Air at FSU, UF Programs," *Tallahassee Democrat*, April 11, 1980, p. 24)

Soon after raising these charges, Gordon introduced a bill in the Florida Legislature whose purpose was just that. Since the Legislature meets in Tallahassee, the Miami Beach Senator was invited to campus, a challenge to which he responded readily. His May 15th campus speech was reported in the University newspaper:

Abolish the FSU Education School? A "Yes" and a "No"

Sen. Jack Gordon stepped briefly into the den of lions yesterday. In a speech on the campus of Florida State University, Gordon attacked Florida's system of higher education and defended a bill he sponsors that would strip the university of its school of education.

Gordon's bill would also abolish the school of education at the University of Florida, replacing both with master of arts in teaching programs. The MAT would require four years of education in the liberal arts, followed by a single year of education courses.

“Local school boards ought to have a choice,” Gordon told his audience, “of hiring people educated in a subject or trained in the methodology of teaching.” Gordon feels that the MAT would improve the quality of Florida teachers by strengthening their background in the liberal arts. (Brad Liston, *Florida Flambeau*, Tallahassee, Florida, May 11, 1980, pgs. 1,2)

The articles went on to report the immediate response from James L. (Jack) Gant who was by then in his sixth year as Dean of the COE at Florida State:

“Disastrous” was the term Jack Gant, dean of FSU’s College of Education, used to describe the implications of Gordon’s bill. “Professional schools are important to have,” said Gant. “If it’s a profession then it needs to have a school, the same as you have in medicine, law, engineering or whatever.”

Abolishment of the two schools marked for extinction under his bill would still leave Florida with nine schools of education at other universities, Gordon told is (sic) campus audience.

Gant, however, feels that the education school here is one of the best in the country. He points out that only five schools in the state have national accreditation, and two of them would be eliminated under Gordon’s bill.

According to information supplied by Gordon’s office, the bill would eliminate one-third of the education bachelor degrees now being awarded in the state. In his speech, Gordon said that the market is flooded with education.

Gant does not buy that, pointing to a projected shortage of teachers in the mid-1980s. He feels that it would be foolish to eliminate programs when they might have to be reactivated in a few years. “A human service institution takes time to mature,” he said.

Gant also disagrees with Gordon’s idea that a liberal arts education should take precedence over education training. Gant pointed to several areas of professional education that are not covered by the liberal arts: (1) elementary education, especially the psychological development of people in their early years (2) special education training. Gant feels this is particularly important because the federal government is requiring that schools pay particular attention to the handicapped (3) vocational education training and (4) the training of school administrators.

Gant hinted that Gordon may only be posturing with his bill for political gain, but he added that the posturing may further damage the reputation of Florida’s education system, even if the bill is defeated or abandoned. “When a respected person, a legislator, attacks programs like this, the public has to think that there’s something wrong. The evidence doesn’t suggest that.”

Gordon’s comments yesterday were not restricted to his education school bill, however. He also attacked several aspects of Florida’s higher education.

In supporting the liberal arts, Gordon also criticized the current stress put on career-oriented educations. “Selecting education because of its

marketplace value is a distortion. I'm opposed to professional education on the baccalaureate level." Very few people make a career of what they go to school for anyway, said Gordon. "We ought to take advantage of the opportunity to learn something about the world and about ourselves before we start training for what we'll do for a living."

Gordon is also the sponsor of a bill that would eliminate all graduate programs at FSU. "Graduate education is vocation education with all the negative connotations that has," he said. "Reasonably we should not spend a great deal of time and money on specific vocational programs whether they call you a doctor afterwards or not."

Gant is also concerned about what would become of his faculty if their school is abolished. "I don't even want to think about that disaster. As I read the UFF contract, it appears that if a program is terminated then the faculty can be dismissed. They lose their tenure."

Gordon offered no answers to that one. ("Abolish the FSU Education School? A 'Yes' and a 'No'", *Tallahassee Democrat*, May 12, 1980)

Senator Gordon's powerful stature in the Legislature of the early 1980s made this threat a genuine one. He had already pushed through a mandate for high school English classes to be restricted to 100 students per day (with the proviso that students write one evaluated-and-saved piece of writing per week). He had single-handedly made the Gordon Rule: that in certain designated courses, student in community colleges and public universities produce a minimum of 54,000 words of written prose.

Finally, he established Academic Achievement Awards to be presented annually to those eleventh grade students who won statewide competition in Science, Math, History, and Writing. The prizes came in the form of substantial scholarship stipends.

For all of the above, the Miami Beach banker/senator gained national recognition. In 1982, at its Fall Conference in San Antonio, NCTE recognized Senator Gordon for meritorious service to the teaching of English. All of the above led to two inferences to be drawn: (1) that Jack Gordon was a staunch defender of the English teaching endeavors nationally, and (2) that he didn't think much of the quality of COE-based English teacher training efforts at UF or FSU.

Alumni from the teaching ranks, both Florida and Florida State graduates, voiced strong opposition both to Gordon's criticisms and his drafted legislation. Political figures throughout the state, also with "old school" degrees, vowed to oppose the closing of the two colleges. Several of them expressed their perception that Gordon wanted to move the power base of the Universities to the Lower East Coast as part of his overall mission in displacing State leadership agencies, especially from Tallahassee. (He had often been heard to profess the belief that "the majority of services should go to the majority of customers" and that he didn't comprehend why two State universities existed in "*hick towns*". (italics mine) With the Legislators from Central and South Florida making their presence increasingly felt, the threat Gordon posed in 1980 was one for real concern, both in Gainesville and Tallahassee. In a lead article, published on May 13th, the *Tallahassee Democrat* reported:

Senate Panel Votes To Eliminate FSU College

Florida State University's College of Education moved a step closer to being abolished Monday when a Senate committee approved a bill that would start phasing out the college next year.

Despite strong opposition by Education Commissioner Ralph Turlington and FSU Education Dean James Gant, the bill passed the Senate Education Committee by a 4-3 vote.

In other action, the committee unanimously approved a comprehensive higher-education bill that would cut, but not eliminate, the governing power of the Board of Regents.

However, the House Higher Education Committee Monday prepared a plan that would abolish the Board of Regents and create boards of trustees at each state university to assist the university president in day-to-day operations.

A conference committee is expected to be called to reach a compromise on the two proposals.

The education school bill, sponsored by Sen. Jack Gordon, D-Miami Beach, would close the colleges of education at FSU and the University of Florida, cutting the number of statewide education bachelor degrees by about one-third.

The money currently used by those programs, according to the bill, would be used instead to build a master of arts in teaching program at the two universities.

Gordon said he proposed the measure to encourage prospective teachers to pursue undergraduate degrees in subjects other than education before getting master's degrees in education.

That, he said, would improve the quality of teaching in the state's public school system.

"We need to turn the school system around," he said.

But Gant told the committee that abolishing the education schools would be counter-productive.

"A time when you need better schools is not a time to talk about getting rid of two of the best colleges of education in the system," Gant said.

Proponents of the bill said it would cut back on an oversupply of teachers currently being produced by the state's nine colleges of education.

But Gant said that by cutting the number of teachers from which school systems can choose, the Legislature would be ensuring lower-quality teachers.

"A system would have to take any warm body that came to it," he said after the hearing. "That's a horrible way to improve a system."

Currently, more than 3,000 students are enrolled in FSU's College of Education and 2,624 are enrolled at UF's. About 17,000 students are enrolled in colleges of education statewide.

According to Gordon's bill, the two education schools would begin a four-year phase-out program in September 1981.

Then, starting in September 1982, both schools would be required to establish a master of arts in teaching program in their colleges of arts and sciences.

Because many legislators are alumni of FSU or UF, the bill is expected to meet strong opposition on the Senate floor and in the House.

Gordon said the switch would cost taxpayers nothing.

Concerning the regents' bill, the Senate version would strip the regents of their current role as long-range planner for state universities, but allow the regents to continue to supervise the university system.

Under the bill, the number of regents would be increased from 10 to 13.

The House bill abolishes the Board of Regents and the Community Colleges Coordinating Council and strips the Cabinet of all responsibilities over colleges, universities and vocational education.

It is scheduled for a final committee vote Wednesday. (Neil Chethik, "Senate Panel Votes To Eliminate FSU College", *Tallahassee Democrat*, May 13, 1980, p.3B)

Let it be stated at this juncture that senior COE faculty members, myself included, were very uneasy as the Gordon initiative began its journey to Legislative action. In all candor, Dean Gant had neither substantial background nor great interest in teacher education. He was never an effective advocate in the ongoing debate. Moreover, the newly appointed Provost, Dr. Robert Lawton was not a particularly

enthusiastic defender of our programs either. An English Ph.D., a “49’er”,¹⁹ and former Dean of Arts and Sciences, his support for the College in general and English Education in particular could be, at best, characterized as lukewarm. President Sliger made little public comment on the possible loss of the College. Luckily, two major adversaries stood foursquare against Gordon’s proposal: Education Commissioner Ralph Turlington and State Senator Kenneth R. (Buddy) MacKay. The latter, a highly respected Legislator, was, at that time, Chairman of both the Senate Education and Appropriations Committees. While Senator MacKay provided inhibiting moves in his chamber, Commissioner Turlington, who had been a member of the Florida House of Representatives for almost a quarter of a century, used his considerable influence with that body to stymie Gordon’s efforts. According to Turlington’s assistant, Mr. Millett, the Gordon Bill would never have found its way to the floor of each Legislative branch. Finally, it should be noted that both Ralph Turlington and Buddy MacKay were Gators, (U. of Florida) loyal to the core. Even the most loyal Seminole (FSU) members of the COE faculty, staff, and alumni were deeply in their debt. Still, the Gordon proposal remained alive and kicking into the final days of the 1980 Legislature. Witness the May 27th *Democrat* article:

Plan Would Kill State Colleges of Education

¹⁹The name *49’ers* referred to a group of (mostly) Arts and Sciences professors who came to FSU in the late 40s and gave the impression that their leadership approached *noblesse oblige* status.

In an attempt to upgrade the quality of Florida public-school teachers, a Senate committee Tuesday agreed to study the possibility of abolishing all nine state-run education schools.

Sen. Jack Gordon's proposal to begin phasing out the colleges of education at Florida State University and the University of Florida in 1982, and at seven other education schools in 1983, easily passed the Senate Education Committee.

But committee members agreed to study Gordon's proposal and another one offered by Sen. Pat Frank, D-Tampa, before December and not bring them to the Senate floor until next year.

"We are not being able to select the best people (as teachers) because they are unwilling to put up with the nonsense and the Mickey Mouse of a college of education," said Gordon, D-Miami Beach.

The money currently used by the education schools would be used instead to build a master of arts in teaching program at FSU and UF, according to Gordon's bill.

Gordon said he proposed the measure to encourage prospective teachers to pursue undergraduate degrees in subjects other than education before getting master's degrees in education.

Frank's bill would not abolish education schools, but would require new teachers to take a fifth year of study after receiving their initial teaching certificate.

“His bill gets their (educators’) attention more directly,” Frank said in explaining the main difference between her bill and Gordon’s.

She said she agreed with Gordon that education schools were not hard enough. She said English majors, for example, were required to complete a far more rigorous curriculum than students majoring in English Education.

James Gant, FSU education dean, said he was glad to hear that the committee would study Gordon’s bill before acting on it. “That seems wise to me,” he aid

Gant agreed that some education programs should be expanded from four years to five. He said some FSU programs would be making that shift when FSU moves from the quarter system to semesters this fall.

“There’s no question that we need more time to train teachers,” he said. “But why abolish education schools?”

Gant said education students probably would demand better pay if they were required to spend an extra year in school before getting their certificates.

“If they put that much more time into training, there will be an expectation that they’ll be compensated for it,” Gant said.

Currently, FSU’s education school enrolls more than 2,500 students in undergraduate and graduate programs. UF enrolls about the same number of education students.

Under Gordon’s bill, education schools at FSU and UF would stop admitting students Sept. 1, 1982. The schools would close completely in 1986. Florida A & M University’s education school, along with the six other

state-run schools, would stop admitting students in 1983 and close their doors in 1987.

Frank said that members of the Senate Education Committee, college deans and faculty members would be involved in the upcoming study of the proposals. The Senate would review the report during the 1982 legislative session.

Frank said she didn't think the education schools would be abolished in the end.

"I think we'll probably keep the colleges," she said, "but they'll have a different role." (Nehl Chethik, *Tallahassee Democrat*, May 27, 1980, p. 1B)

Senator Frank's claim that "English majors, for example, were required to complete a far more rigorous curriculum than students majoring in English Education" was inaccurate, at least in terms of the curriculum followed at Florida State University. At that time, FSU students in the English Education track actually took a required core of academe English courses six hours greater than their counterparts in Arts and Sciences. And all undergraduates, in both majors, were required to take the same courses mandated by the Certification Track²⁰

Senator Frank's motives in creating her bill were quite transparent: with the teacher education program at UF and FSU out of the way, the leadership role in teacher education for the State of Florida would fall to the University of South Florida, a fact not lost on all of the Tampa Bay Legislators. Throughout this entire

debate, the high quality of both the undergraduate and graduate English Education programs at FSU was often used to rebut the arguments of Senators Gordon, Frank, and their Legislative followers. People who knew the FSU program well would pose arguments which were precise, accurate, and well documented, and this support was augmented by statements made by an imposing number of senior English department faculty, including former Chairs, Francis “Gib” Townsend and George Harper; and current chair, Fred Standley. The cooperative attitude discussed earlier in this chronicle was of great value in 1980.

Despite the failure of the Florida Legislature to disband the COEs from its two senior Universities, that body did display a propensity to follow the national trends as established by President Reagan’s educational brain trust. By 1983, a bill was passed whose intent was to heighten academic programs in the high schools across the State. Titled the RAISE Bill (Raise Academic Instruction in Secondary Education), it called for *all* high school students to complete four units of English, three of mathematics, three of science and two of social studies. For those applying for admission to *any* public institution of higher education in Florida, two years of a foreign language was added to those requirements. (Given the lack of *any* foreign language programs in many of the smaller school districts in the state, this requirement produced real hardship.) As if by the waving of a wand, minimal competencies were transformed into an academically enhanced program of studies statewide. And, as was so often the case, the Legislature provided no appreciable funds to assist the several districts in negotiating this considerable transition.

²⁰ In 1980, Master’s candidates in English Ed at FSU took a minimum of 24 quarter hours in graduate English, out of a total of 45; 9-12 in English Ed; and 6-9 in other Ed courses (Reading, Humanities,

The spearhead of this national uplifting of academic goals was Professor E.D. Hirsch, Jr., one of the rising stars in William Bennett's cadre at the National Endowment for the Humanities. Later in the decade, Hirsch's long-awaited text, *Cultural Literacy: What Every American Should Know* (Boston:Houghton Mifflin, 1987) was placed in the bookstores. Over time, time, it became one of the few "education" texts ever to make the Best Seller list. It was written while its author was a member of the Bennett/Cheney staff. It elevated him to the role of cultural guru of U.S. education and caused parent groups to form coast-to-coast, supporting his recipe for reform of the nation's schools.

In his *Preface*, Hirsch sounds the alarm voiced by several of the curricular critics already named in this chapter:

To be culturally literate is to possess the basic information needed to thrive in the modern world. The breadth of that information is great, extending over the major domains of human activity from sports to science. It is by no means confined to "culture" narrowly understood as an acquaintance with the arts. Nor is it confined to one social class. Quite the contrary, cultural literacy constitutes the only sure avenue of opportunity for disadvantaged children, the only reliable way of combating the social determinism that now condemns them to remain in the same social and educational condition as their parents. That children from poor and illiterate home tend to remain poor and illiterate is an unacceptable failure of our schools, one which has occurred not because our teachers are inept but chiefly because they are compelled to teach a fragmented curriculum based on faulty educational theories. Some say that

our schools by themselves are powerless to change the cycle of poverty and illiteracy. I do not agree. They can break the cycle, but only if they themselves break fundamentally with some of the theories and practices that education professors and school administrators have followed over the past fifty years. (E. D. Hirsch, Jr., Preface, *Cultural Literacy: What Every American Should Know* (Boston:Houghton Mifflin, 1987) p. xiii)

For Hirsch, the inculcation of the heritage must begin in early school years and continue through high school, at least for those who decide not to pursue their education further. In fact, he has stated the conviction that if the groundwork hasn't been substantially laid by grade 6 (age 11), no remedial work in upper grades could prove adequate. And, throughout the process of cultural literacy development, he insists on the need for considerable memorization to be demanded by all teachers and practiced by all students:

Children also need to understand elements of our literary and mythic heritage that are often alluded to without explanation, for example, Adam and Eve, Cain and Abel, Noah and the Flood, David and Goliath, the Twenty-third Psalm, Humpty Dumpty, Jack Sprat, Jack and Jill, Little Jack Horner, Cinderella, Jack and the Beanstalk, Mary Had a Little Lamb, Peter Pan and Pinocchio. Also Achilles, Adonis, Aeneas, Agamemnon, Antigone and Apollo, as well as Robin Hood, Paul Bunyan, Satan, Sleeping Beauty, Sodom and Gomorrah, the Ten Commandments, and Tweedledum and Tweedledee.

(This author notes the peculiar juxtaposition of the Twenty-third Psalm and Humpty Dumpty, and the Ten Commandments and Tweedledum and Tweedledee, albeit alphabetical.)

Our current distaste for memorization is more pious than realistic. At an early age when their memories are most retentive, children have an almost instinctive urge to learn specific tribal traditions. At that age they seem to be fascinated by catalogues of information and are eager to master the materials that authenticate their membership in adult society. Observe for example how they memorize the rather complex materials of football, baseball, and basketball, even without benefit of formal avenues by which that information is inculcated. (Hirsch, p. 30)

The memorization issue quickly became one of the most contentious to those who began to scrutinize Hirsch's manifesto. Another was the understandable suspicion that he was advocating a modern day elitism, as were his colleagues Bennett, Finn and Cheney (add to that list Boston University president, John Silber, who, in an earlier time, had been Bennett's mentor). To "elitist" and "memorization" charges, Hirsch had strong words:

Some have objected that teaching the traditional literate culture means teaching conservative material. Orlando Patterson answered that objection when he pointed out that mainstream culture is not the province of any single social group and is constantly changing by assimilating new elements and

expelling old ones. Although mainstream culture is tied to the written word and may therefore seem more formal and elitist than other elements of culture, that is an illusion. Literate culture cuts across generations and social groups and classes; it is not usually one's first culture, but it should be everyone's second, existing as it does beyond the narrow spheres of family, neighborhood, and region. (Hirsch, p. 21)

After making the case for cultural literacy as the needed direction of U.S. education, Hirsch offers some definitional perspective:

Having traced the nature of cultural literacy and shown its importance to national education, I want to consider the practical implications of the ideas I have set forth.

One immediate implication is that we have an obligation to identify and publish the contents of cultural literacy. It is reasonable to think that those contents can be identified explicitly, since they are identified implicitly by every writer or speaker who addresses the general public. If writers did not make tacit assumptions about the knowledge they could take for granted in their audiences, their writing would be so cumbersome as to defeat the aim of communication.

It is true that the specific content of the national literate vocabulary changes from year-to-year, even from day-to-day, as striking events catch national attention. But such changes are few when compared to the words and associations that stay the same. Of course, one literate person's sense of the

shared national vocabulary is not precisely identical with another's; individual experiences produce different assumptions in different people about shared knowledge. But these differences are insignificant compared to what is common in the systems of associations that we acquire by daily experiences of literate culture.

It's also true that we adapt our conjectures about what others know to particular circumstances. Obviously, the knowledge we assume when we talk to a young child is substantially different from that which we take for granted in addressing an educated adult, and we constantly make other adjustments to our audiences. But when we address a general audience we must assume that we are addressing a "common reader", that is, a literate person who shares with us a common body of knowledge and associations. Since we so frequently have to posit a common reader in writing or public speaking, it should be possible to reach a large measure of agreement about what the common reader knows. (Hirsch, pp. 134-5)

To actualize his curriculum, Hirsch developed over the next two years two dictionaries, one for children, the other for young adults, which spelled out the literary texts, the historical epochs, the geographic, the artistic and musical masterpieces about which "literate" Americans should have some knowledge. For the first two or three years, the dictionaries sold well. As this essay is written, however, they have largely disappeared from the shelves of commercial and university bookstores throughout the country.

In 1990, Hirsch created the Cultural Literacy Foundation, with generous federal and private funds, at the University of Virginia, where he holds an endowed chair in English. In 1991, the first of his *Cultural Literacy Texts, Grades One-Six* was published by Doubleday & Co. In fall of that year, an elementary school, Three Oaks, Fort Myers, Florida, began implementation of his program. The Three Oaks area of Fort Myers is largely white and affluent.

In March 1991, I wrangled an invitation to visit the Cultural Literacy Foundation in Charlottesville and, through my interview with Hirsch himself (only about 20 minutes), I did manage to spend a good deal of time with a few members of his staff who, being true believers, were most informative about the development and current status of the total enterprise. It was during that two-day interlude that I learned of the Three Oaks project, and in May of that year, I spent three days observing the classes in that elementary school, interviewing administrators and teachers, and reading through those materials which had been produced during the summer of 1990. Sadly, I was not able to take any of them with me for more thorough analysis.

Interestingly, Hirsch was totally unwilling to share his theory by speaking at national meetings of such interested organizations as NCTE, MLA, IRA, the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD), the National Reading Conference (NRC), the American Council of Learned Societies (ACLS), to name a few. Nor would he permit any of his Cultural Literacy Foundation staff to accept similar invitations. Instead, he claimed to expend his greatest efforts working with “Parent Groups”, which presumably existed throughout the U.S. When President George H. W. Bush was organizing his national forums on education in the

late 80s and early 90s, Professor Hirsch and his Cultural Literacy movement went unmentioned. During those years, Hirsch's mentor William Bennett had moved on from Commissioner of Education, to Drug Czar, and more recently a spokesperson for virtue—public and otherwise—in the US. In the following decade I had little to report about Hirsch, Cultural Literacy, or Three Oaks in my graduate seminar in English Education. By the end of the 20th century, it had become little more than a blip on the screen.

The 1980s began with another adjustment facing all nine institutions in Florida's University system. Making good on a campaign promise, Governor Bob Graham pushed through another change in the academic calendar of Florida's Universities, moving them to a semester system which took effect in fall 1981. He thus cancelled out the quarter system which had been instituted in 1965 by then-Governor Hayden Burns. For English Education, as well as all academic programs, this meant a collapsing of courses by one-third. Some courses were combined, others eliminated, all altered. For Drs. Burton, Brossell, Hoetker, and Simmons, it meant long hours of debate and rewriting. Changes were made most drastically at the undergraduate level; a paring process took place, to the delight of the Jack Gordon's of the State who felt vindicated as they witnessed the sharp reduction in "education" courses. Since the graduate program at FSU included only four actual English Ed courses, the current offerings were preserved, their scope and content expanded.

Throughout the entire decade, English Education, along with all teacher education programs, suffered from what former New York Senator Daniel Patrick Moynahan once termed "benign neglect" from the Dean's office. Jack Gant, whose

administration ended with his retirement in 1983, showed little interest in teacher education throughout his nine-year tenure. A careful, nationwide search then turned up Dr. Bruce Tuckman, a Gagné Ph.D., who had accrued a distinguished reputation in research design and learning theory. Leaving the deanship of one of the City University of New York institutions (it was learned only later that he had resigned under pressure), Tuckman “hit the ground running”, calling for radical changes hither and yon, ignoring the suggestions and advice of most senior faculty and administrators, forcing draconian measures on several programs, abruptly reversing decisions at will.²¹ Some faculty members refused to take all this lying down; they went directly to President Sliger and recently appointed Provost “Gus” Turnbull with their complaints. Under such criticism and opposition, Tuckman lasted through the summer of 1985 when President Sliger asked for his resignation. Tuckman did not go quietly. Instead, he went on the 6 o’clock news broadcasts of the most widely viewed local TV station to excoriate the University’s central administration and to describe the injustices which he had suffered. Next day, so the story goes, he found his personal belongings moved into the corridor outside the Dean’s office and the locks changed.

While English Education suffered no more than any other program during Tuckman’s brief reign, the responsibilities necessarily assumed by faculty members increased during the early years of the decade, a fact which went largely unnoticed by either Gant or Tuckman. Dwight Burton was in poor health and, in 1982, was

²¹ Soon after taking office in summer 1983, Tuckman invited me and a few other faculty to lunch. When I informed him that I was an elected member of the Faculty Senate Steering Committee—the only COE member—and would keep him informed, the new dean replied that “he wasn’t interested in all that.”

replaced as C & I Department Head by E.T. “Tom” Denmark, a longtime professor of Mathematics Education. Thenceforth, Dr. Burton was virtually unable to contribute to the teaching or supervising needs of the program. Student numbers at the undergraduate level began to increase, catalyzed by the Legislature’s addition of scholarship funds for those who would commit to public school teaching. In that legislation, English was designated as an area of “critical need.” There were no such additional funds for graduate students, however, which caused the number of doctoral students in English Ed to remain small. Such graduate assistance was sorely needed, especially for the supervision of a rapidly expanding student teacher population (an assignment, incidentally, which both Brossell and Hoetker tried assiduously to avoid). Things worsened when, in early 1984, Denmark clashed with Tuckman over certain staffing issues and resigned as Department Head. The new dean summoned Dr. Hoetker to his office and demanded that he assume the department headship—a move typical of Tuckman to whom the constitutions and bylaws of the college and/or university, which called for departmental elections, were irrelevancies. Thus Jim Hoetker became a handcuffed leader, and programmatic teaching needs were further affected

In 1982, another “challenge” arose for the English Ed faculty. Although the TEC requests were declining (caused by lack of substantial Legislative support) concerns about students’ statewide test scores drove several school districts to request help, particularly in reading and mathematics. In addition to these needs/opportunities, a minor crisis was evolving in the Florida Panhandle which

would eventually affect the limited faculty resources at Florida State's graduate program in English Education.

During the University System's expansion years, 1960-72, a number of branch campuses were opened and staffed by some of the larger State institutions. In time, for example, the University of South Florida was operating four such campuses in St. Petersburg, Lakeland, Sarasota, and Ft. Myers. Needless to say, the Legislature offered funding for these extensions which could most accurately be characterized as "marginal". The new educational outsets were overwhelmingly embraced, however, by the communities they served.

In 1970, the Board of Regents authorized a branch campus in Panama City and placed it under the control of the University of West Florida (UWF). The new "campus" had no buildings of its own and held classes on the west side of town in a cluster of old, unused barracks which had been abandoned years before by the US Navy. In addition to the barracks, a few classrooms were provided by nearby Gulf Coast Community College. On two separate occasions, I taught my secondary reading course there at the invitation of the College of Education at UWF. Over the next ten years, that institution offered a potpourri of graduate courses, largely in education, all at night. For whatever reason, the courses were chosen somewhat at random; i.e., they were never offered as part of a degree program. Apparently, the main reason for this curricular "structure" was staffing problems: few senior faculty members at UWF were eager to endure the four-hour, 200-mile auto trip on a given night, punctuated by what one professor dubbed, "200 magic minutes of teaching."

Thus, by 1980, the program was offering a minimal number of courses, and plans for a new campus were moribund.

All of the above was occurring under the watchful eye of Panama City's Senator Dempsey Barron, who had risen to a position of great power and influence during the previous decade. [He was once reported to have told then-Governor Reubin Askew to "stay the hell out of *my* Senate!" (italics mine)] By the early 1980s, Barron had been deemed "Dean of the Senate" by colleagues and the Capitol City press corps. The static, truly inert status of the Panama City campus angered Senator Barron. He noted the course offerings were neither increasing nor diversifying, and that no degree-related programs had yet been established. It was rumored that he had heard the UWF president was using the funds earmarked for the branch campus for the enhancement of various needy programs on his own campus in Pensacola. A man of Dempsey Barron's temperament would not allow the Panama City Branch Campus to suffer such an indignity.

Thus it was that on a Tuesday morning in early January 1982, that my fellow Faculty Senate Steering Committee members and I temporarily suspended our regular agenda to hear the comments of two unexpected guests: President Sliger and Senator Barron. The latter visitor did most of the talking, informing us, as he had just told President Sliger, that he was removing the Panama City Campus (PCC) from the aegis of the University of West Florida and placing it under the control of FSU. He further urged us to establish graduate programs "of high quality" on that campus and that the legislature was in the process of acquiring some land adjacent to the East Bay of the county (a gorgeous, waterfront site, incidentally) on which in due time would

be built an attractive campus. Further, the Senator announced that six new lines for tenure-earning resident faculty, in addition to administration support personnel, would be added to the PCC faculty/staff. These lines, he stated, would be equally divided between FSU's Colleges of Business and Education. In the light of the Senator's current powerful status, our unanimous response to his requests was, "Yes sir." Needless to say, the Senator's wishes were affirmed by Dr. Sliger, who was, however, somewhat dubious of the University's capabilities to meet this new challenge. When he received further "encouragement" from then-House Speaker Herb Morgan (D-Tallahassee), the president concluded that we had better give the new campus acquisition our best shot.

In fact, I found myself wearing two hats at and pursuant to that January 1982 meeting. Later that morning, I dutifully informed then-Dean Gant of Senator Barron's charge and offered him my perception that our College would be expected to do its part. From the dean's verbal response and his tone, I inferred that he was not enthusiastic about this development. He knew, as well as I, that the College of Education would be expected to become a player in the new, mandated enterprise, but was quite rightly concerned about the funding support we would receive.

It was, therefore, no surprise that pursuant to that Steering Committee meeting, newly-appointed provost, Gus Turnbull, contacted a somewhat reluctant Dean Gant and strongly recommended that COE begin some exploratory discussion with PCC Dean Larson (Larry) Bland as to the kinds of degree-earning programs which might be initiated on his campus. In the light of my attendance at the Steering Committee meeting, I knew that a phone call was coming. The dean began checking

out program leaders forthwith and, soon he reached department head, Dr. Denmark. In fact, I was ready with a proposal.

In suggesting that English Education open a dialogue with Dean Bland, I was hoping to use three bargaining chips: (1) the probable need at PCC for teacher education programs rather than, say, those in Guidance/Counseling, Leisure Studies, Education History/Philosophy, and the like. For *any* program to succeed on that campus, an acceptable number of qualified applicants would be an absolute necessity, obsessed as the Board of Regents had become, in those days, about adhering strictly to the Minimum Numbers quotas which they had recently established. (2) I was certain that we could procure the support of the FSU English department. Recently elected Chair John Fenstermaker was following in the cooperative footsteps of his predecessors, and I figured that the possibility of overload compensation for members of several of his graduate faculty—happy to supplement their typically modest nine-month salaries—would be welcome news. And (3) the need in this area was clearly (to me) there. For years I had been providing staff development services, TEC and otherwise, to English teachers in the Bay County areas. In fact, that county (as those in the surrounding area) had felt the need for such a program for many years. Several teachers who aspired to achieve their advanced degree goal, who were supported by stipends granted by International Paper Company, completed Master's degrees in English and English Education at Auburn University during the summer months. Significantly, they were willing to make the 125 mile one-way drive to Auburn. Although in a different time zone, Tallahassee was only 100 miles from Panama City. Other Bay County teachers sought course work in one of Troy State

University's (Alabama) burgeoning off-campus programs. Thus I was confident that we could recruit an adequate number of such degree candidates when I approached Dr. Denmark

In July 1982, Dean Bland and I held our initial meeting. In October of that year, I held a recruiting session, which was well-publicized in that and contiguous counties, in a Bay County facility. I promised the 49 teachers who attended that session that I would be *personally* responsible for regular advisement opportunities. In Semester II of 1983, we offered two courses, one in American fiction, the other in Teaching Writing, each worth three hours of *resident* graduate credit, and the program was underway. Thirty-two individuals initially applied. All were eventually accepted. More followed. From January 1983 to August 1992, 77 students completed graduate degrees: 71 received Master's degrees, 4 received Advanced Masters, and 2 received PhDs. The Ph.D. candidates were obliged to come to Tallahassee for their required Statistical Methods and Research Design courses. For a year, an attempt was made to add an undergraduate component, but the numbers were never adequate. It is fair to say that during its nine-plus-years tenure, the program answered a felt need for upper grade level English teachers in that geographic area of Florida. On virtually every Tuesday during that period, including summer terms, I would leave my Tallahassee office, drive to the Panama City Campus to advise students from 2 to 5 PM, and then teach until 7:30 PM (Central Time, 8:30 PM in the summer session. I felt then--as I do now--that it was well worth the effort.

Two further, closely related events occurred during the years in which the PCC featured an English Education graduate program. In the early years, 1983-87,

one group of students came from the ranks of Mowat Jr. High, now Mowat Middle School. This group had as its department head, Ms. Gloria Pipkin, an experienced classroom teacher who had only recently become energized about innovations in English Education through her reading of NCTE publications. To supplement the graduate study being undertaken by her department members, Pipkin instituted a series of weekend work sessions during which the curriculum was significantly modified, including the introduction of the writing process and holistic scoring strategies in the teaching of composition. Introduction of whole language approaches replaced the standard Latinate grammar/prescriptive usage units still in wide use throughout the state and indeed the nation. Pipkin also encouraged teachers to use Reader Response strategies to replace prescriptive ones in the study of literature. Finally, she encouraged the Mowat teachers to turn to a range of recently published and critically acclaimed novels by Young Adult authors. All of the innovations noted above had been studied in the English Education courses taught by FSU at the Branch Campus. In November 1985, the Mowat English department was the only junior high program in the State of Florida cited as a “Center for Excellence” by the National Council of Teachers of English.

In the 1970s and 80s, one of the most respected and widely read Young Adult novelists was a former Massachusetts journalist named Robert Cormier. His less-than-simplistic writing style intrigued and challenged students and their teachers. At Mowat, a Cormier novel was featured at each of the three grade levels. In his work, Cormier often challenged the motives and competencies of certain American institutions, among them the Roman Catholic Church, the CIA, and the Army

Security Agency. His works were largely devoid of sex and profanity, two of the more prominent objects of censorship, but included fair shares of violence, cruelty, and brutality. In each text, there were implicit criticisms of the *status quo* by teenage characters. Not surprisingly, some of the more fundamentalist parents became alarmed at the introduction of Cormier novels as objects of all-class study as well as texts by Judy Blume, Paula Danziger, Gary Paulsen, and other authors whose work featured literary realism—and these parents’ concerns spread by word of mouth through the county community, eventually drawing the attention of newly-elected superintendent, Leonard Hall. Mr. Hall, a leader in a Panama City Assembly of God church, had voiced his strong belief that texts used in all county schools come only from the State Adopted list. None of the paperbound Young Adult novels, now lining the walls of Mowat Jr. High English classrooms appeared on that list. In the spring of 1986, *one* parent objected to her 7th grade daughter’s assigned reading of Cormier’s award winning novel, *I Am the Cheese*. Because the county had no established guidelines for such parental challenges, Mr. Hall unilaterally banned the text, along with Susan Pfeffer’s *About David* whose inclusion of a teenage suicide had enraged another parent. Ms. Pipkin resisted, the students formed an *ad hoc* group to resist the superintendent’s edict, and a group of parents gathered to organize CHOICE (Citizens Having Options in Their Children’s Education), a group outspokenly opposed to the superintendent’s tactics. Thus, the community became inflamed in controversy.

During the summer of 1986, the father of the protesting Mowat mother and prominent bay County realtor, addressed the local Kiwanis Club. In his pro-censorship remarks, he singled out the PCC English Education program which, he

alleged, had brought to Bay County its “Godless offerings.” Needless to say, the President and Education Dean of FSU became aware of the charge and defended the program unequivocally. In August of that year, the Bay County School Board voted, 4 to 1 to support the removal of the novels. My testimony at that heated meeting brought cheers from the teachers, students and CHOICE adherents in the audience, and jeers from a small but vocal cadre of parents who supported the superintendent’s actions.

Encouraged by this vote of confidence, Mr. Hall wasted little time in removing more literary works from the English programs of all county schools. From senior high curriculum, he banned all Shakespeare’s plays as well as such classics as *Oedipus Rex*, *David Copperfield*, *Wuthering Heights*, *Huckleberry Finn*, *Animal Farm*, *Call of the Wild*, *Red Badge of Courage*, *Tess of the D’Urbervilles*—in all, 64 selections. His precipitous decisions brought publicity to the county through a feature article in the *Washington Sunday Post*, the *Atlanta Journal Constitution*, and *Der Spiegel*, the leading West German newspaper. Eventually, Ms. Pipkin, supported by Maya Angelou, appeared on the Oprah Winfrey Show and was opposed by two Panama City fundamentalist parents. The CHOICE parents pressed their case and, by the next school year (1987-88), all of the 64 texts were restored to the schools’ programs-of-study. In fall 1988, Mr. Hall chose not to run for reelection. And, for the record, FSU’s “Godless” English Education program continued to offer courses and degrees from the Panama City Campus.

This tense, emotionally charged interlude did produce one notable casualty. In fall 1988, Gloria Pipkin resigned her teaching position. Victimized by verbal

threats, hate mail, anonymous obscene phone calls, and garbage on her lawn, and viewed by many local citizens as a pariah, Ms. Pipkin found it difficult to continue to function effectively as a classroom teacher. A new principal ordered a total retrenchment of the English course-of-study at Mowat. The department's English teachers all resigned their position, some even moving out of the county.

Ms. Pipkin survived on tutoring jobs (her husband was employed) and supervision of student teachers from both the PCC and main campus. We were able to employ her as an adjunct supervisor for the final five years of the PCC English Ed program's existence. In 1989, however, her untiring efforts in the struggle against censorship were recognized. A newly formed, non-profit national organization called *The Courage Foundation* named four U.S. citizens as its first award recipients. Two of them, G. Everett Koop and Paul Volcker, were chosen for their services to the nation as a whole. Two others, Rudolph Giuliani and Gloria Pipkin, were cited for their "courageous service to local communities." Thus, Ms. Pipkin, one of the PCC's earliest English Education Master's degree recipients, gained distinction for which the program is duly proud.

In other professional activities, Brossell and Hoetker continued to provide Florida with leadership in several aspects of improved writing instructional practices. Throughout the decade, they served on the Florida Task Force on Writing Programs. They also served as consultants to the Governor's PRIDE (academic excellence awards) Committee and made further contributions to the ongoing Secondary Schools Writing Skills Assessment Program. As noted earlier, they were the first authors of topics to be used in the writing component of the College Level Academic Skills Test

(CLAST), a testing program which Florida students completing their two-year basic studies program in community junior colleges or four-year institutions had to pass before becoming acceptable for enrollment in public senior colleges. This passing score was also a requirement for Florida's junior college students who applied for the Associate in Arts (AA) degree.

Brossell and Hoetker also published a number of research reports and monographs summarizing and analyzing their work as curriculum developers and investigators in student-written compositions, grades 6-14. In completing this contractual service, Brossell and Hoetker were also able to support the doctoral programs of several students. Upon completion of these degrees, four students found employment in major universities: Virginia Underwood at Iowa State University, Barbara Hoetker Ash at Auburn University, and two Nigerian nationals, A.O. Aboderin and Abiola Tim Akintola. Both of these latter two graduates returned to their native countries where they became faculty members in English Studies at their national institution, the University of Nigeria (Africa).

I also became more heavily involved during the 1980s. In March 1982, I was a featured speaker at the annual meeting of the National Association of Teachers of English (NATE), the UK counterpart of NCTE, held at York University in England. In November of 1984, I was invited to participate in a meeting of IFTE held on the campus of Michigan State University. One week later, at the annual NCTE convention in Detroit, I was elected Chair of the International Assembly on the Teaching of English. In May 1985, I was asked to serve as senior author of a chapter, "Teaching English in the USA, 1945-1987", in a text titled *Teaching and Learning*

English Worldwide, edited by James Britton, Robert Shafer, and Ken Watson, eventually to be published by Multilingual Matters, a London publishing firm. The collection of essays by authors from 17 countries was finally published in 1990. I received the invitation at another IFTE meeting held at Charlton University in Ottawa to speak on the topic of linguistics.

Earlier that spring, I had been one of five U.S. speakers to appear on a program of English speaking countries held on the campus of the University of East Anglia (UEA) in Norwich, England. This was the first in a series of five such international gatherings organized by Andrew Wilkinson, a leading United Kingdom English Educator and senior lecturer at UEA. At that conference, Mr. Wilkinson invited me to spend the Autumn Term as an “Overseas Visitor” at his institution, an invitation I readily accepted. In September 1986, I began that appointment, moving into a flat on the campus of UEA with my wife and 14-year-old stepdaughter. During that Fall Term, I was able to attend the UEA graduate courses in English Education as well as those held at Cambridge University, a weekly 60-mile auto ride. I also visited a large number of schools in the Norfolk, Cambridgeshire areas as well as three in Croydon, a “working class” community 20 miles south of London. From all of that activity, I was able to learn a great deal about Whole Language teaching strategies as practiced in U.K. schools and the General Certificate for Secondary Education (GCSE), a new and controversial nationwide literacy testing program which was being field tested during my months at UEA. This newly gained knowledge provided me with the opportunity to present papers at National Conferences in the U.S. on one or both topics, as well as to produce a number of related essays which have since

been published on both sides of the Atlantic. In 1989, I made a presentation at Wilkinson's Third Conference at UEA. On that occasion, my topic was "Censorship in U.S. Schools," one on which I was becoming quite well versed. Shortly before that Norwich meeting, the U.S. Supreme Court had made its famous Hazelwood Decision, siding with a suburban St. Louis school district and denying freedom of expression to two student editions of a school newspaper. In preparing for my presentation, I interviewed then-FSU Law School Dean, Talbot "Sandy" D'Alemberte, whose specialty in law—first Amendment issues—plus his acquaintance with at least three Supreme Court justices, including Chief Justice Rehnquist, made him an excellent resource for my prepared remarks. I drew a large audience at Norwich and was interviewed by BBC radio as to the nature and extent of the "censorship problem" in the United States.

Back in Tallahassee, things were happening within and to our program which made life more difficult for all faculty concerned. With the loss of Dean Tuckman, Provost Turnbull appointed Dr. Robert Lathrop to that leadership position. Dean Lathrop had been with FSU for almost 15 years at the time of his appointment, but he had always worked on "soft money" projects procured by Robert Morgan for his Educational Resources Institute (ERI), an entity which functioned on its own, totally apart from the College of Education. In 1985, Lathrop was serving as Director of Vocational Education Development Enterprise, which existed off-campus and which published its own quarterly journal that included Career Education among its interests. The new dean, who had little background and marginal interest in FSU's

College of Education, was therefore thrust into a position for which he was somewhat ill-prepared.

Two of the new dean's first decisions affected English Education directly. He retained Dr. Hoetker as Head of C & I, eschewing any election by departmental faculty and appointed Dr. Brossell as Acting Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies. The fact that we had recently added a new, elective course, "Technology in the Teaching of English", taught exclusively by Hoetker, only exacerbated our teaching-load problems. With their State Department Writing Contract still in play, and their new administrative duties taking up a great deal of their time, neither Dr. Brossell nor Dr. Hoetker was able to teach many courses. Dr. Burton's physical ailments severely limited his participation. The PCC commitment was taking more of my time due to increased student enrollment. With the help of a few capable, if overworked, doctoral students, we struggled along. An example of work loads, in Spring Semester 1989: I taught two campus-based courses, one in Panama City, and supervised 25 student teachers, all of whom were assigned to schools *outside of* Tallahassee.

Due to the number of roles English Ed faculty were called upon to play, particularly during the second half of the decade, those four individual were less able to participate in organizational activity, either at the State or national levels. Four former graduate students, then Florida educators, won Honors Awards given by the Florida Council of Teachers of English: Florence Bumgardner in 1980, Eileen Arpke in 1982, Rosemary Bonifay in 1985, and Gwen Faulkner in 1986. Over that decade, I

continued to serve as occasional speaker, informal consultant to program chairs, and chair of the Honors Award and Nominating committees.

Our involvement in national activities was also quite limited during the 1980s. Lack of travel funds, combined with the demands which the University put on us, kept all four English Ed faculty members from any extended appearances at NCTE Fall or Spring Conferences. The latter meeting had expanded in scope in the early 80s, to become a combining of the secondary, elementary groups with CEE. Burton and I were invited to speak at CEE's 20th anniversary gathering at Columbus, Ohio, in May 1984. Otherwise, our attendance at, and participation in those bi-annual meetings was occasional. In 1988, I accepted an appointment which led to membership on a Joint Task Force on Intellectual Freedom, co-sponsored by NCTE and IRA. At NCTE's 1989 national conference in Baltimore, I was appointed chair of the Standing Committee, a position I held through 1991.

Brossell and Hoetker organized a statewide conference on Testing and Teaching Writing at the Center for Professional Development (later named the Augustus Turnbull Center) held in March 1986, featuring a number of nationally known speakers. A joint presentation, which I chaired, had Commissioner Turlington and the still-prominent Senator Jack Gordon sharing the podium. A large audience, many of them hostile to statewide testing in its current form, peppered the two speakers with pointed queries once they had completed their prepared statements. Turlington and Gordon, both seasoned political operators, more than held their ground.

The two originators of the conference embarked on a considerably more ambitious venture, with support from their grant coffers and the generosity of Dean Lathrop. In late February 1988, a group of English Educators gathered at Florida State University for what was billed as a “Senior English Educators Conference.” The meeting had been called by the Florida State English Education faculty and alumni in response to widespread feelings that it was time to re-examine the English Education enterprise as it relates to current developments in education and society: an impending teacher shortage, the Holmes group and other initiatives in teacher preparation, a renewed interest in the disciplines and the content of instruction, and the development of new research strategies and methods in both the social sciences and the humanities.

Five “junior” English Educators, Michael Angelotti, Rita Brause, John Mayher, Gordon Pradl, and Bruce Appleby provided the following overview of the three-day meeting, also held at the Turnbull Center.

Because one motive of the conference was to capitalize on the collective experience of colleagues who had been in the profession through the flush times (the fifties and sixties) and the tough times (the seventies and eighties), some of the participants had affectionately dubbed the gathering “the grayhairs’ conference.” The common thread, however, was that the group had been active together in English Education and CEE conferences in the sixties and seventies. What follows is an attempt to describe the conference and comment on some of its particulars.

We had going in the flush times what we might now call the class English Education model. Embodied in the tripod curriculum of literature, language, and composition as represented in *Freedom and Discipline in English*, English Educators sought to upgrade the content knowledge of English teachers and to professionalize the education of future English teachers by educating a new generation of English Education professors. Times were good, funding was available, and energy and interest were high.

Something happened. Maybe it was a matter of supply and demand: the 70's recession devastated much of the country; education funding dropped; school districts increased workloads and slowed hiring as the student population dropped; a teacher "surplus" developed; English Education enrollments dipped; power to contend for budget weakened; numbers of English Education faculty diminished; English Education on many campuses faded into the wallpaper.

In combination with these factors, CEE was no longer able financially to mount its own separate conference, and so we diffused into NCTE's combined Spring Conference with the Elementary and Secondary Sections. Once deprived of our separate meeting time, we somehow ended up losing an intangible sense of a group striving together to achieve common goals—with the recession and the diffusion, CEE sessions seemed to lose focus on critical issues of English Education at a time of dramatic social and educational change. Often we seemed little more than a composite NCTE. But admittedly NCTE itself had changed—more power and respect had been

allocated to practitioners at the expense of the former leadership group of English teacher educators. And more “pure” research became fashionable, which, when coupled with the rise of composition studies and of the writing projects, came to absorb much of CEE members’ energy and expertise. Then the recession ended; still, the diffusion remains.

The cumulative effect of these changes was to diminish English Education as a professional in the Universities. For many, survival replaced revolution. There was a need for coming together again to take stock and to do something about the profession. And so, the rallying first step: the grayhairs’ gathering.

One consensus of the group was that we had been out of touch with each other as English Educators talking English Education for too long, and in the interim, the game had changed. But equally strong was the feeling that we still had a chance to re-invigorate the profession, if we got in the action now. It is not surprising, then, that the conference was mainly one of brainstorming: comparing perceptions, sorting out the big questions, talking through possible solutions and lines of research, and seeking a redefinition of English Education to fit the new contexts for teaching and learning. (Angelotti, *et al*, “On the Nature and Future of English Education: What the Grayhairs Gathering Was Really About” in *English Education*. Urbana, Ill: NCTE, Dec 1988, pp. 231-232.)

Angelotti and his fellow authors concluded their summary/critique of the meeting with the following statement:

Much good happened at the Senior English Educators Conference. For two and one-half days interactions were rich as participants attempted to interpret present conditions for teaching and learning English and set in motion processes that would involve more of the profession in exploring possible new directions for English Education.

Questions were identified, issues proved, and solutions posed. And besides beginning a discourse on re-visioning English Education, we resolved to create more open forums on issues in English Education that would invite participation from all stakeholders in the education of English professionals. We rediscovered the pleasure of talking with concerned colleagues about these issues and we are determined to create more opportunities for such open and unstructured dialogues.

It was clear that the challenges facing us will necessitate considered response and the quality of that response will depend on the quality of coming together, of concerted effort. Subsequent meetings will occur and papers will follow. In these and what they provoke will be measured the value of the 1988 grayhairs' gathering. (*Ibid*, pp. 243-244)

Speaking as one who assisted in the arrangement, and attended every moment of the conference, I felt that the participants did little more than reflect on the origins

of CEE, analyze what it had become, and speculate on its dubious future role in the Grand Design of American education; i.e., a rather nostalgic review of the work of a small but enthusiastic group of veteran teacher educators. It also provided an opportunity for Dwight Burton, the original CEE organizer, to meet with some former doctoral students and old buddies. And, to be candid, I was proud that the meeting was held on the Florida State campus.

In the preceding chapter, mention was made of a staff development project begun at the University of California, Berkeley, which later became known as the National Writing Project. Also noted was the first Florida chapter established in summer 1983 at the University of Florida by a U.F. adjunct named Helen Guttinger. Among the 22 teachers involved was the enthusiastic head of Lincoln High School (Leon County) English Department, Ms. Carol Sanfillipo. Three other Leon County high school English teachers also participated. Ms. Sanfillipo returned to the 1984 summer institute as a consultant. (Typically, four such participants received small stipends to serve as ongoing small group leaders in the four-week program, as well as activities which followed during the succeeding school year.) Late in 1985, Ms. Sanfillipo approached me as to the possibility of inaugurating the North Florida Writing Project in summer 1986. According to guidelines established by the national governing body, now chaired by California Professor Gray (named earlier in this document), a chapter instituted on a college/university campus required a university faculty member to co-direct and be responsible for lining up campus facilities. With Drs. Brossell and Hoetker immersed in administrative duties, and Dr. Burton unable to commit to such a time-consuming task, I was really the “only game in town.” Ms.

Sanfillipo and I put together a highly successful four-week summer institute. We recruited 27 teachers from all levels—kindergarten through junior college—all from the Tallahassee commuting area. Three of the four consultants were Ms. Sanfillipo’s colleagues from the 1983 institute in Gainesville.

By that summer, I had been conducting in-service activities for teachers for a quarter of a century, but never had I participated in one as practical, as enthusiastic, and as ultimately useful as that NFWP Summer Institute. *Everyone* took an active role. While some participants were initially reluctant to share their writing, the dynamics of the small group sessions called “Response Groups” turned them into ready sharers of their work (much quite personal) by the end of the first week.

Research done by the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) had long demonstrated that public school teachers, in supervising numbers, were both fearful and reticent about writing on their own and sharing that writing with peers. Weekly dinners, held as pot-luck affairs at somebody’s home, brought the group closer together. The teaching strategies, one required of each teacher and copied for all other participants, were both imaginative and professionally useful. Over that first summer project, I became a true believer in one of the major NWP precepts: that teachers *can* teach teachers. From that summer on, written instruction in local area schools was transformed into a most effective commodity. In 1988, thanks to an intense lobbying effort by then-Bay County Language Arts Supervisor (and PCC English Education graduate) Larry Bolinger, we were able to sponsor *two*, four-week summer institutes, one on the Tallahassee campus, the other on the newly completed Panama City campus, which opened in January 1987. Ms. Sanfillipo directed the

Tallahassee institute, and I directed the one at PCC, where I also continued to serve as graduate coordinator, advisor, and instructor.

One of the features of the Writing Project was the manner in which it was supported: on a virtual shoestring, we lobbied the Leon County Schools Superintendent for stipends awarded to local teacher participants (each participant received 6 graduate credits for attending the summer institute). We sought, and received, donations from the Tallahassee *Democrat* and its parent organization, Knight Ridder. We procured the services, (sans honoraria) of both Florida State and Florida A & M faculty to appear as guest lecturers. We squeezed the Department of Education for in-kind support. We solicited financial contributions from several local businesses: Eckerd's Drugs (now CVS), Publix Supermarket, Sears, J.C. Penney's, McDonald's, plus a couple of banks. Our slogan: "No donation is too small." We raided certain COE departmental supply rooms. On occasion, we even kicked in from our personal resources. Because of these endeavors, the institutes, and monthly follow-up sessions, were close to being self-supporting. To me, it was all part of the joy of conducting this popular in-service activity.

Before leaving the topic of the Writing Project, it must be noted that the more open, content-oriented, personal involvement emphasized in the approach was not universally accepted by either more conservative English teachers or the fundamentalist community at large. The former group lamented the retreat from a grammar-based, five-paragraph-theme, topic sentence-plus-three supporting details techniques of yore. A spokesperson for the latter group, Phyllis Schlafly of the arch-conservative Eagle Forum, stated in a January 1989 interview on National Public

Radio, that one of her main goals for that year was to eliminate all journal writing tasks for American high school classrooms.

Demands from other facets of my department/college/university duties led me to step down as NFWP co-director after the 1989 summer institute. The loss was not a significant one: Ms. Sanfillipo was the true leader—and a true believer. Dr. Hoetker filled in as university caretaker for two years. His subsequent early retirement, due to health problems, brought Dr. Pamela (Sissi) Carroll into the project as co-director in 1992.

Except for the several reports on the State Department Writing/ Writing Assessment programs published by Drs. Brossell and Hoetker, the 80s were not a very productive decade for FSU's English Education faculty. By 1989, Dr. Burton had fully retired. We three remaining professors did publish articles, here and there, in state, national, and international periodicals. In 1987, I served as chief Curriculum Consultant for one volume of *Collectors Anthology* as part of a three-volume series for low-ability senior high students, published by Globe Books, Ind. In that same year, I co-edited *The Short Story and You*, a senior high anthology published by National Textbook Co. That firm also printed the Second Edition of my text, *Reading by Doing*. Since we were all three full professors by then, we were not threatened by the unwritten “publish or perish” edict which affected junior, untenured faculty. As described above, there was plenty to do during the decade of the 80s.

There were also a number of doctoral graduates—as well as some Masters individuals—whose careers are worthy of note:

1. Paula M. Massey (MA, 1980) – Supervisor of Instruction, Dixie County; Assistant Superintendent of Schools, Orange County (Orlando, Florida)
2. Pam Laws (MA, 1980) – Instructor in English, Tallahassee Community College; well-known local singer-entertainer
3. James Barnes (MA, 1980) – State Language Arts Supervisor, Florida Dept. of Education
4. Charles T. Ponder (MA 1980) – Superintendent of Schools, Franklin County, Florida
5. Mary Beth Culp (Ph.D., 1981) – head of English Education, University of South Alabama, co-author of popular NCTE thematic unit series
6. Charles Suhor (Ph.D., 1981) – Deputy Executive Secretary, National Council of Teachers of English
7. Ronald Stone (MA, 1981) – Assistant Superintendent of Schools, Pinellas County (St. Petersburg/Clearwater, Florida)
8. Sarah Martin Clemmons (Ph.D., 1982) – Head, Department of English, Chipola Jr. College, Marianna, Florida), later Provost of that institution
9. Frances Stallworth (Ph.D., 1985) – English department head, Rickards High School, Tallahassee; Assistant Professor of English, Florida A & M University, local civil rights leader, later Fulbright overseas teacher/scholar
10. Gloria Pipkin (MA, 1985) – Honor described in detail in this chapter
11. Larry Bolinger (Advanced Masters, 1986) – Language Arts Supervisor; Superintendent of Schools, Bay County (Panama City, Florida)

12. Ian Barker (Ph.D., 1987) – Dean of Instruction, Gulf Coast Community College, Panama City, Florida (from PCC)
 13. Daniel McQuagge (Ph.D., 1987) – Head of English, Delta State University, Cleveland, Mississippi
 14. Margaret Durham (MA, 1988) – Education editor, Tallahassee *Democrat*; adjunct professor, Flagler College, Tallahassee Branch
- Thus, despite the lean budgetary situation, the English Education program at Florida State University continued to produce quality professionals throughout the decade.

Chapter V - 1990's: Changes, Changes

Throughout the history of Western Civilization, there have been few more poignant images than the tearing down of the Berlin Wall. That momentous event was soon followed by the surprisingly rapid dissolution of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics—while we all watched the TV screen in wonder and disbelief. Now there was only one super power in the world.

For us “senior citizens”, a whole new outlook on life occurred. Gone were the Cold War tensions, anxieties, and fears which had beset U.S. citizens for 45 years. We had witnessed (or participated in) the Berlin Blockade, Iron Curtain, loss of China, Korean War, spy scares, McCarthy hysteria, Sputnik and the manned space race, erection of the Berlin Wall, Cuban Missile Crisis, agonizing Vietnam years, and Soviet blunders in Afghanistan. The progression of Orwellian images of Big Brother: Stalin, Khrushchev, Brezhnev, and Bulganin, then softened to Gorbachev and Yeltsin, no longer permeated our nightmares. As President Bush, the elder, went about efforts to create a softer, gentler image of the USA, some new bogeymen, most wearing funny headdresses, emerged to dominate our thoughts—and fears. The setting was the Middle East. Following the Iranian debacle of the 1980s, a new cast moved to center stage. Their leaders: Arafat, Kaddafi, Assad, Milosovic, Osama bin Laden, and Saddam Hussein. They had an excellent bargaining chip with which to confront us: Middle Eastern oil; and they were not reluctant to utilize a tactic which, as this is being written, holds all free people in a vice of fear: International Terrorism. The decade was marked by terrorist ventures, which were frequent, frustratingly

random, and very frightening. Somalia, Kuwait, and the Persian Gulf Conflict highlighted the early 1990s. More attacks on American embassies, military outposts, and other agencies continued steadily after the defeat in 1991 of Saddam Hussein's vaunted military machine. Most of us found some comfort in the fact that these terrorist episodes were taking place far from home; comforted, that is, until the morning of September 11, 2001.

While the economy during the Clinton years grew and expanded, making the stock market a new center of U.S. citizens ready and willing to claim a share of the Good Life, world tensions, centered in the Middle East but also flaring out in Central Africa, several South Pacific and South American nations, and in the unresolved disputes continuing on the Korean peninsula, caused the jitters in the White House, on Capitol Hill, at the Pentagon, on Wall Street, and, to some extent, on Main Street, USA. At home, the drug war, crime, especially among juvenile gang bangers, immigration crises, and urban blight, to name a few problems, kept Federal support, of a direct and indirect nature, from being a current priority. By and large, the states had to struggle along pretty much on their own in the pursuit of quality education, K through University. Florida, clinging to its identity as a "low tax state", beset with an exploding population which affected all parts of the state, acute drug trafficking pressures and their attendant spin in the crime rate, highway repair needs, and school building demands were among the must-fix items which affected the efforts of those who would reconcile teacher education with the hi-tech, low-budget emblems of this, the final decade of the 20th century.

In the very first year of that decade, some radical changes took place in FSU's English Education faculty. During Spring Semester of that year, I was once again teaching my Shakespeare and Advanced Writing course in the London Study Program (ah, Great Britain in the month of January). I also spoke, during the Spring Break, at the NATE conference in Manchester, England. While I was away, Dr. Burton announced his full retirement, giving up his office, etc. Dr. Brossell then accepted the position of English Education chair at the University of Illinois, Chicago, and Dr. Hoetker's health was making it difficult for him to participate on a full-time basis—all of which left the Lone Ranger, in his flat on Tavistock Square, London, puzzling about the fate of the program. Then, C & I head, Kenneth Tobin, a Science Educator, authorized the three stateside program faculty members to conduct a search for the *one* line authorized for English Education by the Provost. I was, generally speaking, kept in touch by a series of transatlantic calls and, in April, learned that Dr. Pamela (Sissi) Carroll had accepted a position of Assistant Professor in the department.

Sissi Carroll came with good credentials. After completing her undergraduate degree in Auburn University's excellent English Education program, marriage led her to classroom teaching positions in first a high school, then a middle school in Tallahassee. While occupying the latter position, she completed her Master's degree in English Education under my supervision. In the mid-80s, she also assisted me in an abortive attempt to organize a local English council.

Now divorced, Ms. Carroll returned to Auburn where she rapidly completed her English Education doctoral degree, then spent one year as a writing instructor in

the English department of a small liberal arts college in Kentucky. She grasped the opportunity to return to her chosen field as well as her second home/University. Upon my return to Tallahassee, she joined me in planning “the future” of English Education at FSU. Dr. Hoetker’s wife, Dr. Barbara Hoetker Ash, had recently finished her doctorate with us and, in the summer of 1990, moved to Auburn where she had accepted an assistant professorship. This leave-taking, in all candor, reduced Dr. Hoetker’s enthusiasm for his teaching/advising/supervising duties. Dr. Carroll and I were able to appoint an Ohio State, all-but-dissertation teacher, Carol Johnson, who had friends in the Tallahassee area. We also received authorization to hire two temporary instructors from the ranks of Leon County teachers: Sara Lamar, who had recently retired from an outstanding career at Leon High School; and Kathy Corder, a younger teacher from Raa Middle School, who took a year’s leave of absence. These two hard-working individuals assumed responsibility for undergraduate courses, including a new, legislatively mandated Middle School course into which Ms. Corder fit beautifully. Ms. Johnson largely did the best she could with our albatross-like technology-in-English course. And all three newcomers provided badly needed assistance with the large-and-growing, off-campus supervisory burden.

Dr. Carroll had completed an award-winning doctoral dissertation at Auburn on a well-known Young Adult fiction author. She was becoming increasingly active in a subgroup of NCTE, the Assembly on Literature for Adolescents, National (ALAN). This assembly, at that time was the fastest growing one in the NCTE and today stands as the second largest subgroup of the parent organization. It has proven a magnet for both new and experienced middle school English teachers who had

quickly learned that their undergraduate courses in Chaucer, Shakespeare, Milton, Melville, James, *et al*, provided little or no help with their classes of low-ability sixth graders—or average eighth graders, for that matter. In fact, thousands of teachers seeking assistance with their frustrating search for texts which combined interest, relatively simple style, and literary quality found welcome assistance from this group and its new (in the 1990s) journal, *The ALAN Review*. As the decade unfolded, Dr. Carroll assumed a succession of leadership positions in ALAN, culminating in her appointment as journal editor in 1997. As this chronicle is written, she has just completed her second tour of duty in that capacity.

The addition of this quartet of professionals freed me to become involved in instructional offerings as needed: the Graduate Seminar, the ubiquitous Secondary Reading courses, and the Linguistics requirement, the latter having become a problem. The fact is, we never replaced Roy O'Donnell, and, during the previous decade, the English department had decided not to seek a qualified linguist. A grammar/language requirement for English Education remained, however, within the certification rubric. I finally created a patchwork course for undergraduates and graduates, featuring Whole Language and pragmatic strategies, which I offered as an elective, at night, at the Turnbull Center. Enrollments over those years were high, which frankly came as no surprise; the English department was offering its language course taught by an individual who did not possess an English degree and who had lacked any graduate linguistics training. Students' evaluations of that course ranked it as having *no* practical value. Thus, I proceeded with my makeshift offering, which I had determined would "count" for the Linguistics certification requirement.

Simultaneously, I composed a syllabus for the revival of our now-defunct “Backgrounds for Teaching Language” course, eliminated in the conversion to the semester system in 1981. With that OK, provided by then-English department Chair, Ann Rowe, it took its place among undergraduate offerings in 1995, thus relieving me of the ordeal of looking for a parking space on West Pensacola Street where I taught that Continuing Education course each Wednesday evening.

As the decade progressed, the English Education program needed all the help it could procure. The year 1990 saw old pro Lawton Chiles, running with veteran Buddy MacKay, defeat incumbent Bob Martinez decisively to become Florida’s governor for the next eight years. The Republican tide was running in the Sunshine State, however. The GOP took over majority rule, first in the Senate, later in the House, and by 2000, was steadily adding to those margins. Republicans also captured Cabinet posts, thus making the governor’s task that much more difficult. Three major factors affected the budgetary status of FSU—all noted earlier. Law and order assumed a position of pre-eminence with the Legislature; exploding undergraduate numbers was another crucial issue; in 1996, Gulf Coast University was opened in Ft. Myers, bringing the number of state four-year institutions to ten. The junior college ranks were also growing rapidly. And, inexorably, the increased numbers of legislators from Central and South Florida busied themselves with appropriations proposals beneficial to universities in *their* areas. Legislators who were alums of UF and FSU fought a valiant rear-guard action, but those two senior institutions saw their sails trimmed throughout the 90s. One inevitability: the diminution of support for graduate studies and research had a devastating affect on both Universities. Their

undergraduate classes, now a legislative priority, became filled to overflowing. Low yield programs were starved. Adjuncts were hired, virtually off the street, to teach Basic Studies courses. And a new technological creation, Distance Learning, became reality as the Florida Legislature sought all means possible to stick their fingers in the increasing number of holes in the undergraduate dike.

Another change clearly affected the nature, extent, and quality of higher education in Florida: the hiring of politicians, instead of academics, as University presidents. In the early 80s, the University of Florida had hired former Regent and highly-respected Palm Beach attorney, Marshall Criser. (During this same time period, the Universities of Oklahoma and Massachusetts were appointing a U.S. Senator and former governor, respectively, to head their senior institutions.) In 1993, Sandy D'Alemberte, former State Legislator and past president of the American Bar Association, took over as President of FSU. Two years later, former State Senator and Commissioner of Education, Betty Castor, assumed the reins of the University of South Florida. This trend has continued in the new millennium: in 2003, former House Speaker, T.K. Wetherell succeeded D'Alemberte at FSU and sitting Lieutenant Governor Frank Brogan was chosen to head Florida Atlantic University in Boca Raton, Florida. None of those appointments came as any surprise among the University faculties nor, indeed, among the rank-and-file Floridians. The fact is that today's University President has become first and foremost, a fund-raiser. Given the fact that few hard-core academicians have either the background or the propensity for that role, the ranks of distinguished-professors-as-Presidents are growing thinner with every vacancy and nationwide "search".

In 1993, English Education was able to hire a new tenure-earning faculty member, Lawrence Baines. A University of Texas, Austin, Ph.D., he had, like Sissi Carroll, taught one year at a small Kentucky college before joining our ranks. Lawrence Baines was, indeed, a welcome addition. He had completed an MA in Computer Science, was already publishing technology essays in professional journals, and filled that large and vital gap in the program magnificently. Young, energetic, and handsome, he soon became a favorite among undergraduates. He was also a willing worker, enthusiastically filling in--both in the classroom and in field supervision. Moreover, his professional record quickly expanded; in 1997, he wrote the lead article--a piece attacking some of the unwarranted claims for technology in education--in the prestigious *Phi Delta Kappan*. The following year, he co-authored, with me, a collection of essays, *Language Study in Middle School, High School, and Beyond*, published by the International Reading Association.

Because of his expertise in technology and his rapidly-expanding publications list, Dr. Baines was a hot property among colleges and universities throughout the nation. He was also restless, chafing at the unwillingness of the College and University to support his proposed research and development ideas. So it was that, in the fall of 1998, he left FSU for an Associate Professorship (and a substantial salary increase) at Berry College, a small private school in Rome, Georgia. At that institution, Dr. Baines became a big fish in a little pond. Beset with a wide range of collegiate duties, he moved on to Texas Tech University in Lubbock in fall 2001. It is not clear whether he (a former Mississippi all-star high school athlete) assisted

Bobby Knight with the Red Raider basketball program or not. Probably not; he has since made two more moves and is now teaching at the University of Toledo (Ohio).

So, once again, the English Ed program was faced with a diminished faculty. Ms. Corder's appointment (1990-91) was of one year's duration. Ms. Johnson left a year later for an attractive offer at the University of Central Florida. Ms. Lamar left her adjunct position for full retirement in 1992. Once again, we were down to two professional positions and had to make due with help from doctoral students. As already noted, Dr. Baines' presence was of five years' duration. In the spring of 1998, we were searching again. During that lean period, we received free assistance from a retired Pennsylvania high school teacher, an MA from the past, named Bill Salmi. Having retired in Tallahassee, Mr. Salmi gave of his time, particularly in advisement and field supervision, two areas in which we were continually strapped. His premature death in 2001, after a long illness, is mourned by many, including me. Luckily, the program had also recruited four outstanding doctoral students who, with Mr. Salmi, helped to ease our burdensome duties.

In late summer 1995, the true founder of English Education at FSU passed away. Dwight Burton had battled cancer of the esophagus for over three years; in July, he succumbed. Former colleague Roy O'Donnell, an ordained Protestant minister, conducted the funeral service. I was invited to offer a eulogy at the annual CEE luncheon in San Diego during the 1995 November NCTE conference. This I did with a heavy heart. Attending were his widow, Claudia Burton, who had recently retired from her position as a junior college English instructor, and Dr. Robert Shafer of Arizona State University. The latter, a close friend and colleague of both Dr.

Burton and me, later that day received the NCTE Distinguished Service Award. Just two years later, at the International Assembly session, held during the NCTE meeting in Detroit, I delivered Bob Shafer's eulogy, with an equally heavy heart.

I mention these two deaths because they represent the leaders of English Education as it had grown during the post-war/Cold War years. Several other English Ed leaders of that era passed away during the decade of the 90x. Their absence left senior roles of leadership to their doctoral students of whom I was one. Our generation witnessed the birth of the 21st century even as we contemplated our own retirement. The claim that individuals such as Burton, Shafer, and several of their departed colleagues had blazed a new and exciting trail in American teacher education is indisputable. Today, it has been passed through my generation to that of *our* doctoral students—and is surviving as this history is recorded.

At about the time that Lawrence Baines joined the English Ed contingent at FSU (and at the dawn of the D'Alemberte administration), a new COE Dean, Dr. Jack Miller, replaced Robert Lathrop. A Purdue Ph.D. in Reading and former dean of Georgia Southern, Miller posed a physically large and commanding presence. During his six years as COE leader, he made a number of organizational adjustments. Unfortunately, enhancement of teacher education programs in general, and English Education in particular, was not among those changes. That the Reading program actually regressed during the Miller years speaks eloquently to the contention made in the previous sentence. To us, he offered the lateral transfer of wholly unqualified professor from the Department of Educational Leadership, which we unanimously

rejected. Somewhat miffed at our decision, the dean let us dangle for a while before allowing us to conduct a search for a beginning-level line in 1998.

Clearly, the 90s were years in which the University was faced with the need to place undergraduate studies at the top of the priorities list. Swelling numbers of applicants (some felt these were largely due to the success of the football program), an accommodating central administration, and ubiquitous Legislative mandates all combined to fill many undergraduate programs to overflowing. An interesting pattern evolved over a multi-year period: students entering senior college, from both the four year and junior college ranks, would first apply for degree programs in the Schools of Business and Communications (the latter primarily in Public Relations). When denied access, due to filled quotas in those programs, a significant number of them turned to the Department of English as second choice. At that time, English offered four tracks: English Literature, American Literature, Writing, and Secondary School Certification. What the department was *not* able to offer was a significantly larger number of classes. A significant comparison: at that time, the English departments of FSU and neighboring Auburn had roughly equal-sized department faculties for teaching upper division courses. Unfortunately, FSU was listing approximately 700 more majors than Auburn.

Besides this numbers crunch, the English faculty at FSU was dealing with some pressures brought about by the politics of that era. The Bill of Fare in literature offerings, typically of Anglo Saxon texts and authors, came under attack from younger faculty hires, particularly those who were female and/or minority. Thus, a great debate arose, from the late 80s to date about the desirable ratio of courses in

“dead white male authors” and compared with increasingly available ones in women’s studies, African-American texts/authors, Hispanic literature, contemporary writers, Native American and/or Asian authors. Closely associated with this conflict was the rise of Political Correctness one of whose chief precepts was the establishment of some semblance of parity between the two competing clusters of offerings. Department meetings became pitched battles.

Inevitably, the undergraduate program offered to English Education students, along with English majors seeking certification was seriously affected. At that time, State Certification requirements, grades 6-12, were quite flexible: a minimum of six hours in English and American literature, at the upper division level, one course in English grammar, one course in Advanced Composition, and at least 15 hours of upper division electives. (Certain courses in Psychology, Philosophy, Speech Theater, and Humanities could be counted within those courses—with consent of advisor). At that time, the English Ed program required a minimum of 36 hours of “straight English” courses while the English majors required 32 hours.²² With the obvious leeway in which courses, almost invariably *literature* courses, of which advisors could approve, the conflict among English faculty described above, came into play. The English Education faculty took several factors into account while providing this advisement--the current curricular offerings of secondary schools throughout the State being one with considerable weight.

In 1994, the English department curriculum committee made a decision which brought several of the issues noted above into sharp focus. Undergraduates opting for

²² The main reason for this difference was that the Bachelor of Science degree seekers were not required to complete 12 hours in a foreign language; the BA candidates were.

the English Literature track would no longer be required to take a course in Shakespeare's plays and could, instead, select another course in English writers before 1800. Besides being a factor in the turf wars described earlier, the size of the available Shakespeare sections offered each semester were oversubscribed to the point at which overflow students were sitting on the floor of the Williams Building classrooms where they were taught. After a discussion with Dr. Ann Rowe, English Department Chair, I announced to all undergraduate English Ed classes, and published a memorandum to be distributed to all incoming certification candidates, that we, in English Education, would continue to require a course in Shakespearean drama. The reason was obvious: our students would continue to be placed in senior high schools, and seek employment in schools that required the study of Shakespeare's plays, often, one per senior high grade level. Thus candidates for the secondary school English credential would probably be unprepared without such courses in literature study.

To many interested observers, the dropping of Shakespeare by the FSU English department was branded as something bordering on the catastrophic. Education correspondents of several newspapers statewide criticized, even condemned the decision. One in particular, Martin Dykman, an editorial columnist of some repute, of the *St. Petersburg Times* (a daily journal with wide readership in the State) was especially vitriolic. An FSU English graduate, he denounced the loss of Shakespeare in a piece titled, "More in Sorrow Than in Anger" in bitter terms. All of this brouhaha may have had some positive impact; in 1995, the English faculty was authorized to hire several new tenure-earning faculty members. Throughout that

minor crisis, the English Ed students were given priority in their attempt to register for the Shakespeare courses, this demonstrating once again the blessedly cooperative attitude of the English department toward candidates for teacher certification. Further evidence of this spirit was reflected in that department's invitation to one of the English Education faculty members, each semester, to lay out our program to all interested English majors, both undergraduate and graduate, who were interested in becoming certified to teach in middle and secondary schools.

The Shakespeare issue did represent a problem for the English Education faculty and, indeed, for teacher educators everywhere. To the decision makers in state capitols (such as Tallahassee, Florida), all programs of study whose purpose is to prepare individuals whose mission is to serve the state's citizens need to reflect current needs. During this chronology, that sentiment has frequently been evident. When the Right to Read, Functional Literacy, Minimum Competencies days came about, our teacher preparation program featured required work in Secondary Reading. When the great "Johnny Can't Write" challenge was voiced, we modified the graduate Teaching Writing course for our undergraduates. When computer literacy was added to functional and cultural literacies as vital to the entry of young people into the adult world of the late 90s, early 21st century era, we created Technology in Teaching English. More recently, when the Legislature mandated Teaching English as a Second Language (TESOL), we cooperated with the Multilingual/Multicultural faculty—in our own department—to identify course work which would meet the letter as well as the spirit of the requirement. (NOTE: the TESOL legislative adjustment really began in 2000. It is just now being put into place.) Through all of

these adjustments, however, one fact remains decisive: from beginning chemistry, we learned that “matter can be neither created nor destroyed.” In the case of the English Education program, this means that students must be allowed to complete their degrees, and certification requirements, in four years, or with 90 hours; i.e., no more hours tacked on. In the words of an old 1950s ballad, when new courses are added, “Somethin’s Gotta Give”.

One option always available has been to reduce the number of credit hours in the discipline: 27 hours in “straight English” throughout the years of the Florida State English Ed program. To do so, however, would be to bring down the wrath of the Arthur Bestors, Jack Gordons, and Lynn Cheney’s of the world—and their most recent group of organized supporters, the American Council of Trustees and Alumni (ACTA), an organization to be discussed later in this chapter. Decisions on course distributions have always been most difficult when English Educators were faced with the necessity of what to include, and conversely, what to *exclude*, in the content courses to be required, and still allow undergraduates to finish the program “in time” (which also meant how much money would it cost them and their parents/taxpayers). The Shakespeare decision, therefore, represented the horns of a dilemma. If Shakespeare stays in, what is ruled out?

Persuasive arguments have, until lately, been made for year-long survey courses in British and American Literature. If those 12 hours were added to Shakespeare (3), Grammar (3), and Advanced Composition (3), the total would be 21, thus leaving two courses as electives in English. Given the range of topical offerings available today, two courses provide precious little opportunity to “educate” the

prospective English teachers. Moreover, the fallout from the debates raging in English departments in colleges and universities nationwide, has affected the content of the British and American literature surveys to be offered. In those courses, the following decisions were at issue:

1. Which eras should be emphasized: early, more recent, or contemporary; i.e., (Chaucer or Tom Stoppard, etc.)
2. Would African American, Hispanic, and/or Native American authors be included or must their representation be restricted primarily to white males?
3. Closely related to #2, what would the gender lineup be in these two surveys? Would there be an “adequate” inclusion of Elizabeth Barrett Brownings and Emily Dickinsons, or would the “good ole boys” continue to dominate the Tables of Contents?
4. Would chronological/historical survey remain as the organizing principle of these courses, or would genres, themes, modes, or Big Name writers govern the overall structure of the courses?

All of the above issues and others were deliberated throughout the 90s. None were truly resolved as this history is being written. As a result, what British and American literature was being studied by prospective upper grade level teachers at FSU depends on who teaches the courses and from which texts.²³ In summary,

²³An issue never considered in English department dialogues was the position of Young Adult literature. That concern, vital in the training of middle school/junior high teachers, has always been left to English Education at FSU—with some assistance available from the School of Informational Studies (Library Science). In many state universities, however, this course is the property of the English department.

between Legislative mandates and Department of English internecine warfare, the maintenance of a stable, substantive, currently pertinent core of English students became a demanding and sometimes vexing task for our undergraduate advisors in the 90s—and moreso today.

The 90s saw another problem come to a head, one which involved the entire university, but in which English Education played a significant role. The issue of programmatic certification is one which all universities face on a regular, continuing basis. Among those programs which seek to acquire and maintain such accreditation are those of teacher education. While there are at present 22 such programs at FSU, and barely half of them exist in the College of Education, when the time rolls around for teacher ed programs to be evaluated/reevaluated, it is the COE which must assume the burden of response.

For programs such as English Education, three external agencies are regular reviewers/evaluators: the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS), the National Council on Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), and the Florida Department of Education (DOE). The latter agency was created in the 1980s, yet another example of the Florida Legislature's incessant desire to micro-manage all phases of public schooling in the Sunshine State. None, however, is more important than NCATE to any teacher education program whose goal is to maintain an acceptable status among the 50 states of the union.

To quote from NCATE's web site posted in 2003:

- NCATE's dual mission is accountability and improvement in teacher preparation. The NCATE accreditation process establishes rigorous standards

for teacher education programs, holds accredited institutions accountable for meeting these standards, and encourages unaccredited schools to demonstrate the quality of their programs by working for and achieving professional accreditation.

- In NCATE’s performance-based accreditation system, institutions must provide evidence of competent teacher candidate performance. NCATE accredited colleges of education are expected to ensure that teacher candidates know their subject and how to teach it effectively.
- NCATE is a non-profit, non-governmental organization, founded in 1954. More than 30 national associations representing the education profession at large make up the council. The associations that comprise NCATE appoint representatives to NCATE’s policy boards, which develop NCATE standards, policies, and procedures. Membership on policy boards includes representatives from organizations of teacher educators, teachers, state and local policymakers, and professional specialists in P-12 schools.
- The U.S. Department of Education recognizes NCATE as the professional accrediting body for colleges and universities that prepare teachers and other professional personnel for work in elementary and secondary schools.

Quick Statistics

- Over 2,000 professional volunteer their time to make NCATE’s accrediting system work—policy board members, program reviewers, on-site team members, and others.

- Currently, 525 institutions are accredited and another 100 are candidates and precandidates for accreditation.²⁴ The number of candidates for accreditation has almost tripled in the past five years, due to the growing demand for accountability from states and the public, and the number of accredited institutions has risen steadily.
- Thirty-three member organizations representing millions of Americans support and sustain NCATE. NCATE is the largest coalition of education and public organizations in the nation devoted to quality teaching, and one of the longest-standing national coalitions of stakeholders in the education community.

NCATE and the States

- NCATE works with states to integrate national professional standards and state standards in order to upgrade the quality of teacher preparation in the United States. There are currently 46 state/NCATE partnerships in which the states and NCATE conduct joint or concurrent review, saving institutions and states time and money.
- As of 2001, 28 states have adopted or adapted NCATE unit standards as the state unit standards. NCATE's professional program standards have influenced teacher preparation in 45 states and the District of Columbia. NCATE standards are increasingly the norm in teacher preparation.

²⁴ NCATE currently accredits 602 colleges of education with nearly 100 more seeking NCATE accreditation, according to the 2006 web site: <http://www.ncate.org/public/aboutNCATE.asp?ch=1>, September 26, 2005.

- NCATE revises its unit accreditation standards every five years to ensure that the standards reflect current research and state-of-the-art practice in the teaching profession.

What NCATE accreditation means for job-seekers:

- Teacher candidates who graduate from NCATE-accredited schools will be better prepared for initial licensing and advanced board certification. NCATE is working with the Interstate New Teachers Assessment and Support Consortium, and the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards to ensure that teacher education accreditation standards, model teacher licensing standards, and advanced teacher certification standards are compatible.
- Some states have reciprocity agreements based on graduation from NCATE-accredited schools, so graduates of NCATE-accredited schools will generally find it easier to apply for licensure when they move out of state.

(<http://www.ncate.org/>, September 2003)

As time progressed and the organization gained in both membership and stature, its criteria for accreditation became more exacting and, to some, more unreasonably rigid. One of those organizations which regarded NCATE with such skepticism was the Council of Land Grant Deans, a group of COE executives of the 100 largest, most prestigious, and most research-oriented institutions in the nation. Throughout the latter half of the 80s, one such member was Robert Lathrop, then-Florida State dean. His desire was to pull the College out of NCATE entirely, a move which was vetoed by his immediate superior, Provost Turnbull.

During the 80s, however, NCATE turned toward what was called “performance based criteria” in establishing its requirements for continuing accreditation. These newer criteria placed heavy emphasis on the instigation of field based components in teacher education programs of study. Accordingly, English Education, which had, since the late 60s, included a pre-student-teaching participation course, added school based elements to three of its undergraduate offerings. The change in emphasis was not, however, enthusiastically accepted by the Land Grant Deans’ organization. In 1982, 80% of that group, while voting in general support of NCATE, also expressed the feeling that “other agencies” be asked to be approached in terms the rationales for establishing *their* criteria. Accordingly, a splinter group met later in that year to deliberate the “other agencies” issue. In 1986, these deliberations culminated in the founding of the “Holmes Group”—and another challenge was raised to the already harried teacher education element of COE’s.

Relying once again on the “something’s gotta give” principle, the Holmes Group members lamented the loss of academic content in training programs for prospective teachers. Its membership, which grew rapidly over the next ten-year period, included some of the more prestigious institutions of higher education, both public and private. This pro-academic course inclusion stance caused several from the NCATE enclave to label Holmes proponents as “elitist”. In fact, the Holmes Group did espouse the following three precepts as vital to success in the education of prospective teachers:

1. An increase in content course; e.g., English Literature, Rhetoric, etc., in programs of study

2. An increase in the “intellectual vigor” in those professional courses required by COE’s
3. The revision of all programs, in order to accommodate precepts one and two, to five-year duration

In fact, no serious attempt was ever made to establish a Holmes chapter at FSU. While then-Dean Lathrop was, as stated earlier, somewhat hostile to the direction of NCATE, his vocational education/soft money background made him an unlikely candidate for the role of leader of any Holmes insurrection at FSU. Moreover, no Arts and Science group or individual chose to initiate such a movement. Thus, at FSU, consideration of the Holmes Group affiliation never progressed beyond the water cooler dialogue stage. No mention was ever made of the Holmes movement at general monthly sessions of the Faculty Senate, a body which I served as representative from my department and college for 35 years. Of some interest, however, was the decision of our brother institution, the University of Florida, to join the Holmes movement. Consequently, that university, in the very early 90s, put in place a five-year program for those who wished to obtain a baccalaureate degree accompanied by a teacher’s certificate. Thus it was that the Master’s degree applications in English Education at FSU were swelled by a sizeable number of UF transfers. These applicants saw a tangible benefit in working on a graduate degree and certification requirements (including a full semester of student teaching) simultaneously. The incidence of such UF applicants continued throughout the decade.

As the 90s progressed, both NCATE and the Holmes Group modified their criteria. In 1996, the Holmes Group became the “Holmes Partnership,” a modification which included considerable amalgamation of its member institutions with selected and cooperating public schools, both elementary and secondary levels. As its February 1996 web site states:

After a 10-year quest for better ways to educate teachers, the Holmes Group has acknowledged that higher education can’t do the job all by itself. The premier network concerned with revitalizing teacher education is fashioning itself into a new organization that will link colleges and universities with schools and districts.

In its broader incarnation, the Holmes Partnership will pursue the agenda for improving schools and teacher preparation set forth by the Holmes Group in an influential trilogy of reports over the past decade. The group of 90 research institutions and historically black colleges announced the changes at its annual meeting here Jan. 26-28.

The expanded scope and wider participation reflect a growing belief among the group’s members that school reform is too complex to be accomplished by any single set of players.

“The Holmes Group has figured out that education schools aren’t going to be able to get the work done just by talking to education schools,” said Frank Murray, a professor of education at the University of Delaware and the interim president of the Holmes Partnership.

The Holmes Group grew out of meetings organized in the early 1980s by education school deans at leading research universities. At a time of intense public scrutiny of the quality of schools and teachers, the deans were concerned about accreditation standards and the low status of teacher education programs at their institutions.

In 1986, with an expanded membership, the Holmes Group issued an influential report arguing that teaching should be transformed from an occupation into a profession.

Since then, it has called for the creation of professional-development schools and the overhaul of education schools to make their work more relevant to the challenges faced by teachers and administrators.

The Holmes Partnership will have two types of members.

“Partnerships” will bring together, at a minimum, a single college or university and a school or school district.

Professional organizations, such as the national teachers’ unions, the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, and the national associations representing school administrators and school board members, will be invited to join the group as “partners.” (<http://www.udel.edu/holmes/>, February, 1996)

Whatever came of this substantial revision of goals, the Holmes Group has not established any sort of liaison with FSU as their history is transcribed.

Back to NCATE and the contentious episodes of the 1980s and 90s (the latter ones more germane to this tale of English Education. The deans and provosts of many of the larger research universities felt that, during the prior decade, the NCATE leadership had developed what is known in current vernacular as an “attitude”. Several threatened to pull out of affiliation with that accrediting agency entirely and, in the latter years of the 1980s, some did so. The feeling was particularly strong among the large institutions of the Big Ten, the University of Wisconsin being the first to jump ship. The high-handed approach to the whole accreditation task became distinctly noticeable to the Florida State leadership in the early 90s and was probably at the heart of Dean Lathrop’s desultory approach to the task of preparing for the ensuing NCATE assessment of the University’s teaching education paradigm. Upon his retirement in 1993, the responsibility of coordinating that process fell to the new dean, Dr. Jack Miller. In all candor, the rather cavalier attitude which Dean Miller took toward these duties did not sit well with the visiting team of evaluators who, in 1998, placed several programs on probation, including English Education. Angered by the patently condescending attitude obvious in the committee’s assessment of FSU’s program, we set to work responding to the demands stated in the report, some of which we felt to be draconian.²⁵ At length, the four of us completed our labors, under the patient and, at times, ingenious leadership of Dr. Carroll, and, in the early days of 2000, finally received the NCATE blessing.

²⁵One of the more memorable mandates made (with a straight face) by the visiting committee chair was that we approach the English Department and *demand* (italics mine) that they drastically revise their teaching strategies in line with the NCATE spirit.

In the fall of 2001, as I began my first year of a retirement/Professor Emeritus existence, a new dean, Dr. Richard Kunkel assumed the reins of the COE and began moving several curricular elements of the College in a very different direction. In retrospect, teacher education within the College and indeed throughout the University took a back seat as a priority as far back as the replacement of Dean Phillip Fordyce in summer 1974. None of his followers in the COE deanship—Gant, Tuckman, Lathrop, or Miller—possessed the background, the interest, or the sensitivity to guide teacher education programs in the direction demanded by the times. While all of these administrators mouthed pious platitudes about the need for strengthening teacher education during their years at the helm, they never put their money where their mouths were—and English Education suffered along with the rest. The lone exception to these years of indifference and short rations was Science Education, whose faculty continued to possess the great writing skills which shook the National Science Foundation’s grant tree.

In summary, FSU’s English Education program, during the 90s, did continue to sustain its visibility in the state, region, nation, and the English-speaking world.

Our graduate program underwent a significant revision during the latter part of the decade. Following the suggestions of a 1996 review of that program by; the Graduate Policy Committee (which was influenced by outside consultant, Bob Shafer), the Master’s component was considerably diversified. Its new look was:

- ◆ Traditional English Ed/English courses
- ◆ English Ed with an emphasis on secondary reading
- ◆ English Ed with an emphasis on community college composition

- ◆ English Ed with an emphasis in ESL
- ◆ English Ed with an emphasis on National Board Certification

Since we had no additional monetary support to offer prospective students to select any of the above options, there was no subsequent increase in the number of new applicants; it just made the advisement/committee compositions somewhat more complex.

Outside the programmatic area, we continued to make our presence felt, especially in the area of Young Adult literature. I was appointed guest editor of the winter issue (1993) of *ALAN Review*, which focused on the school censorship topic. The individual who really expanded the connection, however, was Dr. Carroll. A regular participant in *ALAN* workshops and frequent contributor to *ALAN Review*, she earned ALAN Foundation Award for research in Young Adult literature in 1989 (and received the same award in 1999). She gained an appointment to the Executive Board of ALAN in 1996, and she was also appointed to a special interest group on adolescent literature created by the IRA executive board in 1997. She was selected by the ALAN membership for a three-year term to the Executive Board in 1997. In 1999, she accepted a three-year term as editor of *ALAN REVIEW* and accepted a second term in 2002. One of her first acts as editor was to appoint me to its Editorial Board. During her first term as editor, Drs. Baines, Wood, and I all contributed essays which were published in that journal.

In 1992, Dr. Carroll took the position of co-director of the North Florida Writing Project. She teamed with a new school-based co-director, Ms. Diane Pulignano, an experienced English teacher at Godby High School in Tallahassee. Ms.

Pulignano had served as a consultant in every FSU Writing Project summer workshop at FSU from the beginnings in 1986 and, like so many NWP veterans, was a true believer.

The manner of support for this important staff development had changed in the 90s. Now the sponsoring U.S. Department of Education provided stipends of \$10,000 to \$20,000 to those programs which met their criteria. For the first five years, Dr. Carroll's proposals were successful. Recruiting participants, however, posed an increasing problem over that period. By 1992, the Florida State chapter had been in operation for six years, including the two-institute-summer of 1981. Despite the continued enthusiasm of old times, the hinterland of North Florida was producing fewer commuter applicants. Then, too, the Project had to compete with two newer chapters operating in Orlando and Ft. Walton Beach. Thus the recruiting wars intensified over that period and, instead of 25-member groups each summer, groups of around 15 became the norm. Actually, the smaller numbers enabled the co-directors to increase their stipends, those of the three or four consultants hired each summer, and those offered the participants. Providing out-of-town teachers with adequate, affordable housing emerged as another challenge.

A more subtle problem arose from the acquisition of Federal funding: the discontinuance of soliciting local support. This need became dramatically evident in summer 1997. Dr. Carroll's proposal to USDE was rejected. Added to the problem was her decision to accompany her new husband, Dr. Joseph Donoghue, FSU Geology professor, to Groningen, Holland, where he was serving as a consultant to the Dutch government. Assuming the Summer Institute would be funded, we were

well along in the recruiting process and had already received positive responses from over a dozen applicants. I accepted Dr. Carroll's request to serve as a one-time pinch hitter working with two graduate students and classroom teacher co-directors. Needless to say, the funding of the suddenly-penniless project was my first concern. The Dean of Graduate Studies and Research came through with \$5,000; the COE Dean with my salary, plus one other co-director's stipend. Newly-elected Leon County Schools Superintendent, Bill Montford, subsidized six of his district's teachers. The Tallahassee *Democrat*, Publix Supermarket, Bank of America, and Farmers/Merchants Banks all contributed. We cut back on out-of-state consultants' services and provided a good deal of the morning coffee/snack offerings from our own pantries and refrigerators. Four excellent local consultants gave of their services *gratis*. I shamelessly raided the supply closets of both my department and the Dean's office. Somehow, 17 Summer Institute participants were afforded a three-week program on a par with those of earlier years. In the end, my old Army scrounging skills came through. The whole enterprise gave me a feeling of great satisfaction.

Upon her return, Dr. Carroll studied the critique of her 1997 proposal and composed one for 1998 which she hoped met the concerns of the USDE evaluation committee. That proposal, sad to relate, was also rejected. Undaunted, she tried again in 1999, with the same result. In all candor, the 1998 and '99 critiques were unconvincing. By then, Dr. Baines had left, I was considering retirement, and the two new faculty members hired in 1998 and '99 showed no enthusiasm for the local support, full-court-press strategy. Thus the FSU English Education program entered

the new millennium minus a Writing Project chapter. To those of us who were involved over that twelve-year period, however, it had been well worth the effort.

Members of the program continued to make contributions on the state and national levels. Dr. Carroll, was in due time, appointed to advisory boards of two NCTE periodicals, *English Education* and *The English Journal*. In 1994, she received an NCTE Affiliate Award for Multicultural Education for her work in the state council. In 1997, she succeeded me as a member of the Statewide Course Numbering System. In 1998, I chaired the English Language Arts committee, grades 6-12, for the Education Standards Commission; Subject Matter Standards for the Florida Department of Education.

My work on the censorship issue continued. In 1994, I edited an anthology, to which I contributed two essays: *Censorship—A Threat to Reading, Thinking, and Learning*, published by IRA. In 1992 and 93, I chaired pre-convention workshops on the topic for the same organization and published three more essays on censorship in national journals.

In 1991, I also contributed a chapter titled “The Junior High Years” to *The Handbook of Research on Teaching the Language Arts*, sponsored jointly by NCTE and IRA, and published by MacMillan & Co. In 1992, with one of my formal doctoral students, H. Edward Deluzain, I published the text *Teaching Literature in Middle and Secondary Schools* with Allyn Bacon & Co. I followed that, in 1994, with the chapter, “The NCTE Curriculum Commission” in a large volume titled *Encyclopedia of English Studies and Language Arts* by NCTE.

In 1994, Bob Shafer and I published the results of a study which we undertook independently just prior to the 1992 General (U.S.) Election. Its (self-evident) title was, “A Survey of Attitudes Towards Certain Aspects of the English Curriculum Held by Selected Educational and Non-Educational Groups Designated as *Liberal* and *Conservative*”. NCTE/ERIC was our publisher, and we made presentations on those results at an international meeting in Norwich, UK, in Spring 1993; at the Spring NCTE conference at Portland (Oregon) in 1994, and at the fall NCTE conference in Orlando, also in 1994. English Ed faculty members also stayed active in the international sphere during the decade. Beside my UK appearances in 1990, 91, 93, and 95, Drs. Baines, Carroll, and jointly conducted three workshops, two on middle school language arts and one on multicultural literature in Florida, at the international conference co-sponsored by IFTE and NCTE on the New York University campus in July 1995. I contributed the lead essay to *Children and Books in the Modern World*, Ed Marum, editor, Falmer Press, London in 1996, and the lead essay (U.S. on censorship) to the NATE quarterly, *English in Education*, also in 1996. Dr. Shafer and I were to make a joint presentation on the phonics-whole language debate ongoing in USA at the NATE annual meeting at York in April 1997, but his sudden death and my illness forced its cancellation.

Dean Miller did offer to underwrite a regional conference I organized in spring 1994 on Whole Language for Young People. That meeting was held at the Turnbull Center, May 12-14, 1994. A small but enthusiastic audience of teachers, K-college convened to hear such distinguished speakers as Dr. John Mayher of New York University, Dr. Jesse Perry of the San Diego Schools and Immediate Past

President, NCTE, Robert Probst of Georgia State University, Edmund Farrell of the University of Texas, Margaret Early of the University of Florida, Sheridan Blau of the University of California, Santa Barbara, Martha Kolln of Penn State University, among others. At the Friday dinner, a tribute was paid to the now-terminally ill Dwight Burton, guest of honor. To be candid, the event was a financial loser, but it did bring to campus a number of eminent scholar/educators who addressed a timely topic.

In late spring 1998, the provost allowed English Education to conduct a search, albeit belated, for a replacement for the soon-to-be-departed Dr. Baines. After an accelerated investigation, we hired, that summer, Dr. Cynthia Bowman, a doctoral graduate of Kent State (Ohio) University and a member, at the time, of the English faculty at Ball State University, Muncie, Indiana. Dr. Bowman's credentials were exceptional. That she was able to perform her duties, and initiate scholarly pursuits, was even more remarkable given her severe physical limitations: in her childhood, she had contracted rheumatoid arthritis which significantly limited her mobility and was irreversible.

Dr. Bowman made a valiant effort to occupy her role as a tenure-track faculty member of a department in a large, research-oriented university. She taught a variety of courses and picked up where Dr. Baines had left off—providing an excellent offering in technology. She performed her field supervision, albeit with difficulty. She initiated a working relationship with a middle school whose student population performed below acceptable academic standards. She was placed on several, probably too many key college and university committees. She was selected for

membership on the CEE Executive Committee. She made every effort to produce professional/scholarly writing, an important factor in becoming eligible for promotion and tenure. In the end, the demands of her position were too great. She is currently seeking a position in a smaller, less demanding college or university environment, departing FSU in May 2003.

In 1999, the provost authorized another search which, if successful, would bring the total English Education faculty of tenured and tenure-earning members to four (for the first time in ten years). The search ended successfully. Dr. Susan Wood became a beginning assistant professor in fall 1999. Dr. Wood had received her Ph.D. from the University of Florida in 1997 and came to FSU after three years as Assistant Professor in the School of Education, Western Oregon University. Her experience in teaching, eleven years in Kentucky elementary, middle, and high schools was strongly in her favor. Public school classroom teaching experience has continued to be a highly important credential in the portfolios of English Education faculty aspirants, a qualification held to by the great majority of respected programs in the country.

Dr. Wood brought to the program a background which included writing instruction, children's literature, curriculum frameworks, literacy assessment, English methods, and field supervision. In the short time she has been a faculty member, she has taught courses in Young Adult literature, undergraduate methods, writing and reading methods. In the final area noted, she designed a new Reading in the Content Areas course and has become in essence my successor in the Reading instruction area. She has also become an effective supervisor of field experience. She has

maintained involvement in NCTE and its most pertinent subgroup, CEE. She has also quickly made her presence felt as a contributor to the Florida Council of Teachers of English.

Closer to home, Dr. Wood has involved herself extensively in articulation with local schools. She is participating in “Electronic Teachers”, a project to assist the teachers of neighboring Gadsden County (Florida) with professional development in telecommunications. She has and is working in two “disadvantaged” Leon County middle schools in broad curriculum development endeavors and is a consultant to the Florida State University School (formerly Florida High) in its creation of a Professional Development School model, an initiative launched in the COE by recently (2001) appointed Dean Richard Kunkel. She is also assisting in the revision of the five alternate tracks of the English Education Master’s Degree offering.

Of particular interest is Dr. Wood’s work in the Florida Literacy and Reading Excellence Project (Fla RE). A statewide initiative sponsored by the Florida Governor’s office, this effort represents the latest in ongoing attempts to enhance staff development in literacy (especially reading) pedagogical skills of Florida teachers at all grade levels – an enterprise quite similar to the Right to Read program of the 70s. Dr. Wood has already served three years as a Fla RE Faculty Fellow and has established herself as a prominent contributor. To state the obvious, she hit the ground running.

During the 90s, despite the flux in which English Education found itself, we could identify a number of successes in terms of those in our student ranks. Making the most out of what resources at our command, we were able to graduate some

outstanding teacher educators/supervisors-to-be during the decade. Among them were:

1. Beverly Chin-actually received her Ph.D. elsewhere, but earned the BS and MA, English Ed at FSU in the 70s; professor and director of English Education, University of Montana; named Distinguished COE Alumna, Homecoming 1994; president, NCTE, 1995
2. Tom Albritton – Ph.D., 1996; Wake Forest University
3. Gail Gregg – Ph.D., 1996; Florida International University department chair, 2000; Professor of Year Award, 2002
4. Linda Broughton – Ph.D., 1997; U. of Tennessee, 1997-98; professor and English Education department head, University of South Alabama, 2000; currently at Kennesaw State, Georgia
5. Kathryn Kelly – Ph.D., 1998; Central Connecticut University, 1998-2001; Radford University (Virginia) 2001 –; in 2005, was elected chair of ALAN
6. Lilly Bridwell-Bowles – Ph.D., U. of Georgia in 80s; BS, MA English Education, 70s; now Director of Writing, University of Minnesota
7. Carolyn Irvine – Ph.D., 1990; Associate Professor of English, Florida A & M University, 1990 –
8. Elizabeth Watts – Ph.D. 1998; Rutgers University; Broward County Schools, 1998 –
9. Helen O’Hara Connell – Ph.D., 1994; Director of Secondary Education, Barry University (Miami, FL), 1990-; head of education at Barry, 2003 -

10. Richard Earl Carroll – Ph.D., 1992; Chair of English, Dean of Instruction, Chipola Jr. College (Marianna, FL)
11. William T. Ojala – Ph.D., 1969. Already noted. Joined the English department, Arizona State University, fall 1971; Presented with Distinguished Service Award by the Arizona English Teachers Association, 1994 (deceased, 2003)

It should be noted, at this point, that the decade, and early in the new millennium, three outstanding contributors to the English Education program at FSU passed away. In 1999, Kellogg Hunt, nationally known English linguistics authority and builder of the now-defunct linguistics arm of the Florida State English department, died. In 2002,, James McCrimmon, renowned rhetorician, went to his rest, as did Roy O'Donnell, who had retired from the University of Georgia, having led the Language Education department there for almost two decades. Those three scholars, together with the late Dwight Burton (deceased, 1995). With Fred Standley and myself, they comprised the powerful Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program of the late 1960s. *In pace requiescat.*

With the arrival of the new millennium, an old nemesis in the guise of a “new” reform movement emerged on the national scene. Within the early months of his hairline, disputed victory of Al Gore, President George W. Bush moved to imprint his Texas-style conservatism on the American landscape. (As I write this, the country holds its breath as the war in Iraq seems endless, the national debt and unemployment figures rise, and anti-American sentiments increase worldwide.) It came as no surprise, therefore, that any movement toward liberalizing any phase of U.S.

education would be contested and/or suppressed. The “No Child Left Behind” slogan included, as a main thrust, a shift in emphasis on attacking the nationwide literacy problem. Of the several “remedies” introduced by the new Education Commissioner, Rod Paige, two demands drew the attention of literacy teachers in general and English Educators in particular. The first, entirely predictable was the promotion of computer in education *uber alles*. Any elaboration on that position would hardly seem necessary—except to say that once again the detachment of students from the *communication* process was being espoused. Second was the wholesale regressive movement toward phonics as *the* way to introduce and develop the basic reading skills of *all* American children. The off-discredited theory was the brainchild of Reid Lyon, second in command at USDE, and favorite of both the President and the Commissioner.

Mr. Lyon asserted that he had *The Answer* to the nation’s literacy problems. The teachers of the US were people of good will and genuine commitment. The phonics approach was the only, the *true* way to success in literacy instruction. Why, then, were things not working, he asked rhetorically. Well, it was the fault of that old culprit, the College(s) of Education who, with the student-centered, sociolinguistic, whole language garbage had led the country astray. In one of the more memorable quotes uttered in the new millennium, Lyon stated, in a November 18, 2002 speech made at a public function that, if he had the power, he would *blow up the colleges of education*. (Italics mine)

So colleges of ed, particularly teacher ed components, and most particularly all English Language Arts programs, once again became the targets of reform

zealots.²⁶ Lyon and his followers formed a new action group called the American Council of Trustees and Alumni (ACTA) who set about “educating” key state administrators across the nation. Two of their members were veterans of former President Reagan’s reform entourage: Lynn Cheney (now Second Lady) and Chester Finn. Here is an excerpt from a 2002 web site of the ACTA:

The Problem with Education Schools

Americans have known for a half-century or more that education schools are doing a poor job of educating (not “training”) teachers. As early as the 1950s, Arthur Bestor and Mortimer Smith wrote devastating critiques of the state of American primary and secondary education and highlighted the role of education schools in producing mediocrity. Today, it is common knowledge at colleges and universities across the country that the students, courses, and faculty of education programs do not measure up to their counterparts in the sciences and liberal arts. In fact, it is difficult to find anyone who is not on the payroll of the education establishment who will defend education schools as they now exist.

The reason for this consensus is not hard to find. Education schools are not just weak or inadequate; they are based on fundamentally wrong premises. With rare exceptions, they assume that subject matter is much less important than method. They assume that teachers need only learn *how* to teach, not *what* to teach. They assume that students do not need to learn

²⁶One interesting question arises: How would the E.D. Hirsch Cultural Literacy apostles, with their “immerse kids in real books” philosophy reconcile their differences with the Lyon’s “phonics-yes; real literature-no” crowd?

anything in particular (history, science, etc.) as long as they have learned “how to look it up.” And they assume that it is less important for students to get the right answer than that they go about getting the answer in a personal and interesting way.

Education schools are suffused with the idea that the social growth of the child is not only more important than intellectual development, but that it is more important even as an educational objective. Therefore, they preach to would-be teachers that self-esteem based on “nonjudgmental” feedback is more beneficial to a child than self-respect based on real intellectual achievement. Our education schools spin out theories and pedagogies, often radically disconnected from reality, such as the notion that children must “construct their own knowledge” and that sounding out words is not an effective way to teach reading.

Lastly, the curriculum at many education schools is saturated with a commitment to using classrooms as means of promoting “multiculturalism” and “social justice.” That is to say, they impress upon teachers that they ought to subordinate instruction in the subjects children need to learn to indoctrination in radical critiques of our society.

The Solution: Activate Trustees

While education schools have little or no intellectual credibility, they continue to dominate education and to absorb increasing resources. One reason for this was given in Lynne (*sic*) Cheney’s National Endowment for the Humanities report, *Tyrannical Machines*, for which ACTA president Jerry

Martin was lead researcher. The report showed how the different parts of the education establishment reinforce each other, in effect locking each other in place. The education schools certify the teachers who join the teacher unions and are supervised by educational administrators whose degrees are from education schools. Hence, the unions and bureaucracy do not want the education schools to reform; nor do the education schools want the unions and bureaucracy to reform.

Fortunately, boards of trustees are not part of this iron triangle. Most trustees are individuals of achievement in a variety of business and professional fields. They are in a position to exercise independent judgment. Many of them care deeply about the future of our country and the education of our children. And, most importantly, they have the authority to review the teacher preparation program within their institution and to insist on reform.

The key is to activate trustees—something ACTA knows how to do. We have had remarkable success in working with trustees to promote high academic standards in the liberal arts. For example, due to ACTA's work with trustees, the two huge systems in New York—the 64-campus State University of New York and the 15-campus City University of New York—have developed core curricula that require all students to take broad-based courses in all the basic fields of knowledge.

To become active, trustees need to know several things: (1) how serious the problem is, (2) what is their appropriate role in correcting the problem, (3) how to evaluate their programs, (4) what kinds of teacher

preparation programs would be best, and (5) what specific steps a board can take to review and improve their programs. (www.goacta.org, September 2002)

Does all this sound familiar? The CBE pronouncements of the late 40s/early 60s, cited in Chapter One are given new life in the ACTA manifestos. So are the Lynn Cheney/Jack Gordon anti-COE diatribes of the 1970s and 80s, discussed in Chapter Three. Thus, once again, English Education, with its counterparts in teacher education programs, finds itself under attack. Thus the cyclical nature of history. Of equal interest are the implied conflicting positions of ACTA with the revised goals of the Holmes Partnership and NCATE. These organizations clearly support Colleges of Education and their dynamic teacher education programs. The promotion of these two groups of the Professional Development School concept, one which both depends on COE's and seeks to enrich their offerings through symbiotic relationships has as one of its goals the strengthening—rather than the destruction of these Colleges.

As the decade and the millennium ended, the English Education program continued to pursue the goals which had essentially been established by Dwight Burton some 50 years earlier:

1. An undergraduate program strong in content and dedicated to serving the changing, growing state population and its schools
2. A graduate program which stressed excellence in the discipline and reflective of contemporary trends in the profession
3. A willingness to meet the in-service needs of schools throughout this diverse state

4. A strong interest in becoming involved in research and development enterprises through its doctoral program as well as that which was conducted through the support of external agencies
5. An ongoing spirit of cooperation with the nearby State Department of Education
6. A desire to maintain its tradition of assuming leadership roles in the activities of the Florida and National Council of Teachers of English
7. A willingness to become further involved in worldwide enterprises of such agencies as the Department of Defense Schools and the International Federation of the Teaching of English
8. Affiliation with such relevant professional organizations as the International Reading Association, the Association for Supervision, Curriculum Development, and the American Education Research Association, and the Modern Language Association
9. Continuing to present monographs, essays, and chapters, both solicited and independently submitted, to privately owned publishing corporations, and those sponsored by professional organizations
10. To continue to serve as a link between scholarly and professional offerings of university departments and consortia and the English Language Arts departments of the public schools of Florida and elsewhere.

In the next and final chapter of this chronicle, an attempt will be made to consider the future of English Education in Florida and across the nation. The

statements of a number of well-known individuals from within the state and from outstanding universities in the United States will feature these predictions.

Chapter VI - Passing the Torch

As I begin this final chapter, I feel compelled to ask the reader's indulgence as I make two points. First, in the final paragraphs of the previous chapter, some events of the new century were recorded. It goes without saying that the written historical record of *any* dynamic entity is a complex and frustrating undertaking. For example, I am composing this chapter introduction at a precise moment in time, and yet, while I am in the act of writing, important events which are germane, even crucial to the narrative are probably unfolding. Moreover, this text will probably not find its way into the hands of readers for years, and therefore that which is labeled "current" here will be "past" as early as tomorrow. Thus the inevitable effect of the ticking clock.

Second, I would explain two personal limitations which have led me to conclude *my* historical review at the turn of the century: my retirement from the Florida State University faculty which came in April, 2001. As the decade of the 90s wound down, I gradually tapered off active participation in several endeavors which had been important preoccupations for all or part of my 39 years as an English and Reading educator: my role as program leader, my Faculty Senate membership, and my active participation in FCTE, NCTE, and IRA. To be quite candid, the decision to "hang it up" was catalyzed by my unwillingness to expend such energy as would be necessary to become computer literate. Thus my Dimmesdalian confession: I have managed to survive 70-plus years *sans* the ability even to type.

Due to all of the above, I will provide, in this closing chapter, two sets of predictions of the future of English Education. The first set will be produced by those

scholars who are still quite active in leadership roles nationwide. The second will be drawn from a cohort of professionals who are connected in some way with English Education at this University. It is they who will affect the future of this professional venture in the years to come at Florida State University. In both cases, they are presented in random order.

Michael Angelotti began his teaching career in the Dade County schools. Moving to Tallahassee in the early 1960s, he pursued graduate study in English Education under Dwight Burton and was hired at the University Demonstration School, eventually becoming English Department Head and also President of the Florida Council of Teachers of English (FCTE). Upon completion of the doctorate, he taught first at Texas Tech University and then Oklahoma University where he currently serves as Director of Teacher Education. He has been a member of the CEE Executive Committee and editor of *English International*, an NCTE journal. His prediction for the future of English Education is as follows:

I am optimistic. English education will not only survive, it will thrive in the next several decades. Bluntly, I am not one for “pie-in-the-sky” pronouncements, but in this case the makings are there for a healthy English education. The caveat is, as always, those programs most proactive will gain the most. Key phrases will be timely response to social change; imaginative marketing, public relations, and curriculum design; and meaningful approaches to external funding.

I see social change that will in the end be positive for English education. The primary issue at the university level will continue to be

bottom line: maintaining sufficient enrollments to employ enough faculty to offer an appropriate range of courses that in good conscience support quality undergraduate and graduate English education programs. The definition of “course” will continue to change to include more substantial electronic interplay between professor and student, both as part of courses and as courses in themselves. Rather than exclude or diminish, this trend, in fact, will intensify the need for student-student and student-professor courses that feature on campus and in-field human interplay. Societal dependence on more sophisticated technology and cultural worldism in every day life will require more complex language use and literary understanding. In response, the future will recognize and require solid professionals at all three English education degree levels to properly serve the needs of a more literate society. In turn, English education will prepare teachers not only to thrive in the technological and cultural milieu as learning partners with children and activists for school change, but also to anticipate graduate education as a natural part of professional and life growth and development. The curriculum will encourage such thinking by deepening undergraduate education to encompass emergent societal change and reconceptualizing student teaching as a field-based graduate internship infused with teacher research or other sophisticated problem-solving elements. This graduate-based teacher preparation internship/research component will provide grounding for and credit towards master’s programs which accommodate the needs of experienced teachers for deeper understandings of content, pedagogy, and

research. As teacher preparation programs explicitly link to masters programs, so masters programs smoothly flow into doctoral programs to advance knowledge and prepare the professorate. In the end, professional preparation for teachers is deep, holistic across degrees, and multi-faceted. Further, as the need for more professional teachers is recognized by the society in general, they will be more valued, and so, more rewarded. Acceptance of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards by many legislatures as one standard for teaching excellence is the first step in what I see as a rather rapid movement forward for education over the next decade or two. Support will come not only from governments, businesses, and philanthropic entities, but also from the citizens themselves, if not in dollars, in volunteerism.

Be assured that as a current English education program chair I am acutely aware of present trends and phenomena that fly directly in the face of a robust English education future. Most of them have a long history, will not go away by themselves, and have always been exacerbated by budgetary pressures of the moment. There simply is not space in this piece to tackle such issues as student enrollments, alternative certification, dollars and sense, faculty passivity, and absorption into literacy or other departments. The solutions have always been embedded in imagination and action. Those who do will thrive. Those who don't won't. That is how it has always been. And will be.

Lawrence Baines received a Bachelor's degree and a doctorate in English Education under Edmund Farrell at the University of Texas, Austin. Sandwiched between those degrees is an MA in Computer Science at North Texas State University. He has taught in the Houston public schools and became an Assistant Professor of English Education at FSU in 1994. He is currently head of English Education at the University of Toledo. A recognized authority in technology in curricular studies, Dr. Baines' long range prediction about English Education is as follows:

I was the last doctoral student in English Education at the University of Texas—the very last. I graduated in 1993, three years after Alvin Keman eulogized the demise of English in his scathing, grumpy book *The Death of Literature* (1990). Since 1993, English Education, like classic literature, has become the academic equivalent of an endangered species. Doctoral students at the University of Texas at Austin and across the nation now must major in Language and Literacy, an interesting field, but one whose focus is more with the scientific study of reading in the early years than with teaching adolescents how to read, write, speak, and dream.

The trends which have served to obliterate English Education will likely continue for the foreseeable future—a burgeoning population of illiterate students, increasing numbers of mainstreamed special needs students (ESL, emotionally disturbed, learning disabled), the stranglehold of state exams on curriculum and instruction, governmental incentives tied to the teaching of reading in the early years, the extinction of literary criticism, the

obsession over “scientifically-based methodologies,” There have always existed challenges in teaching English, of course, but what is different today is the unrelenting intensity of these combined forces.

Teaching English has always been more an art than a science. The worth of an English teacher used to be determined by the number of wannabe young writers who poured their hearts onto a page, the amount of sweat and eloquence that were put into a speech, the nods of understanding when reading the words of a man or woman who lived a hundred years ago, the cry of joy when the perfect word was found to fit an elusive thought. Now the worth of an English teacher is determined by an impartial assessment—a single statistic that serves as the lone indicator of quality—the number of students who passed the state’s minimal competency exam.

As odd as it seems, the last, great hope for English Education may depend upon its ability to weld itself to technological innovation. Technology has long been considered essential to students’ employability and skill set, but as of yet, the specific outcomes that attest to technological competence have not been determined. The impossibly broad, malleable standards of the International Standards in Technology Education provide ample evidence that there will be no multiple-choice exam to assess competence in technology anytime soon. Indeed, by the time technology could be standardized and bureaucratized, it would already be obsolete.

Technology’s certain, rapid obsolescence has been a blessing. Whether working with new or old machines, teachers can still encourage exploration,

expression, precision, and learning for learning's sake. In fact, technology is one of the few areas of the curriculum where creativity and self-expression are still valued. Of course, creativity and self-expression have always served as the cornerstones of English Education. Now, more than ever, they are worth saving.

Carol Bencich served as an English Educator in the Brevard County (Florida) schools for a number of years, first as a classroom teacher and then as English Language Arts Supervisor. She has also been elected president of FCTE. She later received her Ph.D. under Roy O'Donnell at the University of Georgia. She is currently Professor of English Education at Indiana University of Pennsylvania. She has been highly active in NCTE. The following is her vision of the future:

It's tempting to predict the end of English Education, given the strident call of current politicians.

Rather, I would like to celebrate the rich changes that are taking place in literacy, given the impact of visual and technological influences. Our students arrive in English Education programs with broadly divergent ways of making meaning from the world, and with patterns of learning that have been shaped in part by teachers who entered the profession in an earlier decade. The challenge, as always, will be to wed the current with the traditional.

During the past ten years, scholastic reading and writing habits have been perverted by the widespread focus on assessment testing. Students from

that era will be entering English Education wondering why they need four years of university preparation to teach to the test. If this reductive trend continues, our ideas about learning will diminish also.

I think it's important to predict a greater need for understanding the ways people learn English as a second language. ESL instruction will be added to English Education programs, and I see this as a healthy heightening of teachers' awareness that every person's literacy experience is unique.

I would expect to see an even greater emphasis on internet literacy in future English Education programs. As software replaces textbooks in the classroom, our students will need increased technological skills.

Surely there will be an increased focus on field experiences for our students – and this will create a need for close collaboration between English Education programs and collaborating school districts. Perhaps the model of one semester of student teaching will evolve into an entire year's experience, one that combines the collegiality and theoretical focus of the college methods class with the authenticity of on-site teaching. Repeatedly, I hear students asking for more experience working with young people in realistic settings. Peer discussions of theory, either electronic or face-to-face, would enrich this additional on-site experience.

English Education programs need to find a way to stay connected with graduates during the first few years of their teaching. Constant mentoring of undergraduates by beginning teachers from the same program would benefit

the profession, and it would draw English Education professors closer to the real contexts of the public school classroom.

Current indicators point to continuing severe budgetary shortfalls at all levels of education in the U.S. The pressure to eliminate or diminish programs, services, and standards will be enormous, and the necessity to defend our existence will frame much of the discourse in the English Education of the 21st century.

Joe Milner is Professor and Director of English Education at Wake Forest University, Winston Salem, North Carolina. He has served as Chair of CEE, has been a member of NCTE's Curriculum Commission, and has written widely in YA literature, English Methods, and Composition. He and his wife are co-authors of *Bridging English*, a widely used English Methods text. Looking down the road, he states:

What lies ahead in English Education? It doesn't look good – even to an everlasting optimist. The pressures of high stakes tests for students will mean that school administrators will take greater control of student teaching; eventually the struggle will lead to their control of the entire preparation of pre-service teachers. PDSs (Professional Development Schools) will slowly replace university and college classrooms as the place where new teachers are prepared. Local practice will replace best practice and research findings will be ignored.

The new SAT writing test, which is dominated by usage, punctuation, and other editing skills, will undercut the hard earned gains made in Writing Projects across the nation. E.D. Hirsch's Core Knowledge curriculum of hard facts will replace the more thoughtful interpretive community built on a reader response model. Moffett's universe of discourse that sees oral language capacity as foundational in literacy will lose the small place it has had in the curriculum.

The saddest part of this miserable scenario is that English Educator's crucial role as colleagues to and critics of the public school's English teachers will be almost wholly marginalized. We will, I fear, retreat to our super intellectual towers to write extended interrogations of pre-service teachers' journals or become the hirelings and sycophants of Curriculum Coordinators. Otherwise things look pretty good for the years ahead.

Carol Pope taught public school English in the Virginia schools before receiving her doctorate in English Education at the University of Virginia under Richard Mead. She has taught at Old Dominion University, Virginia, and is currently head of English Education at North Carolina State University, Raleigh. She has been a member of the Executive Board of CEE and the International Assembly on the Teaching of English, NCTE. She has published numerous monographs on English teaching and has served as president of the North Carolina Council of Teachers of English. She states:

In my view new theories of teaching and learning will emerge in future years as we accommodate national and global demographic shifts, technological innovations, and cultural blurs. Ironically, at a time when many around the world will yearn for "simpler times" and be nostalgic for what "has been," they will simultaneously embrace innovative ways of communicating, learning about each other, and creating data.

What will all these shifts and innovations mean to English education? The literacy teachers of tomorrow will face gigantic demands--accountability for student success in an era of even more student diversity, expectation that students will develop advanced technology skills, and anticipation that students will reach even higher literacy levels than ever before so that they can communicate and negotiate globally. The diminution of financial and personal resources will challenge the thinkers, teachers, and researchers of tomorrow.

While my position may ring negative, I actually see the future as both an exciting and challenging time. English education will, I believe, see the lines blurred even further among English education/literacy/reading, ESL, instructional technology, and culture. Courses and instruction will move from complementing each other to collapsing into each other. Discreet fields of study will necessarily become braided, and isolated fields of study will become obsolete. The world will be integrative, complex, and systemic, and English education will be a space that welcomes such a composite. We have always not only accepted but embraced the experiential, the diverse, the

interrelationship of disciplines; in the future we will not only model but also forge the way for new theories, new ways of seeing, and new ways of teaching and learning in the world.

Robert C. Small, Jr. has been an outstanding English Educator for almost four decades. He received his doctorate under Richard Mead at the University of Virginia and was then appointed Assistant Professor of English at Virginia Tech University, Blacksburg, where he served for many years. He then moved to Radford University (Virginia) where he was Dean of Education and Distinguished Professor of English Education. With Dr. Mead, he published a widely used collection of Readings on YA Literature. He has served as Chair of CEE and the Committee on Intellectual Freedom, International Reading Association (IRA). He and I co-chaired the Joint Task Force on Censorship, NCTE/IRA, 1990-92. His prediction about the future of English Education in the U.S. is as follows:

English Education? In the future? Well, let's think of where we are today. Many (most) states now require a high-stakes test of anyone wanting to be an English teacher. PRAXIS I and II are probably the most widely loved. For me this is clear evidence that all teacher education is already threatened because so many powerful forces believe that all teachers need to be able successfully to teach kids is a college major or minor in a subject. And that major or minor in English better not be contaminated by low quality course in such stuff and literature for adolescents or teaching writing. Some may agree, if "educationists" insist, that it won't hurt the teacher to have two

or three weeks of the quicky stuff in the summer, before they walk into five classes a day of kids. The kids'll love it so much, they'll gladly learn. What? Some classes in how to teach English? A semester-long or – Heaven Forbid! - - a year-long internship in the real world of the English teaching Profession? Forget that. That's only for Physicians and Dentists. English teachers just teach kids stuff about good grammar.

We already see English teachers leaving the profession; and, given the current disaster of the quicky three-week approach to teacher preparation, it is clear that teachers prepared that way will be leaving the profession faster and faster. And so young people will be learning less, and more schools will be condemned for failure. But when the triumph of the “anyone who knows the subject can teach it” belief takes place, whose failure will this be? Once they have their way and there are no teachers prepared to teach as professionals should be, will people wake up and discover that something important is missing, something just isn't working. Maybe they'll discover that what is missing maybe is knowing how to teach English. Maybe missing is giving teachers the professional experience that they need before they enter into the complex work of helping students learn, grow, and understand their language and the world in which they live. But I doubt it.

So am I optimistic that time will make that possible? No! After years of being an English teacher and an English teacher educator, I doubt that we'll ever see TEACHING recognized as a profession, see the funds required to recognize teaching as a profession, to support a significant internship

experience, an understanding that teaching is a complex area of knowledge and insight into human life, truly a profession. I expect that, for years to come, those three-week quickies will get their certification as teachers, walk into those classes of twelve-year-olds and fifteen-year-olds, try to teach them with no understanding of how they can be taught or what they can and will learn, and, as our experience already shows, leave teaching quickly – unfortunately, only to be replaced with a new crop only to repeat the cycle, unfortunately, only to leave the young people of our country without the educated, trained, experienced professionals that the act of being an English teacher requires if those young people are to master about their language what an education should allow them to master.

So, what will English Education be like in the future. Maybe an English major or minor, maybe that quicky internship, and surely something that teachers may put on their resume (or not) when, after a year or two, they're looking for a job doing just about anything else.

Joe Strzepek taught public school English in the San Francisco Bay Area schools. He completed his doctorate in English Education at Stanford University under former NCTE president, Alfred Grommon in 1972. He then joined Richard Mead at the University of Virginia, eventually becoming head of English Education at that institution. He has served as president of the Virginia Association of Teachers of English (VATE) and is the long-time co-director of Virginia's chapter of the

National Writing Project. An active NCTE member, he has published widely in state and national journals. This is his view of the days ahead:

Here are my hopes and fears for the future of English Education.

Hopes: that we continue to attract the incredibly bright, creative, and dedicated young teachers that we have the good fortune to work with at UVA; that the schools they will teach in will be able to pay them salaries they can live on in learning environments they and their students can thrive in; that the economy will rebound so we can afford a staff of student teaching supervisors who can observe them more than once a semester -- we used to observe every other week; that NCATE will die because universities will refuse to toady to their micro-managing of course syllabi and that NCTE will get out of bed with NCATE; that the Conference on English Education get back to its original mission of serving as a forum for English educators; that the current domination of politicians and state bureaucrats now imposing test based curricula on teachers struggling to help our multilingual students become literate citizens is exposed by common sense and research as the poison it has been for students and teachers; that the internet and computer resources be available to all schools, not just the rich ones; that school districts be brave enough to risk new initiatives, as Henrico County has been in Virginia with its program of giving all students computers and putting all courses on line and eliminating course textbooks; that the improvements we have seen in the teaching of writing brought about by the writing process/portfolio/National Writing Project inservices won't be reversed by a back to grammar worksheets

movement, and most of all that poetry writing in the school will continue to nurture both students and teachers.

My fears are that many of my hopes will not be realized, that the sheer size of our English language learning population and the overcrowded schools they are stuffed into will lead to more standardization and regimentation, to fewer opportunities for individualizing language arts instruction.

To move closer to home, I asked a number of Florida educators to speculate on the future of English Education—and teacher education in general. Again, I have arranged their responses in no deliberate order. Each is a “player” in the future of education in the State of Florida. While their professional roles vary, they all share a stake in the quality and direction of literacy teaching/learning of our young people.

The first contributor is Dr. Lawrence Abele, Provost/Academic Vice President of Florida State University, a position he has held for over ten years as this is written. Dr. Abele is a man of science (Ph.D. in Biology), but he is the chief academic officer of FSU and, in that capacity, presides over all programs, both undergraduate and graduate. His interaction with the Legislature has profound implications for all teacher education programs. Also, it is worthy of note that his spouse, Linda Abele, has been a classroom teacher and guidance Counselor at a local elementary school in Tallahassee for over 20 years. Moreover, she participated in the North Florida Writing Project in the late 1980s. Dr. Abel’s views are as follows:

Given the current downturn in the national and state economies of the moment (2005), it is hazardous to predict the fate of virtually *any* university program. As one attempts to foretell the direction of programs such as English Education, however, some facts offer assistance. Most significant is the growing teacher shortage. Since Florida may soon move from fourth to third most-populated state in the Union, it will have to provide more schools and more teachers to meet the needs of the dramatically increased student population, Kindergarten through Grade Twelve.

Like most states, Florida is already scrambling to find ways to hire *qualified* teachers to deal with burgeoning class sizes. In the upper grades, English is the subject most required for graduation. In this state, the English-for-Speakers-of-Other-Languages (ESOL) mandate makes it more necessary to hire English teachers with training relevant to ESOL regulations. Clearly, most English teachers from other states seeking employment here will lack such training. At Florida State University, the teacher education in English program has a long tradition of preparing highly qualified upper grade English teachers and teacher educators. As this statement is written, the program is accredited by all evaluating agencies. Moreover, the program has, in recent years, made every adjustment demanded by these agencies as well as the Florida legislature.

Another issue that influences predictions about English Education at Florida State is the role of the statewide testing of public school students. While it may be a controversial matter in some circles, the Florida

Comprehensive Achievement Test (FCAT) remains a significant element of the education Florida provides all its young people. It would be sanguine in the extreme to believe that FCAT test scores are not uppermost in the minds of all Florida school district leaders. It must then be recognized that Reading and Writing-- often referred to today as *Literacy*--comprise two-thirds of the content of the FCAT in all its forms. It is also worth noting that, in upper grade mathematical components, reading ability remains a powerful factor.²⁷ In the upper grades, the most direct preparation for literacy components of the FCAT is provided by English teachers.

Beyond the demands of statewide testing, English Educators must respond to the expanded nature of literacy instruction: functional, cultural, and technological. For all English teachers who are pursuing certification, the Florida State program currently includes required courses in teaching reading, teaching writing, and technology for English teachers, grades six through twelve. With its research-oriented faculty, and in close cooperation with English department colleagues (long a feature of English Education at this institution), the program promises to show the way in providing effective literacy instruction to Florida's Young Adults. Just what shape that program will take in years to come is not readily predictable; that it will reflect the best thinking of the moment is a virtual certainty.

²⁷ See E.T. Denmark, Jr., Mathematics Educator, Florida State University, in a report to the Florida Department of Education of his analysis of the results of Functional Literacy testing, Statewide, 1978.

The late Wendy Bishop was a distinguished teacher and student of rhetoric/composition until her untimely death in 2004. She was an outstanding member of the FSU Department of English for a number of years, was widely published in her field, and in the 1990s, had served as Chair of the Conference on College Composition and Communication, a prestigious subgroup of NCTE. She represents a large group of FSU English faculty who were supportive of, and participants with English Education, serving on graduate committees, inviting English Ed graduate students to become involved in special programs, and speaking on several occasions at the Summer Institutes of the Writing Project. Her remarks are both profound and enlightening:

During each of my thirteen years at FSU, I've imagined that individuals interested in literacy were poised to experience exciting changes. Each year I thought: now is the time to more usefully link English Education and the English Department's graduate program in Composition and Rhetoric and to strengthen both programs by emphasizing our complementary interests in the reception and production of literary texts, cultural texts, and student texts.

Unfortunately, to say we've been poised for thirteen years is to point to the problems both programs have experienced in obtaining institutional support and in recruiting and retaining an adequate number of faculty. In English Education, a stronger faculty would allow for a broadening and deepening of course offerings which would, in turn, result in an increased ability to attract strong potential teachers from diverse undergraduate

institutions within Florida and across the U.S. English Education is crucial both to the traditional as well as to the more innovative projects that are dear to this university—computer literacy, distance learning, service learning, literacy skills. English Education prepares the teachers who will teach the state’s students to read and write increasingly sophisticated works; and to explore the poetic, the practical, the scholarly, and the technological and multimedia texts which are the cornerstone of university learning. Program graduates will be educating future citizens to become literate citizens who will in turn support state education initiatives.

Consider these issues and relationships. The state of Florida is facing an alarming shortage of K-12 teachers. The state of Florida has the second largest community college system in the US whose community college teachers provide literacy instruction for most transfer students to Florida State. The English Department at FSU trains an enormous graduate teaching assistant staff to provide literacy skills to students in the first-year sequence, a number of whom go on to study in the English Education program. Graduates from both English Education and English will teach in our state’s community college system.

Next, remember that undergraduates in English study literature(s) that they will, before long, be learning to teach in the MA and PH.D. programs in English Education. Yearly, English Education and Composition and Rhetoric students enroll together in an English Department course titled Research Methods in Composition and Rhetoric. The English Education graduate

students always offer a needed perspective to the course discussions. Graduate students in English tend to rush to judgment concerning the K-12 curriculum, usually based on their own limited histories in school. Faced with informed and dedicated K-12 teachers in training, these graduates learn to seek connections and alliances which will help dissolve the bias against education research that permeates the traditional English Department. Sensing a need to combine cognate perspectives rather than argue positions, many English Education students at both the undergraduate and the graduate level choose to take English courses which allow them to explore their own writing: creative writing, article and essay writing, theories of composing. Finally, the First-Year Writing Program has regularly funded an English Department graduate teaching assistant to attend the National Writing Project site—long hosted by FSU English Education—in order to translate concerns and connect K-college pedagogy. Clearly, a foundation for increased collaboration is in place.

What is surprising—and here we return to the moment of being eternally poised—is that institutionally we have not done more: more to support the sorts of (inevitable?) connections I’ve just described and more to support English Education. As someone who has been poised too long, I wonder why the university is not looking to grow in these foundational areas. Why, for instance, aren’t we launching a teacher education initiative that will more rapidly supply well informed K-12 teachers to state schools, a project which will also serve our own growth as a university? Why aren’t we developing specialties in preparing community college English teachers;

supporting cross-institutional research; highlighting connections between K-12 and college instructors; creating innovative courses that will allow for more informed scholarship in English Education and provide faculty and students a greater number of opportunities to receive grants and attract new faculty and students?

If we don't do most of these things, other—often less qualified or more aggressive—individuals and institutions will rush to fill these gaps. And our institution will fail to benefit from current challenges and opportunities to the degree it can and should. For instance, ten years ago, the English Department's Composition and Rhetoric program was growing and *poised* to become *the* degree program within the state in this area. By being poised too long, it lost that opportunity and today has been eclipsed by a program at another Florida university which has more regularly received overall support and notable help in cultivating a strong and growing faculty.

I would hate to see the same happen to English Education at Florida State University. English Education faculty though few are widely known and respected. However, they are severely overtaxed. In a climate of overwork, there is greater chance that grant applications will not get submitted and that research projects will fail to come to completion. Also, the best students will go elsewhere where they can expect more faculty attention and guidance.

In a more activist and well-supported future, the FSU program in English Education could become a major shareholder in the enormously important task of providing the state with well prepared teachers of language

arts, reading, and writing, and teacher education. More can be done with technology, with mentoring, with developing research partnerships, with co-listing courses, and so on, but clearly, piecemeal improvement will no longer suffice.

Hunt Hawkins currently serves as Chair of the English Department at Florida State University. He received his baccalaureate degree at Williams College, Williamstown, Massachusetts, and his doctorate at Stanford University. He is a published poet and a highly regarded professional in English literary scholarship. More pertinent to this publication, he follows in a long line of English chairs who have worked closely with the program in English Education since he assumed his position of leadership. As were his predecessors, Francis Townsend, Fred Standley, John Fenstermaker, and Anne Rowe, he has stayed in touch with the needs, concerns, and new directions in teacher education/English and has consistently offered his support and encouragement to its program leaders. Of the future, he says:

As current English department head at Florida State University, my duties require attention to all phases of our offerings in English. In past years, however, as undergraduate program coordinator, I worked closely with the leaders of the English Education program as well. During that time, I developed an increased respect for the philosophy and operation of that program, particularly as it affects our English majors whose goals include teaching. It is my hope that the current concern about teacher shortages in Florida does not result in the dilution of the nature and quality of that program.

As with any dynamic enterprise, changes have been, and will continue to be made in English Education in the years to come. For example, I applaud the move to include multicultural literary offerings in the content course requirement although I hope we will also maintain basic courses in British and American literature. Moreover, I am further aware that legislative mandates have resulted in the addition of work in English for speakers of other languages (ESOL) to the paradigm. I hope that all resulting cuts in required course work do not come from the English content area.

While I also applaud the increase of work in written composition in the English Education program over the past fifteen years, I feel the need for adjustment in the pedagogy in those offerings, one which establishes a better balance between *content* and *form* (as grammar, usage, diction, mechanics) in writing. With teachers' in-service as well as graduate students, I hope that the same balance might be featured in the summer institutes of the Florida Writing Project--a program I would like to see revived at this University. For building student proficiency in both writing and research, I welcome the addition of a Technology in English undergraduate component and see it as a necessary one for the training of all middle and high school English teachers.

At the graduate level, I have already expressed to the current English Education coordinator my wish that more courses in the content of English be offered during the summer terms to teachers already employed (and perhaps certified) in the state's middle and senior high schools. I would like to see these courses made available on the Tallahassee, Panama City, and London

Study Center campuses, and particularly within the latter program. Over the past forty years, the Florida Department of Education has supplied us with disturbing data which reveals only one-third of the state's upper grade English teachers having completed a college major in English. The English Education program at Florida State needs to show the way in the vital reeducation of teachers. In this endeavor, the English department will be more than happy to participate.

Anne F. Rowe holds the position of Dean of Faculties at Florida State University. A Leon County native, she has dedicated her professional life to this institution. After receiving her doctoral degree at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, she joined the FSU English department in the early 1970s. In the ensuing years, she built an outstanding scholarly reputation in literary scholarship, especially in Literature of the American South. Throughout those years, she was a strong supporter of English Education; her course in Southern Literature was in great demand by English Ed undergraduates, and she served many graduate students as a committee member/minor advisor. In 1995, she was elected Chair of the English Department where she continued her close affiliation with English Education. In 2002, she was appointed to her current position; she still serves on the doctoral committees of English Ed students. In viewing the future, she writes the following:

The English Education program at Florida State University has a long and proud tradition of preparing teachers of English. This tradition has generally meant a focus on the teaching of written composition, teaching of

literature, and the teaching of the history of the language and grammar. The program has excelled in these areas and has formed useful linkages with other programs, including the Department of English where students from that department take classes in English Education and vice versa.

In recent years programs of English Education have broadened the focus to address issues of literacy. Some of the newer elements related to literacy that are being addressed in the English Education program at FSU are related to instruction in media literacy, instruction in technology to facilitate teaching at a distance, instruction in young adult literature, instruction in the differing needs of adolescent students according to age, and instruction in linguistic and cultural diversity, related to the needs of students. These additions have been made not only in courses of instruction at the undergraduate level but also in graduate research courses.

The future appears bright for the program in English Education. It is clear that faculty and administration have identified and are developing important new areas that enlarge the focus of the program. At the same time the more traditional elements of the program also receive attention. With careful hiring of new faculty in the areas mentioned above the program will be well positioned to meet the ever increasing need for teachers of English.

Rodney Smith has served the State of Florida in several capacities during his lengthy career. He completed his baccalaureate program at Rollins College, which is located in Winter Park, Florida. He taught in elementary schools in Orange County for several years. Appointed to the position of Supervisor of English Language Arts,

Florida Department of Education, he completed his doctoral degree in Elementary Language Arts and Reading at FSU in 1979. He served as state supervisor for a period and was later appointed Assistant Curriculum Supervisor by the Florida Commissioner of Education. For ten years, he also served as editor of *Language Arts*, the journal dedicated to teaching/learning in elementary English, NCTE. Throughout his career in Tallahassee, he worked closely with the FSU program in English Education. In the following statement, he reflects on the future:

The request to predict the future of English Education at FSU calls to mind the eminent systems engineer Eberhart Rechtin's suggestion that, "Predicting the future may be impossible but ignoring it is irresponsible." However, one could think the opposite— predicting the future may be irresponsible but ignoring it is impossible. Irresponsible, because the would-be prophet's personal inclinations color the predictions. Yet ignoring the opportunity to forecast the future flies impossibly in the face of one's ego. Following this latter dictum, one could say that there appear to be English Education predictions that spring up in a self-evident way. In what areas? They are: first, content or discipline; second, research; and third, the delivery system. Below are the called-for three paragraphs.

In the first prediction, that which is related to content discipline, it seems apparent that texts as motion pictures, television productions, various computer applications, and perhaps, though belatedly, radio segments are a part of the teacher preparation curriculum. These media texts are poised to demand much more space in the English Education courses of study. This is a

consummation long overdue. Analyses of the well-wrought novel and poem are, one is tempted to say, rampant. Yet, at the same time there are heretical professors using class time to teach the analyses and creation, the oral and visual rhetoric of television commercials? There will be more of this. Note the current NCTE and IRA nationally consensus developed *Standards for the English Language Arts*. (<http://www.ncte.org/standards/standards.shtml>) Throughout, one finds the terms: video, non-print texts, visual language, media techniques, and computer networks. Additionally, articles proliferate on classroom use of media such as Browyn T. Williams' article, which offers readers a modest but sufficiently instructive and comprehensive bibliography list, *Reflections on a Shimmering Screen: Television's Relationship to Writing Pedagogies* (<http://www.writinginstructor.com/areas/englished/williams.html>). Decades ago the media prophet Marshall McLuhan (and a clique of young Turk NCTE disciples) lectured us on the changes to come and how we might approach teaching/learning after the knowledge explosion, the *Information Age*. That age is here, *The Post-information Age*. It will figure more and more strongly in the future of English Education at Florida State University. Also, the penultimate and ultimate predictions in the areas of research and the delivery system will serve as entries into this new age.

One needs look no further than the writing of the late Dwight L. Burton for the importance to English Education of the nature of learning and research techniques. Burton wrote, "...our scholarship in [these] should go well beyond casual acquaintance and should represent serious, formal study."

(*English Education as a Scholarly Discipline* in Stanley B. Kegler, ed. THE CHANGING ROLE OF ENGLISH EDUCATION. Champaign: NCTE, 1965, p.2) Now, almost forty years have passed us by and we have not yet seen this inculcated in our university graduates so that they may bring this research practice wholesale to the classroom. However, aided by our expanded computer technology, we should in the near future see the fruits from Burton's seedbed. Research, as used here, is meant to call up inquiry into literary studies and teaching/learning theories. But it is also meant to summon over-riding governance considerations such as statewide and national assessment and the accountability movement. In all of these topics, but in particular the latter, what we don't know can hurt us. Florida, more so than most states, has seen and will see greater intensification of this reform movement. It will continue to spread across the nation and world. The English Education majors at FSU will see their courses of study come to grasp with corresponding issues so that they may play major roles in the years to come, not as followers but as rightful leaders. However, to capitalize on our expanded research capacity, instructional delivery will need to change.

Thus, this third prediction deals with how these new changes will be delivered to the English Education majors. As used here, delivery means how university faculties teach their students. There will be major changes. Judith V. Boettcher's *Turning the Kaleidoscope: Teaching and Learning Patterns in 2007 What Will We See?* (<http://www.cren.net/~jboettch/predict.html>) speaks to the *virtual university* and new ventures *such as* Motorola University, Penn State's

World Campus, Western Governors University, Harvard Case Studies, distance education, and the like. She sees complete teaching and learning software systems. She notes that the curriculum of the near future will see student conferences and faculty office hours giving way to “asynchronous e-mail, synchronous chat, telephone and video conferencing”; and student knowledge/performance acquisition that is self-paced and self-testing. Boettcher’s chief prediction “...is that the course as a unit of design and development may disappear.” There will be semesters of varying lengths. There will be courses of all types and sizes—from individualized to cohort, from one credit to five, and all will shift to competency-based outcomes. As well, perhaps controversially, those bastions of conferred knowledge and student grading as we now know them will vanish. The replacements will involve *mediated* knowledge clusters, competency based discipline databases, and multiple validations of performance. Finally, to make sure this and other foregoing predictions come to pass, we must re-think English Education staffing. It seems counterintuitive, but with the expansion of assistive media, technology, and computer systems, more hands will be needed. Therefore additional faculty is required. Needed at the helm are major, minor, and auxiliary personnel with more, not less, specialization to orchestrate the broader teaching/learning knowledge base in the predictably coming *Post-information Age*.

Dr. Darian Walker holds the position of Supervisor of Secondary Language Arts and Reading in the Pinellas County, Florida, public schools. After receiving her

bachelor's degree in English Education from FSU in 1968, she began her teaching career in the Pinellas County Schools. Elevated to Assistant Language Arts Supervisor in 1974, she became Supervisor in 1988, following Dr. Lois V. Arnold and Dr. Margaret C. Howell, both FSU English Education Ph.D.'s. During her tenure as Language Arts Supervisor, Ms. Walker completed her doctoral degree in English Education at the University of South Florida. For many years, she has been a leader in the Florida Council of Teachers of English, elected president in 1993 and receiving the Honors Award in 2000. As had her predecessors, Dr. Walker has consistently invited the FSU English Education faculty to provide her county with staff development support. To her, the days ahead appear as follows:

“Nothing endures but change.” Heraclitus said it 2,500 years ago, and it is certainly true today. A continuing parade of programs, legislative plans, and schools of thought has marched through my thirty-plus years in language arts education: graduation tests, management by objectives, open space, modular scheduling, sentence-combining, whole language, and the writing process come to mind as examples. Many have come and gone; many have come and stayed.

As if it were yesterday, I remember interning during my final semester at FSU. Now I'm placing FSU interns in classrooms, supervising more than 500 talented English teachers in a large urban district, and contemplating retirement. These experiences bring me to a good vantage point for considering the needs of the future in language arts education. Here is my list of three major issues facing us in the years to come.

Number one, I think, will be the challenge to assist new teachers who have had no education courses and no internship. Recent newspaper and journal headlines announce an alarming shortage of teachers. Even an episode of *Boston Public* showed administrators meeting with students to explain the lack of applicants and apologize for the series of out-of-field substitutes they've faced in, of all places, their English class.

Will Florida really need 20,000 new teachers in the immediate future? If so, where will they come from?

The teacher shortage of the new millennium is a tough problem. On one hand we have thousands of college graduates who, having lost their jobs in today's sluggish economy, are willing to try teaching. On the other hand we have schools hiring college graduates who are motivated but who do not hold teaching certificates. Unfortunately, in many cases the situation simply does not work.

Teaching is a difficult art that demands the best of those who are prepared to teach. What about those who aren't prepared? The case of a friend's niece has helped me see the challenges for both the non-College-of-Education beginner and the school.

Devon is a college graduate in her mid-thirties. Bright and articulate, she has decided that teaching might be a rewarding profession for her. For more than a dozen years, she worked in restaurants, beginning as a hostess. Then she moved to serving customers, training employees on a local and national level, and ultimately managing a major franchise. Now she's decided

that it's time for a career change, and it turns out she's one college course short of certification in science.

Devon's chances of landing a teaching position in science are excellent since it is an area of critical shortage. We don't have that designation in English, but we have lots of Devons coming into our classrooms these days and more will arrive in the future.

Devon asked her aunt, an outstanding educator with over thirty years' experience, what kind of training she would have if she were hired. Having trained many servers who were not cleared to work a shift alone until they had met some pretty exacting standards, she was shocked to find that she'd be turned loose in the classroom after a few orientation sessions. When she and her aunt talked of such things as curriculum, lesson plans, pacing, classroom management, and parent conferences, Devon confessed that she was overwhelmed at the prospect.

I put myself in her position. I thought of all the Devons I've addressed in orientation sessions – and all the Devons throughout Florida who have left their classrooms in frustration after a few days or a few months. Despite the efforts of administrators, mentors, coaches, and colleagues, the going is tough for these newcomers and we've got lots of work to do to help them.

If on-the-job training for novice teachers is our biggest challenge, in my opinion, what others are on the horizon? Certainly revising our curriculum for better instruction in reading merits mention. In Florida and many other states, students are failing the graduation reading test in droves. Our best

readers, I think, are performing much better than their counterparts twenty or thirty years ago. Honors, Advanced Placement, and International Baccalaureate classes demand much of them and they are delivering in a very impressive way. On the other hand, average and below-average readers are finding highly effective ways to avoid reading anything but the briefest and easiest material. As a result, their skills are stagnating, possibly even deteriorating. I predict that we will need to adjust our curriculum more and more to help these students improve in reading.

Third on my list is standard written English, as the College Board used to call it. The English language is such a magnificent treasure, so rich, so versatile. The creativity that it allows and its fascinating changes over time leave me in awe. But I believe I'm observing a disturbing decline in students' language skills. Let's not even talk about the problems with spoken English, such as the ubiquitous "between you and I." The written work I'm seeing in classrooms has far too many errors in spelling, capitalization, punctuation, and usage. And when I factor in the influence of advertising, e-mail, and text-messaging, I wonder how many students fail to realize that it is simply not appropriate in their school work and their future jobs to write like this: "Wanna go 2 the game 2nite?"

Problems? Yes, we are facing plenty of them. But the power of teachers is strong, and I predict it will carry us through the difficulties of the years to come. Teachers come to school each day with high ideals, a love for students, and a love for learning. We believe in what we do. We have rich

resources such as the English Education faculty of Florida State University, and we bring wisdom and dedication to the professional tasks we face. What do I see when I look to the future of English Education? I see challenges and successes. I see Florida educators rising to each occasion and continuing the tradition of excellence I am proud to have been a part of for more than three decades.

David Foulk was the head of the Department of Middle and Secondary Education (MSE) at FSU until summer 1995. He was then made Assistant Dean of the College of Education. Dr. Foulk is a Health Educator earning graduate degrees at the University of Tennessee and the University of Florida. He received his Ph.D. at Florida. He joined the faculty of FSU in 1994 after serving as department head of Curriculum and Instruction at Georgia Southern University. During his ten-plus years as head of MSE, Dr. Foulk became intimately familiar with the English Education program which was first under my direction and later under that of Dr. Pamela “Sissi” Carroll. He has been a strong supporter of the program, both in terms of interest and allocation of resources. In assess the future, he makes the following statement:

There is much in the history of the English Education Program at Florida State University that would seem to predict continued success. I believe the English Education program at Florida State University will continue to grow and flourish as a result of a number of the confluence of a number of national, state and programmatic developments. First consider the changing technological environment of education in the United States. This

national investment has resulted in necessary different thinking about how people communicate read and understand. Clearly technology and literacy causes reconsideration among many social and educational activities.

Secondly there has been a national direction that moves forward reading as necessary tool for all educational success and thus there is renewed interest in the preparation of teachers capable of teaching reading. I believe the faculty members of the English Education program are engaged in research and reflection on these topics and have a national voice in advocacy for their research agenda. These faculty members have been exploring these research areas and exerting their influence from inside the profession for some time and are not moving to literacy and reading as a late response to outside forces. The history and success of the program is outlined in this text, the future of the program is unfolding and appears bright but demands more. The future of English Education hinges on the ability of the faculty to grow the graduate, especially the PhD, programs. One set of demands is practical from the Florida State University because a Research 1 institution has a reputation in part dependent on the numbers of PhD students graduated so there will be institutional pressure to grow. Additionally, to continue such a stellar reputation the program must produce PhD students entering the field and spreading the influence of the program. A final measure will be the presence of graduates of this PhD program affecting educational policy and practice in English Education.

The final contributor to this set of prophetic statements is Dr. Pamela “Sissi” Carroll, currently head of the Department of Middle/Secondary Education at FSU. Dr. Carroll’s professional background was provided in Chapter 5. Beyond this, she has published four monographs in the discipline, all favorably reviewed. She and I collaborated on a chapter, “English in the Middle Years,” for the internationally known *Research in the English Language Arts* text (2003), published by Erlbaum. She has recently completed service as editor of *ALAN Review*, a quarterly journal on Young Adult Literature, NCTE. In the late 1990’s she succeeded me as coordinator of the English Education program at FSU. She was elected to her current position in July, 2005. Dr. Carroll’s vision of the future is as follows:

What will the English Education Program Look Like in the Future?

The English Education program at FSU provides me with reasons to be cautiously yet enthusiastically optimistic. Although our discipline has struggled first to justify its existence then to define itself and, as Lawrence Baines laments, now risks sacrificing its hard-won identity to the shifting whims of political intervention in education and the prevailing winds of critical theories, I am confident that it will conquer its challenges. The undergraduate and graduate programs at FSU, as Dr. Simmons has demonstrated, have established themselves through solid and often-distinguished contributions to the field of English education. The current faculty and students are working diligently to sustain and extend that history of contributions. At the same time, we are working to expand the reach of our

programs in at least two directions. One direction is related to the kinds of courses that students are required to take as they prepare to teach English (as undergraduates) or to work as researchers, curriculum specialists, consultants, and professors of English Education and literacy programs (as graduate students). The other direction for expansion will move the English Education program toward more systematic and complete communication and cooperation with the communities and families that are served by the schools in which our teachers and teacher educators work.

On Expanding Course Requirements

I suspect that the undergraduate and graduate curricula will evolve to include not only the traditional topics of literature, written composition, language, speech and drama, but also attention to the full range of demands on today's language users. The curricula will therefore give attention to *all* of the ways that today's teachers and adolescents use language to make sense of their world—even those that have been considered inappropriate for classrooms in the past. In the past, for example, prospective teachers learned to build lessons around canonical literary texts. In contrast, tomorrow's undergraduate and graduate programs will provide prospective and practicing teachers with courses and experiences in which they learn to critically read, or make sense of, and create “new media”.

The new media will include contemporary works of non-linear, non-print, mixed media, and other alternative texts that English/language arts teachers have previously excluded from their teaching, as well as those that are new and thus potentially intimidating to those who are teaching in today's

classrooms. Those who participate in tomorrow's English Education programs will also spend more time learning to "read" the more familiar texts of film and video, print and sound advertising, contemporary music, and other contemporary sociocultural artifacts. Baines and Farrell (2003) highlight the potential for the computer literacy development as a means of promoting a broader range of critical literacies: "With computers, a student may watch television, edit films, download clips of new musical releases from a favorite band, and project images and text against a wall-size screen," (p. 77).²⁸ Further, they explain that computers make possible access to an almost unlimited variety of texts and ideas in every classroom that is wired to the Internet ("every play and sonnet ever written by Shakespeare is available somewhere on the Internet" (p. 77), and thus computers and Internet access offer teachers of English with vehicles for meeting the needs of virtually all of their students, including those who have physical disabilities such as low vision and those who are English language learners.

At the graduate level, this expansion of course requirements will also require the addition of a more specific set of courses within programs of the College of Education, such as in educational research, higher education, and school policies, as well as courses in theory and research in areas such as anthropology, sociology, and psychology, philosophy, and cognitive science. Methods for effectively assessing and evaluating teaching and learning of new media, for example, must be addressed. Educational priorities and policies,

²⁸ Baines, Lawrence & Farrell, Edmund J. (2003). "The Tao of Instructional Models." James Flood, Diane Lapp, James R. Squire, and Julie M. Jensen (Eds.) *Handbook of Research on Teaching the English Language Arts*, 2nd edition. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 74-86.

such as those that promote equitable access to new technologies (a significant issue for teachers in schools that are marked by poverty and poor student performance), and those that address issues related to classroom study of the artifacts of contemporary culture such as popular music and movies (a significant issue for teachers who will still be struggling with would-be censors about whether it is evil to require middle school students to read the Harry Potter novels, or high school students to dramatize scenes from *A Streetcar Named Desire*), must be part of the program that English Education develops in the near future. As Mike Angelotti notes, these curricular changes at undergraduate and graduate levels will bring with them changes in the ways that English Education faculty interact with students. Evidence of those changes are apparent in the FSU program as faculty members work alongside graduate students to conduct classroom-based action research projects, to make presentations at FCTE and NCTE, and to direct/co-direct the FSU chapter of the National Writing Project and its year-round in-service components.

On Expanding Community and Family Connections and Cooperation

In terms of connections and collaboration with communities and families, I predict that the English Education program will continue to develop its already-significant practice of working with local schools---their teachers and administrators---in order to help prospective and practicing teachers of English/language arts better understand the broad contexts for learning that have tremendous impact on the adolescents who populate classrooms. I

believe that our faculty and students will spend more time in middle and high school classrooms in the future, working with teachers and their students to implement and evaluate their teaching strategies, to better understand the physical, psychosocial, emotional, and intellectual characteristics of adolescents from a variety of backgrounds, and to develop their teaching and learning philosophies. In addition, I anticipate that the faculty and students of the English Education program will find ways to work with the families of adolescents, especially in schools that are characterized by poverty among the student population, in order to better understand the many influences---within and beyond school---that contribute to and interfere with the literacy learning of adolescents, and with those students' motivation to learn. Issues related to family literacy will become embedded into the body of ideas that the program explores in regard to the role of the English/language arts teacher in the future.

What I Won't Paint in This Picture

In order to paint an optimistic picture, I have chosen to ignore the scythe-wielding specter of the current government of the state of Florida, a government that blatantly demonstrates antipathy toward colleges of education through its policies of micromanaging the work and even the course content developed by professionals in those colleges, and through its mandates that effectively allow for divorce between teacher certification processes and accredited teacher education programs like the one we offer. Regardless of political pressures that would like to push our program beneath the surface of university education, we are certain that programs like ours will

continue to thrive, because they provide the kind of teacher preparation that is required for the demands of teaching in the 21st century. Joe Milner predicts that teacher education will be relegated to PDSs, that university and college classroom experiences will be replaced by public school-based ones in the education of tomorrow's teachers. Perhaps he is right, but for the day after tomorrow. Tomorrow's site for new teacher education, unless programs like ours continue to thrive and continue to receive strong support at institutions and national organizations, are likely to be two-year colleges. In Florida, the tension and programs are intense. Regardless, today, we answer those who ask why they should spend the time and energy required to complete an undergraduate or graduate program like ours---including significant amounts of time in real classrooms with real teachers and students---instead of merely meeting the state's few certification requirements (including a liberal arts degree that never requires a student to step foot into a middle or high school classroom and a passing score on a state exam) by saying this: Our English Education programs prepare teachers and researchers for the realities of today's schools, students, curricula, and policies. It is my hope and expectation that the English Education program at Florida State will continually evolve, so that we will be able to use that answer in the future, as well.

The foregoing position statements were all solicited: the first group from English Educators from various colleges/universities nationwide; the latter from key

educators within the State of Florida who have had close ties to the program at FSU. The Mayher report which follows was composed at the request of University officials. It is offered not in its entirety but through a series of selected excerpts.

During the academic year 2001-2002, the Graduate Policy Committee of the FSU Faculty Senate ordained that an outside authority/consultant be hired to review the total program in English Education. At that point, the program had reached a critical crossroads: I had just retired; Dr. Carroll had been promoted to full professor; Dr. Susan Woods, a newly hired assistant professor, had just received MA graduate advisement status; and another Assistant Professor had been informed that her appointment would not be renewed. Given the large number of undergraduates, the addition of two course requirements (technology and content area reading) to the undergraduate program, and the increased number of beginning graduate students, the program faculty was clearly overburdened. Most critical among program concerns was the future of the doctoral program, which must provide two eligible faculty members for each candidate. To assess the current situation and make recommendations for the future, Dr. John S. Mayher was chosen.

John Mayher was well qualified for this responsibility. As a graduate student, he had been a member of the first Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program (see Chapter Two) at the University of Illinois, Champaign-Urbana. That illustrious group included a number of young scholars who have since become leaders in the profession. Their collection of essays, *The Growing Edges of English* (NCTE, 1967) had gained widespread acclaim across the nation. Mayher then completed his doctoral degree at Harvard and joined the New York University faculty and a

program which listed Louise Rosenblatt and Neil Postman. Dr. Mayher ascended in those ranks rapidly and, by the early 1980s, had established himself as a leader in English Education. His text *Uncommon Sense* (Heinemann, 2000) became required reading for graduate students. In 2005, he was a candidate for the presidency of NCTE.

Mayher was no stranger to Florida State University. In 1985, he participated in the “Gray Hair” Conference on English Education at the Turnbull Center (see Chapter Four) and had been the main speaker at a conference on Whole Language, which I organized in 1994, also at the Turnbull Center.²⁹

What follows is a series of excerpts from Mayher’s review of the English Education Program, Florida State University,” February 2003:

The most important finding concerning the FSU English Education Program is that it is a high quality program with a distinguished history, a strong present, and the possibility of an even stronger future if some key decisions are made about its current staffing needs. Academic reputations for excellence build slowly, and even though they also fade slowly, they must be nourished if they are to be sustained. FSU’s tradition of excellence in this area is well known nationally, and the current continuing full-time faculty—Pamela Sissi Carroll and Susan Nelson Wood—are exemplary, but unless they

²⁹ This conference was the site of a ceremony honoring the terminally ill Dwight Burton. It proved to be Burton’s final public appearance. He died of throat cancer in August 1995.

are supported with additional colleagues, they will not be able to sustain the excellence they and their predecessors have achieved.³⁰

The key to the whole edifice is the doctoral program. Doctoral students teach some of the undergraduate courses, help mentor fieldwork, and work with the faculty on research projects. A healthy doctoral program, therefore, undergirds the whole curricular and programmatic structure. While additional funding to support doctoral study would help to ensure its future health, the reason promising students choose a doctoral program is entirely based on the quality of the mentoring faculty...

The basic undergraduate and MA curricula are solid, and some recent innovations including the integration of English as a second language (ESOL) pedagogy into the program in response to a state mandate and the development of better uses of technology have made them even stronger. The teacher preparation program was recently certified as of high quality by the National Council of Teachers of English as part of the NCATE review process, and that assessment seems highly appropriate...

The undergraduate curriculum seems well organized and conceptualized and the newly integrated efforts to include ESOL certification as well as English certification seem to be proceeding well. The program's curricular connections with the Arts and Sciences English department seem both strong and extremely supportive. Further explorations with departments concerned with theatre, film, and other communications media could

³⁰An additional tenure-earning faculty member, Dr. Shari Steadman (U. of Michigan) was hired in fall 2003.

strengthen the scope of the curriculum as will expanding the focus on the impact of technology on the secondary English classroom. The employment of a visiting professor who splits his instructional responsibilities with a local high school has brought an additional set of strengths. Not only is he a fine teacher, but his continuing presence in a secondary school brings the whiff of the chalkface and current practice directly into the campus for everyone's benefit.

The current curriculum structure, while more than adequate, will need to be re-examined to meet the new demands of teaching in the diverse schools of today as English teachers strive to compete with the electronic world of today's teen-agers. Continued strengthening of attention to the impact of computers and other technologies on reading as well as writing, on the role of English teachers in helping students read non-fictional as well as fictional texts, and on continuing the integration of English language learners into the mainstream English classrooms will all require further thought in the years to come. The collegial good will of the Multicultural and English faculties toward the English education faculty in terms of their collaborative efforts bodes well for the future.

While I was in Tallahassee I also had the good fortune to both talk with some alumni about their fieldwork experiences and to visit one of the schools with which the program works closely in a professional development school relationship. The school is a largely African American middle school and while talking with the principal and the local professional development

coordinator, it became clear that the connection with the English education faculty and student body has had a dramatic impact on all aspects of the school. The alumni were also enthusiastic about their experience there even though, or perhaps because, they were initially apprehensive about going there. The supportive atmosphere, and the obvious caring for the children on the part of the whole staff, made it a turn-around experience for these young women, however, and made them better prepared to teach all the children they have encountered since as they moved off into the world of public schools in Leon County and the surrounding area. This is evidence that the program's restructured and renewed attention to pre-student teaching field experiences is paying off in better preparation for practice...

The program's well-formatted advisement sheets have brought clarity to students and faculty alike about options and timing of courses and other learning experiences. The students I talked with feel that the faculty is accessible, and that they get good advice not only about course choices, but about their future careers as well. The new office space for the program is also apparently a great improvement over its former quarters and is clearly functioning well...

The most important testimony to the accomplishments of the undergraduates is that they are eagerly sought after for the plum teaching jobs in the state. And, on the basis of the students in the MA program who completed the BA earlier, it seems clear that they move rapidly into leadership positions in the schools which employ them. I had the good fortune to meet of

of the distance supervisors who helps FSU students in their internships, if they choose to go far from Tallahassee. He had nothing but high praise for the quality of the FSU English students and for the level of their preparation in both knowledge and teaching skills...

Both levels of graduate students are in real demand for jobs. Regionally competitive at the MA level, nationally competitive at the PhD level. The PhD students have been regularly presenting at national conferences, and the PhD graduates have done solid dissertations, gotten good jobs and easily achieved tenure, and continued to publish high quality work. Indeed one of the current students got to choose between several job offers and she has not yet completed her dissertation! There haven't been as many PhD graduates during the last five years as would be desirable, and as noted throughout every effort should be made to increase the number of PhD students. The job market for English Education PhD's is very strong, perhaps stronger now than it has been for at least a generation. This has been caused by a combination of strong enrollments in pre-service teacher education programs, the rising expectations for high standards of teacher preparation and by the retirement of a large number of faculty who were hired 40 plus years ago. (This last group of retirees include a large number of my peers and professional colleagues who graduated from Florida State in the late 60's and 70's, and who helped to establish FSU as one of the premier faculty producers in this field.) ...

Both continuing members of the tenured or tenure-earning faculty—Pamela Sissi Carroll and Susan Nelson Wood—have exemplary records of publication and research made all the more extraordinary by the extensive burdens of teaching and service that they are carrying simultaneously. Indeed one has to be amazed at both the quality and quantity of their publications in view of the other demands on their time. And in addition to all of her on-campus work, Professor Carroll manages to edit a major journal!

Professor Carroll's publications have varied widely although studying how to connect adolescents to literature seems to be a dominant theme. This is the area where she is a national leader and a journal editor and clearly gives FSU both continued visibility and a strong reputation for quality. Her recent work with Mike Rychlik on student teaching and what should prove to be the dominant text on middle school language arts will further cement her reputation in the next few years.

Professor Wood's work is not as extensive yet, but it is equally impressive. She, like Professor Carroll, is to be particularly commended for the connections of her research and writing to her teaching and curriculum development. Her paper on the use of work samples will continue to have national impact as NCATE pushes teacher education curricula to include such assessment methods in their pedagogy. And her study of how prospective teachers make meaning from their own reflective processes sheds new light on both the strengths and limits of the notion of reflective practice.

Collectively it seems clear that each of these two scholar/teachers are among the leaders of their generation of scholars, and if FSU can recruit two more to supplement and complement their work, it will once more return to the top ranks of English education programs nationwide...

The program has plans to continue to seek additional support from outside sources including a return to being a site of the National Writing Project, which would bring students and recognition. They are also seeking funding in the general area of literacy. Indeed, as national attention shifts upward to the concerns of the literacy and critical thinking abilities of adolescents, which seems to be the trend, Professors Carroll and Wood, with their expertise in middle school teaching, young adult literature, and adolescent reading will be strongly positioned to seek whatever research and development funds become available. Their capacity to do so effectively will depend on having additional colleagues to mind the store, but if they get them, they should be able to seek funds to support their own and doctoral student research.

Professor Carroll's editing of *The ALAN Review*, and both faculty members continuing leadership in the NCTE have continued to build FSU's reputation within English Education nationally and internationally...

As noted throughout this is a high quality program with a strong and durable national and international reputation. Most of my peers would list Florida State as one of the places they would seek doctoral graduates from, and it clearly ranks in the top quarter, probably in the top ten per cent of

doctoral producing institutions in our field. Similar things could be said for the bachelor's and master's programs, but reputations at these levels tend to be more regional than national. If the program can be strengthened by the addition of two faculty members to replace those who have left, then I would certainly expect the high level of performance to continue. The two remaining faculty are exemplary and will be sought after by students as mentors.

I can only repeat the need to replace the two departed faculty members and to continue to strengthen the already strong and productive ties among the current faculty and other related departments across the campus. Recognizing the tight funding problems facing higher education, seeking an endowment for a chair in English Education would be a strong possibility. And, while they couldn't fund it, seeking some doctoral scholarship support from the distinguished cast of professors who got their degrees at FSU and are at or near retirement would be a vital signal of support. Perhaps John Simmons could be coaxed into one final service to the University by leading a small fund drive to raise some money from the grayhairs to correspond with the publication of his history of the program.

This is a program at the crossroads. If it is to sustain the level of excellence that built its reputation, it must be given continued faculty resources. But if it is, I have every confidence that it will make FSU proud.

The above statement, produced by one of the nation's leading English educators, speaks eloquently of the illustrious history of this small but productive program and to the high potential for its future

In contrast with the largely optimistic notes expressed by several of the contributors above, at least two ominous concerns for the future of English Education at Florida State, and indeed at all U.S. institutions of higher learning which train teachers. The first of these is the acute, growing shortage of public school teachers, K-112, facing all fifty states as this chronicle approaches its conclusion. Clearly it is of such a magnitude that English Ed programs now in place will be hard pressed to accommodate the numbers, and English represents the content area which employs the largest number of teachers. Witness this September 16, 2005 report, published in the *Tallahassee Democrat*:

Florida's Need for Teachers Keeps Growing

Next Year's Target: 31,000 more

State education officials are devising ways to recruit the 31,000 new teachers Florida will need for the 2006-07 school year to fill vacancies and help local districts meet requirements to lower the number of students per class.

The number of teachers needed for the 2006-07 school year is close to 50 percent more than was needed for 2004-05, according to an estimate by state officials.

“It’s one of the most critical issues facing Florida today,” Pam Stewart, a deputy chancellor of the Department of Education, told a Board of Governors committee Thursday.

The department wants to increase performance-based pay for teachers, allocate some of the funding for smaller class sizes for teacher pay, increase the ways people from other professions can become teachers, allow more flexibility in teacher education degree programs and have parents play a larger role in encouraging the best teachers to stay in the profession.

An important source of potential teachers are schools’ paraprofessionals, such as teacher aides or staffers who work in school offices, said Sandra Robinson, dean of the University of Central Florida College of Education.

Increasing teachers’ salaries also is crucial in retaining the best educators, she said.

“We are losing our science teachers. We are losing our math teachers because they can go other places and earn more money,” Robinson said.

In other business, members of the Board of Governors committee were told that the amount of money dedicated to construction, renovations and repairs on campuses would decline considerably over the next three years.

The amount of money designated for campus capital outlays in the 2005-06 budget is \$219.4 million. But that figure drops to an estimated \$135.8 million in the 2006-07 budget, \$82.7 million in the 2007-08 budget and \$75.8 million in the 2008-09 budget.

The universities may have to find money for construction projects from other sources, such as by issuing bonds or using funds other than the Public Education Capital Outlay allocation, education officials said. (Mick Schneider, *Tallahassee Democrat*, Sept. 16, 2005)

In a significant summary of data relevant to the current state of the discipline, Professor Lawrence Baines, quoted earlier in this chapter, has provided a somewhat pessimistic perspective. In an as-yet-unpublished research-based essay, “Whatever Happened to English Education?” he offers much food for thought to teacher educators in general. Here are some excerpts from his statement:

At one time, the program in English Education at my alma mater had four and-a-half, full-time, tenured faculty in English Education; today the program has one. The Ph.D. in English Education has been dropped and the master’s degree has been subsumed by Language and Literacy. Other than as an area for teacher certification at the bachelor’s level, English Education has ceased to exist.

Over the past ten years, I have had a vague notion that English Education was being pushed aside by a number of trends—the streamlining of undergraduate degree programs, a renewed focus on reading, the surge in alternative certification, and the proliferation of distance-education degree programs. To assess the status of English Education in the early 21st century, I reviewed data on programs from the more than 1,000 institutions and

NUCPs (Non-University Certification Programs) that prepare teachers of English in the United States.

According to Sections 207 and 208 of the Higher Education Act, states must report annually on the performance of candidates in teacher preparation programs in institutions within its borders. This information has been made public in an online database at www.title2.org.

Many state departments of education have responded to the new requirements of the Higher Education Act by assessing teacher competence in three areas: basic skills, professional practice, and knowledge of English content. Some states have mandated tests in all three areas; other states only test in one or two. Maine and Nebraska require only a basic skills test; Montana and Iowa require no exams at all. States have the authority to determine how teacher performance is assessed...

The Largest Programs

If asked to name the largest English Education program in America, most of us would probably mention a research institution with a large student body, such as University of Michigan, University of Texas, Penn State, University of Minnesota, or Ohio State. In 2004, the largest group of teachers of English did not matriculate at a university at all, but received their teaching credentials from K-12 school districts. The two largest preparation programs in English Education are Non-University Certification Programs (NUCPs) in California and Texas (U.S. Department of Education, 2005). The growth of NUCPs in these two populous states is indicative of a nationwide trend to

streamline certification requirements and open entry to the profession. In Texas and California, the education, training, and assessment of alternatively certified English teachers are wholly the responsibility of K-12 personnel.

The third largest producer of English teachers is National University (California), an institution with a small, non-virtual campus in La Jolla, and a huge graduate program that is delivered over the Internet.

The fourth largest English Education program is the NUCP in New Jersey. As in California and Texas, New Jersey’s NUCP offers a “learn while you earn” plan that enables holders of a bachelor’s degree to teach right away. New Jersey operates its NUCP through community colleges, whose instructors also teach the classes.

According to New Jersey’s recruiting brochure, “The Alternate Route is different in that the preparation for teaching is done while on the job rather than prior to entering a classroom” [sic] (New Jersey City University, 2005). Perhaps George Orwell would appreciate the effort to redefine the meaning of *preparation*.

The fifteen largest English Education programs in the U.S.A. in 2004 are listed in Table 2 as follows:

Table2: The Fifteen Largest English Education Programs in the U.S.A., 2004

Rank	Institution or Agency	Number of English teachers
1	California NUCP	168
1	Texas NUCP	168
3	National University	146

	(California)	
4	New Jersey NUCP	101
5	Western Michigan University	101
6	Wayne State University (Michigan)	93
7	Eastern Michigan University	92
8	Central Michigan University	80
9	Chapman University (California)	79
10	Georgia NUCP	75
11	University of North Texas	58
12	Saginaw State University (Michigan)	55
13	Grand Valley State University (Michigan)	54
14	Kent State University	52
15	Colorado NUCP	51

(“NUCP”=Non-University Certification Program)

Obviously, the career paths to becoming a teacher of English have expanded dramatically with the proliferation of NUCPs and the phenomenon of credentials deliverable over the Internet...

The State of the Profession

Twenty years ago, few states had NUCPs and those that did dusted them off only in emergencies, such as an unexpected death or a temporary shortage of teachers caused by a sudden spike in population (in areas like Orlando or Las Vegas).

Today, NUCPs supply an increasing percentage of new teachers of English. In California, approximately one in five new teachers enter the profession through NUCPs; in Texas and New Jersey, one in four new

teachers come from NUCPs (Feistritzer 2004). In Florida, where every school district in the state has the capability of certifying teachers, the numbers of prospective choosing NUCPs may grow rapidly over the next few years.

When comparing the number of English teachers who graduate from doctoral institutions with the number of students who take alternative routes via NUCPs, the difference is startling (U.S. Department of Education 2005) as follows:

- NUCPs in California certified 168 English teachers; The University of California at Berkeley graduated 22; Stanford 11.
- NUCPs in Texas certified 168 English teachers; The University of Texas at Austin graduated 27.
- NUCPs in New Jersey certified 101; Rutgers University graduated 39.
- NUCPs in Georgia certified 75; The University of Georgia graduated 26.
- NUCPs in Colorado certified 51; The University of Colorado at Boulder graduated 36.
- NUCPs in Louisiana certified 22; L.S.U. graduated 14.

As is evident from the burgeoning numbers of English teachers coming out of National University and Chapman University (together, the institutions produced 225 English teachers in 2004), Internet-based, virtual

degrees in education, also have great appeal. They are fast, easy, and require limited *f-to-f* (Internet jargon for *face-to-face*) interactions. In point of fact, the largest English Education program in Arizona is a virtual one at The University of Phoenix which produced 36 English teachers in 2004; the University of Arizona graduated 21...

Conclusions

Whether they acknowledge it or not, universities who prepare teachers of English are currently engaged in a fierce fight for students. Competition is coming from profit-centered enterprises and K-12 school districts—especially in urban areas. State legislators, anxious to cut costs in higher education, have allowed teacher certification to migrate from universities to school districts, community colleges, and apparently—any NUCP that promises to provide a fresh supply of warm bodies for the front lines of teaching on the cheap.

Even prestigious liberal arts colleges, with their small groups of well-heeled, bright-eyed students, offer programs that do little to prepare students for the realities of teaching secondary English to a group of adolescents who may view their teacher's 1450 score on the SAT as insufficient reason to sit up and pay attention. However, a student with a 1450 who also takes 24 hours of coursework in English education, spends 400+ hours in schools, then student-teaches for 15 weeks under the tutelage of a master teacher has a better chance for success.

At a time when global competition is heating up, and American adolescents' literacy may be on the decline (Bauerlein 2005, Bureau of Labor

Statistics 2005, National Endowment of the Arts 2004, U.S. Census Bureau 2005), the need for experienced, well-educated, enthusiastic English teachers has never been greater. The justification for a quick and easy entry to teaching seems to be that anyone has a right to teach—even those who never learned how. Expecting an English major with minimal training and experience to waltz into a secondary classroom and begin teaching literature, language, composition, speech, drama, and critical analysis effectively to five or six classes of rowdy adolescents is not hopeful—it's idiotic.

Yet, this expectation has become the prevailing template for the preparation of English teachers across the nation. An editorial in the *New York Times* reiterates the need for better reporting from institutions and higher standards for teachers: “At the very least, both the federal government and the states need better data systems to keep track of how many teachers are being trained.... The states must also bite the bullet and finally close any colleges of education that are no more than diploma mills” (2005).

Closer to home, in Fall 2005, I agreed to supervise an FSU student teacher in English Education. As I write this, I have paid my first visit to her at a large middle school in a West Florida county. While there, I learned that the school had, at the beginning of the year, hired eight teachers, none of whom possessed either a regular teaching certificate or a baccalaureate degree. A little scary, I'd venture.

Another alarming direction which U.S. education has taken in the past several years is the politicizing of literacy study currently being pursued by the federal government through its education-related agencies. A general retrenchment, a kind of back-to-the-basics movement, reminiscent of the 70s, is the policy of the U.S. Department of Education—and with a vengeance, especially its promotion of literacy. This phonics *uber alles*, one-program-of-study-fits-all approach dominates the “No Child Left Behind” strategies of the George W. Bush administration. And, to no one’s surprise, those strategies are echoed here in Florida. The fact that this “new” way of promoting basic reading instruction flies in the face of eighty years of reading research and scholarship has not dampened the enthusiasm of its supporters.

This retrenchment has placed in sharp focus the policies, especially in their research endeavors, of Colleges of Education at major universities, as well as education organizations such as NCTE, IRA, and the prestigious National Reading Council. This attitude has affected funding of reading/language arts research and attendance/participation by federal officials in national/international conferences.

An outspoken adversary of this trend is Ken Goodman, a professor emeritus at the University of Arizona and highly regarded literacy scholar during his fifty-plus years of professional involvement. Writing in a recent *Reading Teacher* (IRA) essay, Dr. Goodman states:

Reid Lyon, lauded by the Wall Street Journal as President Bush’s reading Czar and introduced by Education Secretary Rod Paige as one of the President’s main educational advisors made a similar slip on November 18 when he proclaimed at a public function attended by many educators and

representatives of professional organizations that if he made the laws he would blow up the colleges of education. Actually, Lyon does have a major influence over the recent laws and their interpretation and enforcement. By his own word he played a major role in the selection of key members of the Bush Department of Education, unusual power for a career bureaucrat in another federal agency, NICHD.

In his apparent advocacy of violence-terrorism-Lyon revealed impatience with the tactics being used to destroy colleges of education as a major step of putting the blame for school failure on the education profession with the ultimate goal of ending public education and putting in its place a privatized education system.

Nowhere has the switch in tactics from confrontation to manipulation of the institutions of democracy in order to destroy democracy been more successful than in education. A crisis in literacy has been manufactured (to paraphrase Berliner and Biddle) and Lyon is a key player in a campaign which has successfully imposed a national reading methodology and curriculum on the nation's highly decentralized educational system. Through a series of sham scientific panels and reports they have established that there is a simple solution to the literacy crisis supported by a consensus of the scientific community and that the crisis is so great that it warrants federal interventions in the schools right down to the class room levels. Never mind that the laws and their enforcement through which this has been accomplished clearly violate the United States Constitution; those framing the laws have understood

that in a democracy if power is taken and then institutionalized it becomes hard to challenge particularly if the judiciary system that is supposed to be a check against assertions of power is also controlled.

Remarkably the campaign has succeeded in centralizing control of the educational system at a bargain cost—less than 8% of the national education budget comes from the federal government. But Chester Finn, another key player, has gloated how easy it has been to Co-opt the local and state decision makers—they don't have to take the money, he says. Actually they do, because the same forces have been active at the state level. Curiously silent are the usual ultraconservative states' rights advocates who have fought federalization all these years.

Perhaps Lyon is impatient with the process because it is becoming increasingly clear that the fail-proof scientific reading programs are not working. In the laces where the imposition of the small number of reading programs anointed as scientific by those enforcing the national curriculum and methodology has been in place longest, California for example, the failure of these programs is becoming increasingly evident. That's not unexpected, firstly because these are warmed-over narrow phonics programs with long histories of failure masked by unwarranted claims of success. But more important the tactic of forcing conformity on teachers neutralizes the more professional teachers, driving many out of the classrooms, while providing a cover for less competent teachers. Assistant Education Secretary Susan Newman's promise to stamp out creativity among teachers shows both the

extent to which power has been centralized and the belief that by controlling teachers learners can be controlled.

The very failure of the mandated program becomes a tool in the tactic of blaming the professionals. Since the programs are scientifically proven to be fail proof then it must be that their failure is the result of the incompetence of teachers or deliberate sabotage of the programs. In the beginning it was sufficient to blame whole language, a popular pedagogy among innovative teachers and teacher educators. But having declared the reading wars of phonics vs. whole language over it became necessary to broaden the blame to the entire education establishment. The International Reading Association, which has desperately tried to be supportive of the reforms and willingly let itself be co-opted, discovered it would no longer be accorded that option when a few days before their annual convention all federal presenters canceled their appearances.

In the various states it was easy to eliminate or hamstring professional in the state departments of education and shift power to state boards of education where the agenda can be more easily controlled. Professional decision making becomes political decision making at increasingly lower levels.

That leaves the colleges of education, which have never enjoyed high status among their academic colleagues, as the logical group to carry the blame for the failure of the scientific solutions to the reading crisis. It is they who mislead and miseducate teachers. Incompetent themselves, they fill their

students with useless, overly-complex theory and refuse to teach them the phonics they need to know to teach scientifically. They are unworthy of academic freedom and can therefore be required to clear their course syllabi with state monitors on threat of decertifying their programs.

Black lists have been established of people, ideas, and practices that may not be included or even cited in state or federal applications for support. These blacklists are particularly enforced in staff development designed to reeducate teachers in the federally mandated programs in addition to placing the burden of proof on all teacher educators to demonstrate their acceptance and support of the federal mandates in order to participate. Lyon has also made reference to the possibility of charging administrators and teacher educators with malpractice for their non-conformity. And it is certainly true that those attempting to conform with the mandates may find themselves legal scapegoats charged with fraud or misapplication of funds for innocent attempts to ameliorate the effects of the mandates (Ken Goodman, "Current Formulas for Disaster," *The Reading Teacher*, April, 2003, pp. 11-14).

In Florida, many of Professor Goodman's sentiments have been echoed by Dr. Richard Allington. While he held an endowed chair in Reading Education at the University of Florida, Dr. Allington spoke out frequently and emphatically against the regressive curricular policies emanating from Washington, D.C. Sad to say, Allington left Gainesville for a similar position at the University of Tennessee. This

is a significant loss to the Sunshine State; besides his numerous scholarly publications, he holds the position of president of IRA, academic year, 2005-06.

Thus, once again English Education at FSU finds itself in the role of challenger to the *status quo*. Not the first time it has occupied this position, and probably not the last. A hopeful note lies in the fact that as this chronicle reaches its conclusion, FSU doctoral graduates and former faculty colleagues are carrying on the tradition coast to coast. English Educators from the following institutions are at present providing leadership in the training of upper grade teachers of English Language Arts/Reading. Several are also preparing supervisors, curriculum specialists, and teacher educators through programs of graduate study. These educators are located at the following colleges/universities:

Albany State University (Georgia), Auburn, Barry University (Miami), Delta State (Mississippi), East Carolina University (North Carolina), Florida A & M, Florida International University, Furman, Iowa State, Kennesaw State University (Georgia), Ohio State, Southern University (Louisiana), Ohio University, Oklahoma University, Radford University (Virginia), University of Alabama, Winthrop College (South Carolina), University of South Florida, University of Toledo, and Wichita State.

From these 20 institutions, located in 12 different states, educators trained at FSU are carrying on the tradition of excellence in teacher training, supervision, research, and curriculum development. It is a tradition which has enhanced the reputation of FSU throughout the past 50-plus years—both in good times and bad.