Looking at License Preparation

Ruth Wood

The topic for this issue is the newly proposed license for teaching English at the University of Wisconsin-River Falls.

These new proposals are part of a larger effort by the University of Wisconsin and other institutions to bring English education into the 21st century.

The national push for reform in education and the need for more effective teachers and schools have led to the development of new licensing programs. In Wisconsin, a task force was appointed in 1994 to study the needs of Wisconsin schools.

In 1993, a study was conducted in Wisconsin. Many of the recommendations that were made were incorporated into the new licensing program. The task force recommended that teachers be required to complete the new program to meet the needs of exceptional learners.

This task force recommended that changes in the licensing program be recommended that teachers be licensed. Rather than completing the new program, teachers will be asked to provide proof of professional development. This measure of professional development is necessary for maintaining the license.

Ruth Wood is a Professor of English at the University of Wisconsin-River Falls.
Looking at Licensure

Ruth Wood

The topic for this issue of the Wisconsin English Journal is the newly proposed licensure guidelines for public schools in the state of Wisconsin.

These new proposals have come into being, according to the State of Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction, because of these circumstances:

The national movement to develop standards for both PK-12 schools and higher education and the demand for greater accountability of teachers and students to demonstrate what they know and are able to do are primary forces behind the creation of the new Chapter P12, Wisconsin Administrative Code.

In 1993, a study of how Wisconsin teachers are licensed was conducted. Many concerns were identified about the number of rules and regulations that individuals and colleges had to comply with in the licensing process. In order to study the issue further, a task force was appointed in 1994 to study and debate what the licensing system for Wisconsin should be for the next century.

This task force issued a report in 1995 that called for sweeping changes in how teachers were licensed. The central focus of the recommended changes was a shift to a performance-based approach to licensing. Rather than counting on the fact that students in college completed the requisite coursework, it was suggested that there be a measure of performance to substantiate that the candidates for a license had the knowledge and skills needed to succeed.

Ruth Wood is a Professor of English at the University of Wisconsin-River Falls. She is the current editor of the Wisconsin English Journal.
The changes that resulted have come in the form of three major recommendations:

1. Develop performance-based professional education programs and continuous professional development based upon a set of standards.
2. Change the structure of licensing to have three stages or tiers—beginning, professional and master.
3. Change the categories of licensing to better match what was happening in the curriculum and instructional patterns of school.

To find out how administrators felt about these new licensure proposals, the editors of Wisconsin English Journal distributed questionnaires to forty randomly chosen secondary principals. Although we got only seven responses, these are worth attending to.

None of the administrators who responded felt unfavorably toward the proposals, and each had at least one positive thing to say about them. One liked the flexibility of having teachers with broader preparation who could fill a set of staffing needs that changed from year to year. Two felt that public confidence in professional staff would be improved by these changes. Another said, “Anything to improve teacher competence is worth trying.”

But each had one reservation as well. One felt it would be harder to secure qualified people, and one felt that it would increase pressure to conform. Two noted how much time it would take to establish administrative guidelines and how much time it required of veteran teachers, willing though they may be, to serve as mentors over a five-year period.

A very insightful comment came from a principal who worried about the anxiety a five-year probationary period would create in new teachers. Having just survived a tenure decision myself, I can appreciate how much the uncertainty of “making it” into the profession affects one’s ability to take risks, to feel confident, and to feel comfortable. But another principal thought the shared responsibility of teacher assessment would lighten the load on everyone.

Two English teachers who responded to the survey (we invited the principals to share them) were more aware than principals that the necessity for veterans—who already have many other responsibilities “on their plates”—to mentor beginners would require release time because the veterans “don’t have anything more to give.” To be mentored also requires time of beginners who are “overwhelmed with prep and correcting.” Still both these teachers see potential in these proposals for strengthening the profession and for making the licensure process more “real world...less artificial.”

All of us to the highest standards is one way to best way. As a principle it might be about “what might be about “what fulfillment their responses look further than the monitoring. If you response items for...
All of us will probably agree that our profession needs to hold itself up to the highest standards of accountability. And certainly revisiting licensure standards is one way to do that. But perhaps it’s not the only way or even the best way. As a profession, we probably haven’t been as professional as we might be about “weeding out” those among us who don’t carry their weight or fulfill their responsibilities to the best of their ability. But perhaps we need to look further than these licensure guidelines to do the best job we can of self-monitoring. If you have further ideas to propose, consider submitting them as response items for the next issue.
Egg on Our Face?
What We Talk About When We Talk About Certification

Jeff Wilhelm

The other day, just before lunch, I received two e-mails from former teaching colleagues. These electronic missives were about the proposed certification changes in English for the state of Wisconsin. Specifically, as I understand it from afar, certifications for Speech and Journalism will be eliminated, and teachers with a general English certificate will be considered able to teach such courses. Because I now work in Maine as a teacher educator, I am often involved in discussions and policy-making around certification issues, and these e-mails got me to thinking . . . or to be more precise, to daydreaming about what seminal educational thinkers might have to say about this issue . . .

Lunchtime with Lev

(In Jeff’s kitchen. Jeff’s apron shows serious signs of distress. He continually refers to Martha Stewart’s gourmet cookbooks and articles on hostessing tips. A sink full of pots and pans attest to his labors. Today is an important day. He has invited Ed Brazee, a curriculum theorist from the University of Maine, to lunch so that they might discuss certification issues. Ed indicated that he might bring along a few friends. The doorbell rings.)

Jeff: (Still stirring the borscht) Come in! Come in!

Ed: Jeff, great to see you. (Turning to his companion) Do you know the famous (and deceased -[remember this is a daydream!]!) Russian educational psychologist Lev Vygotsky?

Jeff: (Shaking Lev’s hand) Yes . . . I mean no . . . I mean only through his writing.

Lev: This borscht is so most excellent.

Jeff: Well, you know? Wisconsin’s best! Journalism?

Ed: You know this work is important. For that reason, teachers should know not only the material and the use of the language, but also the rest of the learning that goes on and is compelling; every other academic discipline and language art.

Lev: (Tasting the borscht) This is more interesting than entertaining. It makes no sense to keep us in the dark about areas of knowledge.

Ed: Thanks, Lev. The NCTE and NCTM are working on developing a common thread for teaching meaningful literacy, but I am not sure we’ve achieved the same for journalism. Each teacher as a journalist needs to handle procedures of the kinds of work they do (heart surgery) and should be involved in Wisconsin’s English. The advice is for teachers in medical schools to make their curriculum analogous to the conventional school in a given subject.

Lev: Excellent point. I noted the processes of reading and writing are not sufficient to the personal skills needed for journalism. This will assist teachers to realize that they have these skills. Furthermore, they need to continually change. We need to adopt changes in current contexts. Finally, I am not sure how to bring this ourselves with you.
Lev: This borscht smells most excellent! My grandmother used to make the most excellent borscht!

Jeff: Well, you know why I invited you to lunch. What do you think of Wisconsin’s plan to eliminate teaching certificates in Speech and Journalism?

Ed: You know that all of my work has been around curriculum integration. For that reason, I like the potential of this move. I think that all teachers should be thinking about how speech and journalism, oracy and the use of different kinds of communication media merge with the rest of the language arts. The research on curriculum integration is compelling; and how will we get there if we can’t even integrate the language arts?

Lev: (Tasting the borscht) Mmmm. I must agree with Ed. We do not learn and use skills in isolation, but in the process of addressing issues and solving problems. We will use any tools that are available and useful. It makes no sense to divide domains of knowledge and sets of tools as we do in school. If this new certification serves to integrate different areas of knowledge, that would be a good thing!

Ed: Thanks, Lev. Furthermore, all of the standards, such as those of the NCTE and NMSA, as well as many of the state level standards, sound a common theme of integration and of producing knowledge in meaningful contexts. But I’m a bit concerned about how this will be achieved for the teachers themselves. Let’s consider the beginning teacher as a medical intern. She is probably quite adept at general procedures of practicing medicine, but you wouldn’t throw her into heart surgery without focused professional development. Under Wisconsin’s plan, what support and incentives are provided to assist teachers in meeting more task-specific demands like integrating curriculum and teaching specialized content and procedures such as the conventions of journalism?

Lev: Excellent point, Ed! Many people do not understand that general processes of doing something, like teaching, are necessary but insufficient to the practice of more task-specific procedures, like teaching journalism. So I am wondering how this new certification program will assist teachers to this kind of specialized knowledge and insure that they have it! I also wonder, since knowledge domains are constantly changing, how teachers will be assisted to embrace and adopt changes in rapidly-developing fields such as journalism. And finally, I am wondering when we will be able to sit down and indulge ourselves with this most excellent borscht!
Jeff: Oh, I’m sorry, let’s sit down. (Dishes out the soup.)

Lev: A bit more fresh cream, please. Thank you. (Between slurs of soup) As you know, Jeff, I have written extensively about learning. In a book based on my work, Tharp and Gallimore argue that teaching is the active assisting of a novice to a more competent and expert performance. Mmmm. This soup is excellent! But in order for this model to work, the teacher must be more expert than the student. The teacher must know more and be able to do more AND know how to pass this knowledge on to the student so that the student can internalize the teacher’s knowledge and language.

Ed: So if teachers don’t have specialized knowledge, they won’t be able to teach specialized sets of knowledge.

Albert Shanker: I was just walking by and smelled the borscht. Do you mind?

Jeff: Albert! Of course not, help yourself.

Albert: As the President of the American Federation of Teachers, I was always concerned with the depersonalization of teaching. If any Joe on the street can teach, then we are not a profession. A profession means that you have special knowledge and skills that are highly developed. Certification is not a panacea, but it is one gateway and one kind of assurance of professional expertise. I am concerned whenever this kind of assurance is eroded, though I do think these assurances must be administered and controlled by teachers. A profession that does not control professional entry and police itself is not a profession. This is a problem that has long plagued American education. So I am concerned about what is going on in Wisconsin. Who is controlling this re-certification process? If it is not teachers, then I am doubly concerned. Jeff, please pass the Russian eggs.

Lev: Russian eggs!!?? My favorite!

Ed: Of course, there are other ways to provide depth to a teacher’s repertoire and to assure quality besides completing a list of college courses that lead to certification. But if we eliminate the requirements for substantive coursework, then we need other ways to actively support teachers to new teaching performances—and we need new ways to evaluate teacher skill that will insure their qualifications to teach.

Lev: Exactement! Tharp and Gallimore have pointed out that though teachers must provide assistance to students, no one ever assists teachers to greater performances. We expect teachers to teach new
things and to improve their practice without ever really providing them with the resources and assistance that are required. Take most school inservice programming, for instance, it is a joke—

Mikhail Bakhtin: Ah ha! This is the source of the olfactory emanations of the delicious borscht! (Ladies himself a bowl.)

Lev: Don’t you ever knock? Hey, not so much. I might want seconds!

Jeff: You mean thirds.

Mikhail: This notion that anybody can do anything with a certificate is utter nonsense. Ridiculous! To be an expert you must know the possibilities of practice, and you must develop expertise and new ways of knowing and doing things over time. This requires assistance, coaching, and dialogue! As you know from my theory of dialogism—

Lev: Give him a Russian egg. He is always dialoguing.

Ed: What is the real issue here and in Wisconsin? Is it a lack of teachers who can teach these courses, so we make it easier to be certified? Is it lack of resources to teach and assist the teachers so we eliminate required coursework? I am worried about what else will be lost with the loss of certification areas.

Mikhail: Dialogue will be lost! Exactly my point! We homogenize language arts to the point that there is no more dialogue, only monologue! We will lose graduate classes, special interest groups and the vitality of professional organizations that support dialogue about specialized subjects. We will lose an awareness of possibilities, and the vitality of discourse! You see, each of us is the novelist of our own life. But as we write this life, we author ourselves in response to the voices in our environment. If this new certification idea causes us to lose authoritative voices, then the possibility of higher consciousness, professional wide-awareness, and improved practice will be lost! (Vygotsky stuffs a Russian egg in Bakhtin’s mouth.)

Ed: But perhaps this certification debate opens up possibilities. It does make sense that expertise is not best developed in classrooms, and is not best demonstrated on tests or through transcripts, but through actual performance. So perhaps what we need is not the abolition of certification areas, but multiple paths to certification. For example, a preservice teacher could work on the school newspaper for a year and create a portfolio about her work as an alternative to taking a journalism class. Or a new teacher could be mentored as an apprentice teacher in a speech class or through the debate or forensics club for two years and could demonstrate qualifications in that way. That way,
professional knowledge is required, and that knowledge could be
developed through actual accomplishment in the field versus the
taking of a class. We would then be certifying teachers, but in a way
consistent with what we know about learning and the developing of
expertise.

Albert: I do understand that ETS is developing a Praxis approach to certification. This relies on performance based demonstrations of practice based on theoretical understandings about how students learn, and how various knowledge domains work. Wisconsin also is developing multiple and optional routes to move from provisional to professional licensure.

Lev: I like to say that knowledge must be made visible and reasoning must be made accountable.

Albert: That is what the Praxis tests try to do. To prove that theoretical understandings are in place and can be put into practice. But to assist teachers to meet such high standards, there must be a comprehensive, well-supported system of assistance for teachers to develop new knowledge and strategies.

Ed: Has any one ever taken state learning results or standards for students and applied them to teachers so we can see what teachers must know and be able to do to actually assist students to meet those standards? Then we would know more about how to help teachers to do the jobs they are being required to do.

Albert: That would make too much sense. Pass the last Russian egg, if you don't mind.

Ed: You know, in Maine we have general certificates, but then we have endorsements that are necessary to teach special subjects like Speech and Journalism. The endorsements are required but can be earned through various avenues and different ways of displaying expertise. This might be a way to insure the expertise of teachers without a certificate. Of course, there do have to be other ways to support and develop expertise and these will have to be provided.

Jeff: Well, I guess we've established that there are possibilities in reconceiving certification, but there are even bigger pitfalls. So the question is how will professional assistance be provided over time, and how will dialogue in specific knowledge domains be supported and sustained once certification areas disappear . . . .

Lev: No, the real question is about dessert. What is for dessert? (Doorbell rings again.)
Fiona (Jeff's daughter): Dad, there are a lot of people at the door. Jerome Bruner, Louise Rosenblatt, John Dewey and a bunch of others. And they are dressed funny! They say they want a piece of the action!

Jeff: Oh no! How will I feed them all?

Lev: You know your story of the loaves and fishes? In Russia, we tell the story of the Borscht and Eggs.

Mikhail: This is exactly the point of Dialogism. When we find ways to dialogue and share, knowledge and understanding increases—it multiplies! In dialogue, we share a surplus of seeing and are unfinalizable. A new certification system must increase dialogue and sharing or these fields will stagnate! What we want is growth and unfinalizability. Just like the miracle of sharing increased the loaves and fishes so that every one could be satisfied.

Lev: (Sotto voce) Where is the last Russian egg when you need it? (a bit louder) Jeff, this borscht rivals my own grandmother’s!

Jeff: (Returning to reality) That’s high praise, especially from someone who has been dead for sixty years!

Fiona: Dad, why are you always talking to yourself? You are so weird!

Jeff: Fiona, please clean up the dishes. I have to commune with my laptop and write a little article for the Wisconsin English Journal!

Fiona: OK, Dad, but geez, did you have to dirty so many dishes? And hey—you didn’t leave me any of the Russian eggs! Except on your face!
Ready or Not: Meeting the Demands of Standards and Licensing

Mary Meiser and Helen Dale

Many of us recall the sparse preparation English Language Arts teachers of our generation received, and although we have certainly risen to the challenge of the profession, we also can’t help but wonder “What if?” That is, what if we had received a state-of-the-field preparation? Would our confidence have risen more quickly? Would our ability to tackle curriculum and instructional dilemmas have taken root more firmly? Would our response to issues of assessment have been grounded more thoroughly? And, most importantly, would we have been ready to incorporate the Model Academic Standards in English Language Arts into our curriculum? Further, would we have been ready to fulfill the proposed licensing standard for novice teachers?

Probably not. The two of us became teachers by a 12-credit requirement of the Department of Public Instruction. Within those credits, at least in our case, were one course in adolescent or educational psychology, one in educational philosophy, and one methods course. Then we were sent out for the requisite student teaching semester. While we may not have known much about the practice of English language arts, we certainly knew something about its content. Thus, if there were a positive side to our preparation, it lay in the strong liberal arts background that we received: we did know the content of our field. What we didn’t know, of course, were the most effective ways to convey it to adolescents. We learned them on the job.

Today’s novice teachers simply don’t have the luxury of time. They are expected to enter the classroom prepared not only to deliver curriculum but also to construct a model for the 21st century. They are expected to meet the needs of classroom diversity that range from the gifted to the disabled, the alienated to the overbearing, the articulate to the illiterate, the proficient to the limited-English-proficient. And they are expected to prepare these students for state assessments that never existed before, the results of which now grace the front pages of hometown newspapers. They are expected to use technology, not as a gadget for education, but as an integral part of the process. How do they do this? Perhaps the only answer is to enroll them in a college program taught in the following manner:

Perhaps the only answer is to enroll them in a college program taught in the following manner:

This raises the question: What is the role of Education? While we recommend English education courses under the auspices of English studies majors are nearly dead, what about the Novice Teaching Program, taught in the following manner:

At UW-Eau Claire, pre-service students are trained in a comprehensive major in English Language Arts. The program integrates the traditional program in English Language Arts and the School of Education. With the American Studies minor, comprehensive majors are exposed to courses in the different content areas. With the American Studies minor, comprehensive majors are exposed to courses in the different content areas.

Now as we prepare to propose licensing requirements for novice teachers, we must acknowledge that this program will serve as a model for all education programs. We believe that the 12-credit general English-language arts requirement will provide the general education background in English language arts that is necessary for the professional to teach. This program will allow pre-service teachers to develop their knowledge of content areas through the general education curriculum and through the strands of the Model Academic Standards. Through the pre-service teachers will develop their knowledge of content areas through the general education curriculum and through the strands of the Model Academic Standards. Through the pre-service teachers will develop their knowledge of content areas through the general education curriculum and through the strands of the Model Academic Standards.

Mary Meiser and Helen Dale are members of the English Department at the University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire.
as a gadget for educational games, but to teach lifelong skills of research. They are expected to defend their use of certain materials or methods—to articulate why this and not that—to colleagues, to administrators, to school boards, and to parents. How do they meet those expectations? Who helps them?

Perhaps their colleagues, at least if the proposed licensing requirements are enacted. Under the proposal, new teachers would have a mentor. But however good that proposal sounds, we know that implementation will be problematic—not because there is no desire to be a mentor, but rather because there is so little time or energy for it. How, then, do we prepare novice teachers to be relatively self-reliant, confident, and able to survive the inevitable bumps? One obvious response is an undergraduate program in English education that addresses both the contents of the Model Academic Standards and the performance-based expectations for licensing new teachers. Given the rigor of these new state initiatives, we believe that a coherent English studies and methods program, taught in the English Department, would best meet the needs of our pre-service students.

This raises another question, of course. What is the role of the School of Education? While we believe our students need and benefit from education courses, English education students are—both literally and figuratively—English Studies students first. Further, at many schools, it is not until English majors are nearly done with their coursework that they start taking methods courses under the auspices of the education faculty. The result is unsettling for students who suddenly find themselves no longer English majors, but education majors, learning information in a new field with different underlying assumptions, and different ways of viewing knowledge. Consequently, English educators often fail to provide a cohesive, unified program.

At UW-Eau Claire, we chose to bring English education “home” to its content area. With the cooperation of the English Department, as well as the School of Education, the English education faculty created a cohesive 60-credit comprehensive major centered around twelve credits of English methods courses taught in the English Department. This model replaced a more traditional program that included as English methods only a two-credit Curriculum and Instruction course.

Now as we look at the new English language arts standards and the proposed licensing requirements, we believe that the choices we made in our program will serve our students well. In view of what our students have to absorb and demonstrate en route to licensing, the traditional two- or three-credit general English methods course is unreasonable. They need substantial background in English studies, as well as in the pedagogy inherent in the strands of the Model Academic Standards. Moreover they need experience in observing and evaluating the craft of teaching, and finally, in implementing their knowledge of content and pedagogy. The field experiences both in our methods course and through the School of Education meet this need.
The core of our program is represented in the twelve-credit requirements listed below. The three primary methods courses (English 402, 404, and 406) can be taken in any sequence. A benefit of this flexibility is that in any given methods class, there will be students who are new to English methods, those who have taken one other course, and those for whom it is the last English methods course. This variety of student expertise adds a rich dimension to the courses and allows students to offer one another resources and strategies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English 402</td>
<td>Composition for Teachers</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English 397</td>
<td>Tutoring in Composition</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English 404</td>
<td>Literature for Teachers</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English 406</td>
<td>Language for Teachers</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English 408</td>
<td>Seminar in Teaching English</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A summary of other requirements in the English education major is included as Appendix A.

The names of the three core courses—Composition for Teachers, Literature for Teachers, and Language for Teachers—point to our biggest concern while designing this expanded English education program: the implication that reading, writing, and language should be taught separately. Nothing could have been further from our intentions. As we met to discuss these courses, we discussed our common understanding of the interconnectedness of all aspects of teaching English. We concluded that separate courses allow for sufficient attention to each aspect of teaching English/language arts while still honoring an integrated English/language arts curriculum.

When we designed this program, the state standards had not yet been implemented; however, we now find that our design complements both the standards and proposed licensing requirements. And we are quite certain that, had we retained the more traditional model of a single two- or three-credit methods course we could not have met these new demands. Further, we have come to appreciate even more fully the role that our English Department colleagues play in the development of our teaching majors. For it is in English studies that our students learn not only the content of their field but also a variety of instructional styles, or as educator Dan Lortie points out, they engage in the “apprenticeship of observation.” The intensive English program also prepares teachers well for the proposed licensing standards for teacher performance.

**Composition for Teachers**

The Model Academic Standards in Writing, although focusing on pedagogy, certainly imply that teachers must be writers, that they understand the craft and the processes of the writer. It is in methods that students experience genres other than those typically addressed in college writing courses.

Composition for Teachers, English studies, adds to the pool of writing knowledge and research behind the practice of writing to learn. They study models and research behind the practice of writing to learn.

Students learn how to write assignments. They intensively study the models that they might some day use in their own work, and then write the assignments that they might use in their newly created writing assignments and rubrics. We train our students’ writing.

The composition model—response to and evaluation of student writing; writing partnerships as excellent means to assess students’ writing; writing partners as a way to have writing partners improve their writing; writing partnerships as a way to have writing partners improve their writing; writing partnerships as a way to have writing partners improve their writing—has been a primary focus of our work. (See Dale & Traun, 1994.)

**Tutoring in Composition**

This course, of course, provides an opportunity to put principles into practice. Students have been assigned several college students and tutored a variety of first drafts. They have encouraged and supported them to improve their writing. Students have also helped for new teachers to understand students’ writing and to improve students’ problem solving skills.

**Literature for Teachers**

In English studies and the literature now stipulated by the state standards, British, world, and American literature will provide knowledge to develop their own writing and their students and human.
Composition for Teachers takes the experience of their writing courses in English studies, adds to it, and directs students to their new role: that of a teacher of writing. Students examine not only learning to write, but also writing to learn. They read and write toward an understanding of the theory and research behind the teaching of writing, but also work at a very practical level to discover ways to engage their future students in meaningful writing.

Students learn about writing workshops and about creating a variety of assignments. They invent some writing assignments of their own, assignments that might some day have their future sixth to twelfth grade students write, and then write the assignments themselves. These pre-service teachers try out their newly created writing assignments with their peers, and they revise assignments and rubrics with the same care they must later give to their own students’ writing.

The composition methods class focuses on appropriate contexts for response to and evaluation of student writing. One goal of the course is that the preservice teachers have contact with real students and real students’ writing; writing partnerships between college and secondary students offer an excellent means to accomplish that. Students in Composition for Teachers have writing partners from a nearby high school. Using both e-mail and face-to-face writing/revising conferences, the pre-service teachers work with high school students as tutors and evaluators of narratives, job applications, and essays of literary analysis. While our students feel more comfortable in the role of tutor, they learn most from trying on the role of evaluator for the first time. (See Dale & Traun, 1997; Dale and Traun, 1998, for more information on this partnership.)

**Tutoring in Composition**

This course, concurrent with Composition for Teachers, offers another opportunity to put preservice English teachers face-to-face with student writers. Methods students have intensive training as writing tutors and then are assigned several college freshmen to work with for the entire semester. By tutoring a variety of freshmen, our students experience how different writers respond to them and to the strategies they use. We can think of no better way for new teachers to understand and use a variety of instructional strategies to aid students’ problem solving than through a course aligned with methods of composition.

**Literature for Teachers**

In English studies, our students learn the structure of the discipline, of genres and of texts. It is here that they also learn the breadth and depth of literature now stipulated in the standards: contemporary, classic, American, British, world, and adolescent. In English methods, they learn to use this knowledge to develop a curriculum that brings students to an understanding of themselves and human experience.
A significant amount of class time is spent on broadening the concept of canon to include minority, women’s, and adolescent literature. Here the depth and breadth of their comprehensive English major comes into focus, for now they are looking at literature in terms of the adolescents they will soon teach.

To learn more about pedagogy, students write in journals, create and complete assignments secondary students might use, and research some aspect of teaching literature—teaching mythology or multicultural literature, for example. Students also teach one class session and create teaching units based on themes that interest them. These units often become a centerpiece in their employment portfolios, as well as provide concrete evidence of students’ skill in performance-based assessment. Their teaching experience will be further enhanced when, similar to Composition for Teachers, they work on literary studies with area high school students via e-mail.

Wisconsin’s Model Academic Standards for reading and literature are far-reaching in their demands on practitioners. Without a solid background in the content of English studies, as well as sustained exposure to selecting and teaching this content, our teaching majors would be less prepared to develop curriculum and implement the Model Academic Standards.

Language for Teachers

In our program, we made a decision that pre-service teachers must have an applied course, one where the connections between linguistic content and teaching are made explicit. Although Language for Teachers cannot substitute for the depth of a course in structural or historical linguistics, it addresses the concepts most critical to the secondary curriculum—and often the most hidden and ignored.

This course introduces students to basic language and linguistic concepts and their application to teaching adolescents. Too often this aspect of the English language arts is the one given the least attention, yet language is the element of English that students engage with most frequently. Further, Wisconsin’s Model Academic Standards in Language now require that our pre-service students both understand these concepts and develop appropriate curriculum in this area. Consequently, course topics include the nature of language, first- and second-language acquisition, American dialects, English as a second language, and grammar. The course also depends upon integration with literature and writing. For example, students use adolescent fiction to study both language issues and concepts.

In their English studies courses, students engage in a variety of speaking and listening activities; however, they rarely explore them. In methods, they do explore them. In the process they realize that secondary teachers have to structure discussion, thus providing an arena for all students to participate in speaking.

Seminar in Teacher Education

This one-credit seminar is linked to support courses and is designed to develop teachers. Additionally, it offers discussion of student teaching in the center of their primary classrooms. The students teach a class section of a high school classroom as part of their role as teacher. It involves an emphasis on self-reflection, observation, and relating to specific lesson plans and structure. More importantly, it provides a context for the teaching experience and to link theory into practice. In our seminar, students are encouraged to take an active role in the English methods classroom. They develop the “reflection on teaching” standard for Teacher Education.

The Program and Its Antecedents

The Program began in 1973 as an extension of the teacher preparation program and methods courses. One standard, for example, is the “teaching the discipline” standard. The Program’s primary purpose is to develop the discipline, and the Program’s core is the “teaching the discipline” standard. The Program provides the opportunity for students to study the teaching of English as a discipline, to examine effective teaching strategies in the secondary classroom. Students have the opportunity to design, implement, and assess lessons in English, to understand and use a variety of strategies to teach English. Students are encouraged to take an active role in the teaching process, to design, implement, and assess lessons in English, to understand and use a variety of strategies to teach English. Students are encouraged to take an active role in the teaching process, to design, implement, and assess lessons in English, to understand and use a variety of strategies to teach English. Students are encouraged to take an active role in the teaching process, to design, implement, and assess lessons in English, to understand and use a variety of strategies to teach English.
participate in speaking and listening. They can not rely on an "it will happen" approach to these critical oral language skills. In addition to developing lessons and units that structure oral language activities, students visit middle or high school classrooms to observe "for real" classroom discourse.

**Seminar in Teaching English**

This one-credit seminar is taken during the student teaching semester and is linked to supervision. Adding the seminar has allowed us to devote adequate time and energy to the important endeavor of supervision and to the discussion of student teachers' experiences in sixth to twelfth grade English classrooms. The seminar provides a chance for students to examine their new role as teacher. It allows a specific time and place in which to share resources, ask questions, solicit suggestions, or discuss lesson and unit development. More importantly, it creates an opportunity to problematize their experiences and to link theory and practice specifically in the teaching of English. In the seminar, students can revisit concepts that arose in a more abstract context in English methods classes. In this semester especially, students learn the value of being the "reflective practitioner" discussed in the proposed licensing Standards for Teacher Performance.

**The Program and Proposed Licensing**

The proposed Standards for Teacher Performance add another dimension to the preparation of English language arts teachers. Here English studies and methods most often blend to meet the requirements for teacher licensing. One standard, for example, requires that teachers: 1) understand central concepts of the discipline, 2) understand the structure and tools of inquiry in the discipline, and 3) create learning experiences for adolescents. This standard is explicit in its intent that teachers, novice or not, know both English studies and English methods. The content of English studies is essential to thinking critically and exploring our critical thinking; that is, one can't think critically about nothing. Similarly, to think about instructional strategies, one has to both experience them and explore them. Students need both to witness the strategies in a variety of English studies courses, and then methods courses, to examine consciously these strategies and their value for the secondary classroom. Since a proposed licensing standard notes that teachers must understand and use a variety of instructional strategies, without the concentration of both English studies and English methods, pre-service teachers would surely be less prepared in this area. The list of proposed standards also includes an understanding of cognitive and linguistic development, diversity in learning styles, and effective communication—all of which are found in the blend of English studies and methods. Even standards that appear to be "strictly methods" rest firmly on the knowledge of one's content area.

The proposed standards that address methods courses strongly indicate the role of the methods teacher. We need to model reflective practice, talk about reflective practice, and insist upon reflective practice from our students as
they work through our courses and their field experiences. We are also the ones who show students how to form professional relationships, how to engage in professional development activities, and how to bring home to students the benefits of our professional lives.

While these proposed standards for teacher performance and licensing are not yet required, we must believe not only that they will be, but also that they should be. An article in the MLA journal Profession characterizes English teacher preparation as a "national disgrace" (Gies, 1995, 6). While most criticism of teacher preparation is less strident, the sentiments expressed are familiar, and have given rise to the plethora of external standards proposed (or imposed) by the state. Our state is no exception. But rather than view the teacher standards as an unwelcome imposition, we can view them as an opportunity to examine, and where warranted, revise our courses and programs in English education.

A Final Reflection

The English education major at UW-Eau Claire is and will continue to be a work in progress. Why? Because of the continued growth and complexity of the field itself. The traditional view of English as a body of knowledge to be transmitted has been broadened to a view of English as cognitive and social processes. However, because we thought in terms of "program" before we planned the courses, we started out with a solid, coherent framework. It's a model that has worked for us. The traditional model where students have a single, general English methods course will no longer serve our students well. Nor will such a model provide our secondary schools with new teachers who can meet the demands of state standards and a new licensing system. We began with a title that noted the reality of our situation; whether we are ready or not teachers have to be prepared to work with performance-based standards—for our students and for ourselves. We could be upset about state "demands," but we aren't. We can respond to "ready or not." We are, for the most part, ready.
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Appendix A

Requirements in the English Education Major at University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire

English Methods Courses
Composition for Teachers (3)¹
Tutoring in Composition (2)
Literature for Teachers (3)
Language for Teachers (3)
Seminar in Teaching English (1)

Required English Department Courses
Introduction to Texts (5)
Introduction to English Studies (1)
Shakespeare (3) (one of two Shakespeare courses)²
Critical Approaches to Literature (3)

English Department Elective Courses from the following areas
American Literature (6)
English Literature (3)
World Literature (3)
Ethnic Literature or Women's Literature (3)
Writing (3)³
Open Elective in English (3 credits)

Courses Required Outside of the Department
Fundamentals of Speech (3)
Content Area Reading (2)
Literature for Adolescents (3)
Developmental Psychology (4)

¹ Numbers in parentheses indicate semester credit hours.
² The Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction requires a course in Shakespeare for English teacher certification.
³ This requirement can be filled by taking any creative, technical, or expository writing course beyond Introduction to College Writing.
develop appropriate curricula, enough to do so; teachers group or content; teachers performance standards, let alone them.

It is not enough. Being a gifted writer, for example, writing. In fact, being a trip one up completely fine journalist does not make one English 10. And, being background assumed in a professional in the field.

There are good reasons to now. Translating state reading, oral and written tasks to professional in the field.

Just as there are certification levels in elementary problem, even before the currently certifies elementary arts in grades 1-9, which asks, “Who’s to worry? They can’t respond: “That’s the problem. depth and breadth and more, every outgrown pair of secondary English major methods; an elementary which are general education, academic preparation and.

An elementary area, English language arts is no more prepared to teach, prepared to teach elementary challenging differences in teaching, teachers lay the critical language arts curriculum prepared only to build on.

And thus my personal feeling than another—but the
develop appropriate curriculum because they do not know the content well enough to do so; teachers who use instructional methods unsuited to the age group or content; teachers who do not understand the implications of performance standards, let alone how to develop and implement curriculum to meet them.

It is not enough to love a field, or even, to have experience within it. Being a gifted writer, for example, does not necessarily prepare one to teach writing. In fact, being an expert, where processes are routine and buried, may trip one up completely when dealing with the novice student writer. Being a fine journalist does not mean one can handle the full curricular demands of English 10. And, being a bookworm does not always provide the literary background assumed in AP English, where the sophisticated expectations of curriculum for the college bound must be met.

There are good reasons for the traditional academic major, especially now. Translating state standards into appropriate curriculum and developing oral and written tasks to demonstrate student performance are the job of a professional in the field. A professional with the academic background to do it.

Just as there are good reasons for the traditional major, so there are for certification levels in elementary and secondary. Here we already have a problem, even before the DPI proposed greater latitude in licensing. The state currently certifies elementary teachers, for example, to teach English language arts in grades 1-9, which might lead our friend Alfred E. Neuman to ask, “Who’s to worry? They’re just kids.” Or it might lead some teacher educators to ask, “Why, then, can’t secondary teachers be licensed to teach 1-5?” But educators already know why, and to Alfred’s “they’re just kids,” they can respond: “That’s the point.” The kids. The English language arts changes in depth and breadth and sophistication with every spiral of the curriculum, with every outgrown pair of jeans and ragged sneakers within that spiral. A secondary English major typically has a 60-credit major in English studies and methods; an elementary major has perhaps 12 credits in English, some of which are general education courses. Where is the appropriate match for academic preparation and the English LA classroom here?

An elementary education major must prepare for all major content areas, English language arts being only one among them. Typically, he or she is no more prepared to teach secondary English than a secondary major is prepared to teach elementary language arts. There are significant and challenging differences in teaching English language arts in grades 1-5, where teachers lay the critical foundation for oral and written language. Third grade language arts curriculum would be a daunting assignment to a secondary major prepared only to build on that foundation, not to create it.

And thus my point: it is not that one curricular level is more challenging than another—but that they are significantly different in the modern school
Furthermore, content knowledge is only one part of it; knowledge of the learner is another. And here too, some DPI proposals are very much in the Alfred E. Neuman camp. The most perplexing: the proposal that divides certification into categories that include the “early adolescence through adolescence period,” covering ages 10-21. For the sake of civility, let’s just say a license to teach ages 10-21 is, at best, indefensible. If there is reputable educational research or models that support such a category, I am unaware of them.

Further, the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards is developing certification levels in English language arts, for example, as follows: Middle Childhood ages 7-12, Early Adolescence ages 11-15, and Adolescence and Young Adulthood ages 14-18. These categories align with academic preparation in elementary and secondary English LA. They recognize real and significant differences—cognitive, linguistic, and social—that have a bearing on curricular and instructional choices facing teachers every day.

Licensure as broad and unspecialized as that proposed would surely erode the quality of instruction at every level. It would surely bring “worry” to the forefront. Novice teachers are always going to have a bit of worry—not the mocking Alfred E. Newman variety—but those butterflies that keep circulating whenever there is a first time in their classroom, and there are a lot of those. Why compound it or make it a way of life with certification that suggests that teachers can enter the classroom with provisional knowledge to practice.

For those who think I sit at a university desk and look at all of the above theoretically, let me quickly tell you that I write from experience. As a novice teacher, I taught for three years on a 24-credit minor in Spanish, from grades 3 through 12, and I was always conscious of that minor; I was always coping. It didn’t matter if I were intelligent, dedicated, and hard working: I knew what I didn’t know, every day that I faced those kids, especially in the secondary classrooms. When I returned to my major, English, I came home to my content field. But even then, I had to retool and begin the long process of becoming a practitioner in English language arts. I thus have to ask: Why would anyone want to dilute or ignore the academic preparation so needed today?

I grew up with Alfred E. Neuman—but I never latched on to his “What? Me Worry?” approach. Perhaps because I was too busy coping with real curriculum and real kids. The state of Wisconsin cannot afford Alfred’s approach to licensing. Let’s hope he is stuffed back between the pages of *Mad Magazine*, where he belongs—before someone decides I can also teach on that 24-credit Latin minor, duly certified of course.

**Rethinking English Language Arts Preparation: Is the Model Adequate?**

**Roni Telfer**

While the state and local changes in Wisconsin are preparing English language arts teachers to be more professional and on the forefront, what is the adopted professional development model they need to develop? What professional development Standards are already in place? How can Wisconsin teachers prepare for the standards in preparation for the new standards?

The discussion of these professional development Standards in Wisconsin needs some direction. Each group that has worked on the Standards for students has faced the same issue, but are largely ignored. Should all standards be effective in college preparatory literature? Should all standards be effective in college preparatory literature? Should all standards be effective in college preparatory literature? Should all standards be effective in college preparatory literature? Should all standards be effective in college preparatory literature? Should all standards be effective in college preparatory literature? Should all standards be effective in college preparatory literature? Should all standards be effective in college preparatory literature? Should all standards be effective in college preparatory literature? Should all standards be effective in college preparatory literature?
Rethinking English Language Arts Professional Preparation: Lessons Learned from the Development of the Model Academic Standards

Roni Telfer

While the theme of this issue of the journal asks what the proposed changes in Wisconsin’s certification and standards for teachers will mean for preparing English language arts teachers, I would like to suggest that another change—the adoption of model academic standards in English language arts for Wisconsin students—already provides direction for how the preparation of teachers needs to adapt. Yes, the certification and standards will impact professional development after initial certification. But the Model Academic Standards are already impacting what teachers need to know and to be able to do to prepare their students to meet the standards. As a member of the task force that developed these standards, I can attest that one frequently recurring question asked during the development of the academic standards was: “And will colleges and universities be preparing new teachers to meet these standards?”

The discussions that have surrounded the development of academic standards in Wisconsin, in other parts of the country, and throughout the world offer some direction for the preparation of English language arts teachers. Each group that has engaged in the process of identifying academic standards for students has had to grapple with the necessity for reading and writing standards, but are listening and speaking instruction necessary for students to be effective in college and/or the workplace? How important is the canon of literature? Should all students know and identify the parts of speech? What about spelling, penmanship, phonics, vocabulary, roots and affixes, sentence types? What exactly should we have students learn in that which we call language arts?

Roni Telfer is the Curriculum/Staff Development Coordinator for the Whitewater Unified School District. She is also the Co-Chair of the English Language Arts Task Force of Wisconsin Model Academic Standards.
The Wisconsin Model Academic Standards are the final distillation of what could be agreed upon that all students in Wisconsin should know and be able to do. The assessments that students and teachers will be accountable for are being built from these standards. Perhaps it would be helpful to examine how the Wisconsin language arts standards came to be. In the process there were no burning bushes; there was no divine inspiration. There was much examination and discussion of what others had done. The standards were arrived at through much deliberation and negotiation. It is hard to tell who contributed what. But most who engaged in the process of developing the standards came away with a deeper understanding of what is encompassed in “language arts.”

And how does one come to understand what the standards mean? The task force’s experience would suggest that this is achieved by discussing the standards with others of both like and not-so-like background and frame of reference, by looking in other directions for knowledge about the language arts. We set out to do the following: 1) engage in elaborated conversations about the standards, 2) engage many voices in the conversations, and 3) embrace the changes that are inevitable.

**Engaging in Elaborated Conversations**

The Wisconsin Model Academic Standards for English Language Arts contain six content standards and eighteen performance standards identifying what students should know and be able to do in English language arts. The standards are the same across all the grade levels. Teachers of the English language arts will need to teach students to know and be able to do.

Look at the content standards. Do you notice a common thread about the use of the language? The standards suggest that effective language fits the purpose and the context. Do students need to know how to read? Yes. And what should they read? *It depends* on the purpose and the context in which they find themselves. So what does that mean for instruction? Should all students be able to speak effectively? Yes. And does that mean students should use appropriate Standard American English? *It depends* on the purpose and the context in which they find themselves. Therefore, students need to know what the expectations are, and their teachers have to be able to teach them about the social, cultural, regional, and professional situations that impact on the use of language. Should student writing be graded on spelling, punctuation, capitalization, and usage? *It depends* on the audience, the purpose, and the context of the writing. When writing for publication, yes. In most forms of e-mail, no. But still, it depends. And how are pre-service teachers going to know when to apply which expectations in their teaching? By developing an awareness of how dependent on context and purpose all language is and by cultivating a sensitivity to language.

**Engage Many Voices**

A second lesson from engaging many voices in the discussion would suggest that English language arts standards are the result of differing views to the core. The language arts standards became difficult to see for all.

An illustrative example is the task force meeting to develop a draft of the standards for English language arts. The language arts are ever more “multicultural literature that is multicultural and because the term does not mean anything.” Some who were parents who were part of the discussion. At one point, someone asked, “What do you mean?” Someone in the group discussed the idea of language that they can read and be different from themselves. The term was phrasing clarified what they meant. This was the end of being unable to get out of the discussion on communication. It took the group to get to the intent.

Other disciplines use the language of the language arts. A review of the nature of science, of social studies, and arts. Discussion emerged on language arts classroom that would need to be able to do.

**Embrace the Changes**

The third lesson from the process of engaging other voices is that when you start looking for ready ideas and are impacted by language also changes. We have access to a variety of standards for content areas. So the standards and inquiry because the standards in language arts, although often under the discipline of
Engage Many Voices in the Conversations

A second lesson from the standards development is the importance of engaging many voices in the process. The standards development experience would suggest that English language arts departments should engage many voices in the discussion of what to include. Teachers, professors, business people, administrators, and parents, all from a variety of perspectives, brought differing views to the discussion of what was important to be included in language arts standards. However, when we were so close to the “trees,” it became difficult to see the “forest.”

An illustrative example occurred within one discussion group developing a draft of the standards to address the need for diversity in literature. The English language arts educators were trying to work around the term “multicultural literature” because it was felt the term carried political baggage and because the term did not seem to address the purpose of literature. Two parents who were part of the group reviewing the standards were listening to the discussion. At one point, one asked, “What do you want this literature to do?” Someone in the group responded, “We want students to experience literature that they can identify with, but also literature that is about others very unlike themselves.” The parent responded, “So you want them to read literature in which they can see themselves and others.” The group was momentarily dumbfounded. That was exactly what was wanted and the parent’s phrasing clarified what the academics’ language could not. The educators had been unable to get out of their own discipline-specific language to achieve communication. It took a voice from “outside” to clarify both the language and the intent.

Other disciplines, too, have much to offer in understanding English language arts. A review of science standards, particularly those that focused on the nature of science, offered insights into an understanding of the nature of language. Discussion of the connections between content areas and the language arts classrooms helped broaden the expectation of what students would need to be able to do with their language skills.

Embrace the Changes That Are Inevitable

The third lesson learned from the standards development process is that when you start looking deeply into what you are doing and you start engaging other voices in your conversations, things are going to change, so get ready for it. Language is fluid. Technology, media, and culture all have an impact and are impacted by language. What we expect students to do with language also changes. We expect word processing, on-line communication, access to a variety of sources, written communication in mathematics and other content areas. So the standards address media and technology and research and inquiry because that is part of the shared responsibility of the English language arts, although some questioned the inclusion of these specific areas under the discipline of English.
Overall, engaging in the development of the English language arts standards was an exhilarating professional experience. It changed some perspectives and pushed the edges of what we see as language arts. Most importantly, it generated valuable insights into what is important for all students to know and to be able to do. Similar conversations hold promise for enlightening our preparation of the future teachers who will guide our students to achieve proficiency in the standards.

**Wisconsin Model Academic Standards for English Language Arts**

A. **READING/LITERATURE**: Students in Wisconsin will read and respond to a wide range of writing to build an understanding of written materials, of themselves, and of others. Students will use effective reading strategies to achieve their purposes in reading. Students will read, interpret, and critically analyze literature. Students will read and discuss literary and nonliterary texts in order to understand human experience. Students will read to acquire information.

B. **WRITING**: Students in Wisconsin will write clearly and effectively to share information and knowledge, to influence and persuade, to create and to entertain. Students will create or produce writing to communicate with different audiences for a variety of purposes. Students will plan, revise, edit, and publish clear and effective writing. Students will understand the function of various forms, structures, and punctuation marks of standard American English and use them appropriately in written communications.

C. **ORAL LANGUAGE**: Students in Wisconsin will listen to understand and will speak clearly and effectively for diverse purposes. Students will orally communicate information, opinions, and ideas effectively to different audiences for a variety of purposes. Students will listen to and comprehend oral communications. Students will participate effectively in discussion.

D. **LANGUAGE**: Students in Wisconsin will apply their knowledge of the nature, grammar, and variations of American English. Students will develop their vocabulary and ability to use words, phrases, idioms, and various grammatical structures as a means of improving communication. Students will recognize and interpret various uses and adaptations of language in social, cultural, regional, and professional situations, and learn to be flexible and responsive in their use of English.

E. **MEDIA AND TECHNOLOGY**: Students in Wisconsin will use media and technology critically and creatively to obtain, organize, prepare and share information; to influence and persuade; and to entertain and be entertained. Students will use computers to acquire, organize, analyze, and communicate information. Students will make informed judgments about media and products. Students will create products appropriate to audience and purpose. Students will demonstrate a working knowledge of media production and distribution. Students will analyze and edit media work as appropriate to audience and purpose.

F. **RESEARCH AND INQUIRY**: Students in Wisconsin will locate, use, and communicate information from a variety of print and non-print materials. Students will conduct research and inquiry on self-selected or assigned topics, issues, or problems and use an appropriate form to communicate their findings.

(from Wisconsin's Model Academic Standards, 1998, Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction)

---

The New Wisconsin

By now, you've probably read the journal. One is there is no other article from teachers from all over the nation, I consider writing a piece on the Wisconsin journal issues—Ruth Fagan has a wealth of material to include in this article. I have to have it come from the kindergarten to college teacher.

The two themes I choose are Censorship and Misunderstandings.

Now that you've read the response and get many, write a few paragraphs during the summer, we will receive articles on the special needs issue up.

On the topic of censorship, I think should be able to teach in through the room time. But most students are more frequently under

So we feel the need to dialogue with each other. There are considered positions on different issues. If you might want to agree your own way.

If you think you know over the selection of reading, do you think so?
The New *Wisconsin English Journal*

By now, you've probably realized that some changes are being made in the journal. One is that we're focusing each issue on a selected topic of interest to all language arts teachers. We're hoping to get submissions on these topics from teachers from all over the state and all across the spectrum. Please consider writing a piece for next fall's issue. Here's your invitation:

ATTENTION WCTELA MEMBERS! The editors of this year's two journal issues—Ruth Wood and Anne Stinson—would love to have more material to include in upcoming issues of the journal. And we would also love to have it come from a broad cross section of our own members—from kindergarten to college teachers and from every part of the state.

The two themes we want to use for next year's fall and spring issues are Censorship and Meeting the Needs of Exceptional Learners.

Now that you know this, you will have plenty of time to think about a response and get manuscripts to us. We'd be happy to get manuscripts (you can write a few paragraphs or up to 12 manuscript pages) on either of these topics during the summer, when we all have more time. But we'll also be glad to receive articles on the censorship issue until September 15, 1999, and on the special needs issue until February 15, 2000.

On the topic of censorship, many of us believe that classroom teachers should be able to teach whatever reading materials we deem worthy of classroom time. But most of us also know that our freedom to do so is more and more frequently under attack.

So we feel that as a concerned body of language arts teachers we need to dialogue with each other in order to assure that all of us reach carefully considered positions on this important debate. Below are some questions that you might want to address specifically; otherwise, feel free to respond in your own way.

If you think you, as a classroom teacher, should have clear authority over the selection of reading and viewing materials in your classes, why do you think so?
Who should decide what’s appropriate and not appropriate to read? Why? How?

What’s the difference between the uncensored language arts classroom and the one that must keep a constant look over its shoulder at potential censors?

Have you had positive experiences with non-educators who wanted to have some say over the materials you use in your classes? Describe them.

Have you developed better techniques of handling censorship challenges that have been directed at your choice of classroom materials? Share them with us.

Is there a particular title that you successfully defended against a censorship challenge? How?

Are there popular or commonly taught books that you think should be removed from classroom discussions? Why? What are the good reasons to censor what students in your classes read, view, and discuss?

Why are we experiencing this rise in censorship challenges? Does the fact that we’re getting more challenges indicate that there ought to be more challenges, or does some unrelated set of anxieties produce the climate of censorship?

Is it possible to look at censorship as a healthy “checks and balances” on language arts curricula? How so?

Thanks for taking the time to consider this invitation to submit. We hope to hear from lots of you!

CREATIVE WRITING MAGAZINE

As you may know, the WCTELA has been attempting to birth an annual statewide literary publication that will incorporate the poetry, fiction, and creative nonfiction of students in all University of Wisconsin colleges and Wisconsin junior and senior high schools.

Since we have no funding source for such a publication, we would like to produce it as a self-funded booklet. If we can make a success of the first issue, we may be able to acquire grant money from NEH to make this publication a continued outlet for Wisconsin student literature. We also hope that an initial success will enable us to expand into elementary creative work as well.

To succeed, this project needs the support and communication. We have figured that if 100 schools would contribute a fee plus a subscription fee for 15 issues, we could fund the project.

Clearly, what we need is your help. How many of you out there have plans? Please send your plans to WCTELA News, c/o Paul Wood, 715/425-3354; fax 715/425-3612.

WEBSITE NEWS

The third change in the WCTELA News is that we will be publishing articles that relate to literature at different grade levels on WCTELA’s website.

After we have a site that incorporates these different locations according to their individual being, you may simply subscribe at:

http://www.uwec.edu/
To succeed, this endeavor will require a great amount of cooperation and communication. We need about $5,000 to launch an issue, and we've figured that if 100 schools would each contribute a $20 entry and processing fee plus a subscription fee of one dollar per issue (and then order a minimum of 30 issues), we could fund the first issue.

Clearly, what we need to know before going ahead with the plans is how many of you out there are willing and interested in going along with these plans? Please send your "vote," along with comments and suggestions to Ruth Wood, 715/425-3354; fax 715/425-0657 or e-mail

Ruthann.P.Wood@uwrf.edu

WEBSITE FOR TEACHING STRATEGY ARTICLES

The third change that we've decided to make in the journal is to publish articles that relate and describe specific teaching strategies for specific grade levels on WCTELA's website.

After we have amassed a fair amount of these, we'll file them in different locations according to grade level and subject matter; but for the time being, you may simply send your article to:

http://www.uwec.edu/academic/wcete

Ruth Wood, Editor
Anne Stinson, Associate Editor
NATIONAL COUNCIL OF TEACHERS OF ENGLISH
90TH ANNUAL CONVENTION
MILWAUKEE CONVENTION CENTER
MILWAUKEE, WISCONSIN
November 16-21, 2000

November 16-21: Over 300 concurrent sessions will be offered for elementary, middle, and high school English language arts and reading teachers and college instructors. The program features special strands for elementary and middle level educators and for those interested in research.

November 20-21: More than 30 day-long workshops will be presented on topics such as reading, writing, assessment, literature, teaching diverse populations, English as a second language, and technology in the English language arts classroom.

CO-SPONSORED BY THE WISCONSIN COUNCIL OF TEACHERS OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

For more information, please contact:
Jacqui Joseph-Biddle, NCTE Convention Director, (800) 369-6283, ext. 3672
Pam Rennhack, President, WCTE-LA, 5424 Chicago Avenue South, Minneapolis, MN 55417

NCTE CONVENTION 2000
Milwaukee, Wisconsin
GET ON BOARD!

I would like to help in the work of the local committee:

( ) Newsroom (4 hours)
( ) Yes, I can type
( ) Yes, I've done reporting and newswriting
( ) None of the above, but I want to help

( ) Workshops (1 or 2 days)
( ) Monday, November 20
( ) Tuesday, November 21

( ) I would like to discuss the possibility of serving as a chair for one of the sub-committees.
( ) I'd like to help wherever help is needed most.

I am available:
( ) Up to 4 hours per day
( ) One or more full days
( ) Other__________

(Circle the days you are available to work.)
November 16 17 18 19 20 21 22, 2000
Th F S Su M T W

NAME

ADDRESS

PHONE: Home__________ Work__________
Mail to: Pam Rennhack, 5424 Chicago Avenue South, Minneapolis, MN 55417
Help us meet your needs!

With over 80,000 members who teach at all levels from pre-kindergarten through graduate school, the National Council of Teachers of English provides an excellent opportunity for teachers' professional development at all stages of their careers. In an effort to make our 2000 Annual Convention in Milwaukee an experience particularly beneficial to teachers in the Milwaukee area, we seek your help in shaping the program. Please circle the general area that you think would be most useful to you and your colleagues and suggest additional specific topics that you are interested in seeing.

Literature  Language/Grammar  Technology/Media  Critical Thinking
Reading  Curriculum Development  Multilingual/Bilingual  Evaluation/Assessment
Arts  Whole Language  Listening/Speaking  Professional Development
Writing  Multiple Intelligences  Multidisciplinary Teaching

Your ideas/needs__________________________________________________________

NAME______________________________________________________________
ADDRESS______________________________________________________________

PHONE: Home_________________ Work______________________________

Mail to: Jacqui Joseph-Biddle, Convention Director
National Council of Teachers of English
1111 W. Kenyon Road, Urbana, IL 61801-1096
Fax: (217) 329-0977
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