

able cooperation between teachers in the schools and subject-matter faculty in the colleges. This cooperation between teachers and scholars has resulted in better materials and stronger teaching in the schools; college-bound students especially have found themselves better prepared for college and university work. It would be unfortunate to lose these benefits by turning prematurely to general instead of categorical aid.

Another danger has arisen in the recent reassignment of subject-matter specialists in the USOE to positions of general responsibility. Already one working arm of the profession has been amputated, or at least disabled, in terms of its accessibility to teachers in the schools and colleges. Sound program development and evaluation depend upon administration by qualified subject-matter specialists who are in frequent communication with their counterparts and colleagues in schools and colleges throughout the country. Even if Congress approves the general authority that has been proposed, it should insure that programs in each subject-area be administered by competent specialists.

Categories and priorities

The Congress and the Administration have declared their intention to improve all education. The NCTE applauds that intention. It would not oppose the wish of Congress to add categories of aid which its members deem crucial. But the Council would urge Congress to establish priorities. In 1967 and 1968 some areas are more important than others, and categorical aid can attend more adequately to those priorities than can general aid.

For the same reasons that English and reading were important in the early years, they are important now. Qualified English teachers are still among those in shortest supply. Teachers of English for the disadvantaged need specialized training, as do teachers of English as a second language. Members of the NCTE Task Force reported instance after instance of programs for the disadvantaged floundering because of the shortage of personnel trained in English.⁷ Seventy percent of the teachers of English as a second language indicated a desire for additional formal training in subject-matter areas in their field.⁸ These needs are specific and not general.

In 1964 the NCTE reported to Congress on the need for inservice education of teachers of English. At that time teachers were complaining that their local institute and workshop programs had, for the most part, been devoted to general educational problems. "Over two-thirds of both elementary and secondary teachers of English report that less than 50 percent of the time in such institutes is given to the teaching of English. Only 21.4 percent of the teachers of English have an opportunity to attend a district sponsored institute or workshop devoted largely or entirely to English."⁹

The Congress responded that year by establishing NDEA institutes in English and reading, to meet the needs of those teachers who wished to acquire competence in specific aspects of language instruction. Thus far, opportunities for advanced study in English and reading have provided for only some 15,000 of the one million teachers of these subjects. The compelling need for specialized institutes for such teachers continues.

Subject supervisors for states

One of the clearest gains following the inclusion of English under NDEA was the extraordinary increase in the number of full-time state supervisors in English, a fact which has already been mentioned (p. 5). This seven-fold gain over a period of less than three years was achieved because of provisions within Title III of NDEA for such state positions. Moreover, state departments of education were quick to see the desirability of having a person with competence in a specific subject area available to coordinate state activities with a counterpart in the U.S. Office of Education. And since the nation's schools and colleges are organized on the basis of subject areas, such state appointments are logical extensions of existing educational conditions.

The National Council of Teachers of English has found state supervisors to be an invaluable contact and accurate source of information about state and local

⁷ *Language Programs for the Disadvantaged*, pp. 27-28.

⁸ *A Survey of the Teaching of English to Non-English Speakers in the United States*, p. 5.

⁹ Committee on National Interest, *The National Interest and the Continuing Education of Teachers of English* (Champaign, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1964), p. 5.