

379
N81d
No. 2284

A HISTORY OF STATE LEVEL CURRICULUM LEGISLATION AFFECTING
TEXAS PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS, 1950-1983

DISSERTATION

Presented to the Graduate Council of the
North Texas State University in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

By

Dorothy C. Love, B.S., M.Ed.

Denton, Texas

December, 1984

J.W.D.

Love, Dorothy A., A History of State Level Curriculum Legislation Affecting Texas Public Elementary Schools, 1950-1983. Doctor of Philosophy (Elementary Education) December, 1984, 147 pp., 2 tables, bibliography, 120 titles.

The problem with which this study is concerned is that of tracing the history of state level laws and resolutions which affected the elementary school curriculum in Texas' public schools during the years 1950-1983. The roles of the legislature, the State Board of Education, and the State Department of Education in relation to the curriculum are presented. The purposes of the study are to review state level legislation since 1950 that affected the curriculum, to update the work of earlier historical accounts of public education in Texas, and to provide a basis for understanding the current state of curriculum by focusing on its evolution.

Inspection of the data reveals that numerous topics were added to the elementary curriculum during the years under study, resulting in a fragmented and complex curriculum. Many of these topics were repealed in 1981.

The study concludes that the State Board of Education and the State Department of Education, as well as the legislature exert considerable influence over the curriculum, and that this influence seems likely to increase as the result of reform legislation enacted in 1981. Further study

relating to the implementation effects of the new curriculum
is recommended.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	v
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	
Purposes of the Study	
Background	
Significance	
Definition of Terms	
Limitations	
Sources of Data	
Procedures	
Importance of Historical Research	
Content by Chapter	
II. A BRIEF HISTORY OF CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT IN TEXAS, 1823-1950	23
Introduction	
Curriculum Development in Texas, 1900-1945	
Postwar Problems and the Enactment of the Gilmer-Aikin Laws, 1947-1950	
Chapter Summary	
III. LAWS, RESOLUTIONS AND STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION ACTIVITIES AFFECTING THE ELEMENTARY CURRICULUM, 1950-1965	40
Curriculum Study Commissions	
Other Laws and Resolutions Affecting the Curriculum	
Curriculum Activities of the State Department of Education, 1950-1965	
Chapter Summary	
IV. LAWS AND RESOLUTIONS AFFECTING THE ELEMENTARY CURRICULUM, 1966-1979	69
Curriculum Additions by Law	
Curriculum Additions by Resolution	

Chapter	Page
Programs for Special Populations Activities of the State Department of Education Chapter Summary	
V. STATE LEVEL CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT, 1980-1983	95
Curriculum Reform Committees Enactment of House Bill 246 and State Board of Education Implementation Efforts Revised State Curriculum Other Legislative Actions Affecting the Elementary Curriculum, 1980-1983 Activities of the State Department of Education Chapter Summary	
VI. SUMMARY, OBSERVATIONS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	124
The State Legislature and the Curriculum The State Board of Education and the Curriculum The State Department of Education and the Curriculum Summary of Findings Observations Conclusions Recommendations	
BIBLIOGRAPHY	140

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Summary of Recommendations and Implementation Suggestions of the Public School Boards of Trustees Advisory Committee and the Profes- sional Personnel Advisory Committee	108
II. Components of the Elementary Well Balanced Curriculum as Defined by the Texas Education Agency	115

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Although the federal constitution does not deal with education, Good (8) notes that it has had profound indirect influence upon many phases of the educational process. He states that the greatest influence has been through the doctrine of reserved powers stated in the Tenth Amendment. Under this amendment, education is a function reserved for the states; this, therefore, implies state level involvement in the curriculum development process.

The elementary school curriculum in Texas evolved as a result of actions of the state school superintendents, the legislature, the State Department of Education, and to a lesser extent, the local districts, which function within the parameters set by the state. These actions led to numerous changes in the elementary school curriculum during the years 1950 to 1983.

One reason for changes in the curriculum was the passage of the Gilmer-Aikin Bills which took effect in 1950. Although generally regarded as finance measures, the Gilmer-Aikin Bills also provided for the election of State School Board members by congressional district and reorganized the State Department of Education. This new structure resulted in increased

state influence upon the curriculum. The enactment of these measures therefore serves as the beginning point for this study.

Inspection of the Texas Education Code reveals numerous curriculum requirements, including those for the teaching of patriotism, Texas history, physiology and hygiene, kindness to animals, dangers of crime and narcotics, consumer education and economics education (13). In 1983, the Texas curriculum was described as "a patchwork of pet issues and special interests from former legislative sessions that omitted several major instructional areas (17, p. 8). Laws and resolutions which affected the elementary school curriculum, and the responses of the State Board of Education and the State Department of Education in implementing these legislative mandates provide the focus for this study.

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study was to synthesize from available sources a history of those state-level laws and resolutions which impacted the Texas elementary school curriculum during the years 1950 through 1983.

Purposes of the Study

The purposes of the study were to (1) bring together in one volume a comprehensive review of state-level curriculum legislation since 1950, (2) update the work of earlier writers in order to provide a more complete history of curriculum

development in Texas, and (3) provide a basis for understanding the present status of the public school curriculum by focusing upon its evolution during the past three decades.

Background

The elementary school curriculum in Texas was influenced by the emergence of a state structure for the development and maintenance of the schools, by the legislature, the State Board of Education, and the State Department of Education. Each of these influences is described below.

Emergence of a State Structure

During the 1700's, American schools were generally allied with religion. Campbell (4) writes that both the purposes and the control of the schools were under the direction of the various denominations. In Texas, the Spanish mission schools, beginning with San Francisco de los Tejas in 1690, formed the basis for education. Efforts at establishment of a unified system were hampered by a poor and widely scattered population that forced the earlier settlers to rely on the few poorly equipped private schools that came and went frequently (2).

Thurston and Roe (15) suggest that by 1800, some important concepts relating to state control of public education were emerging. These included the belief in the worth of the individual, a realization that education was essential to the process of democratic governance, a growing notion of

education as a state function, and a belief in the need for a separation of church and state.

Campbell (4) notes that the basis for state control of education was well established as early as 1820 through constitutional provisions or state statutes. Of the twenty states comprising the Union at that time, only two lacked provisions for a state educational structure. The wording of some statutes however, called upon the states to "protect and encourage" education rather than to establish and support it (4, p. 48).

The importance of a public education system for Texas was recognized by the Constitution of 1845 which directed the state legislature to "make suitable provisions for the support and maintenance of the public schools and as early as practicable establish free public schools throughout the state" (7, p. 60). The Law of January 31, 1854 created a state and local administrative structure for the schools, and appointed the state treasurer the ex-officio superintendent of schools. Duties of the superintendent included taking the school census, apportioning the available school funds, recording disbursements, making annual reports to the governor, and making recommendations to the legislature pertaining to the schools (7).

The Law of 1871 empowered the governor, the attorney general, and the state superintendent to act as the school board for the state. This board had authority to draft

school legislation; the superintendent continued to apportion the school funds, keep records, approve disbursements, and prescribe the course of study. Eby wrote that this system of state governance of the public schools was "the most imperial system of education in the country, assuming absolute authority over children, and acting in the place of the legislature in school affairs" (6, p. 159). Unpopular as it was (the Thirteenth Legislature abolished it in 1873), this system set the precedent for a state educational structure in Texas.

In modern times, the state has assumed an ever-increasing role in public education. Campbell (4) cites several reasons for this, including increased dependence of local districts upon state funds, increased public demand for accountability, a reduction of the federal role in education, and assumption of a larger role in educational matters by the state governor and the legislature.

Role of the Legislature

The Texas Constitution directs the state legislature to establish and maintain free public schools (7), but forbids any action contrary to state or federal law; neither can the legislature delegate its plenary power to other government agencies. Campbell describes the legislature as "the big school board" (4, p. 55), and notes that although the state board can screen and improve proposed legislation, only the legislature can decide basic questions regarding the schools.

In the discharge of its responsibilities toward the schools, the legislature is subject to influence from various groups that seek to sway votes on key school issues, particularly those involving financial matters. Although business, labor, and agricultural groups exert considerable influence over the legislature, Aufderheide (1) asserts that the group having the greatest sway is state-level teacher organizations. In reaching this conclusion, Aufderheide sampled state teacher groups in twelve states, including Texas. He concluded that the large staffs, large memberships, financial resources, and increasing activism afforded these groups considerable influence with their legislatures. He also found that the legislators themselves named teacher groups as the most influential groups affecting school legislation.

A second major source of influence upon the legislature derives from the office of the state superintendent. The importance of this position increased after the enactment of the School Law of 1884 which restored the office and provided for two-year elective terms for the State Board of Education members (7). The influence of the early state superintendents upon the legislature had to do largely with securing adequate financing for the emerging public school system, and with effecting organizational changes within the state educational structure. The biennial reports of Carlisle (5) and Kendall (10) reflect concern for needed bond issues, and for administration of interest funds accrued from the permanent school

fund. Evans (7) notes that state superintendent R. B. Cousins, who served as state superintendent from 1905 to 1909 was particularly influential in securing the legislation and constitutional amendments needed for taxation.

Other early superintendents influencing the legislature were F. M. Bralley (1910-1913) who authored the Rural High School Law, enacted by the Thirty-Second Legislature, and who was instrumental in the enactment of the Textbook Law of 1911. This law provided for a nine member board which worked with the governor and the state superintendent to select textbooks for use in the schools. Bralley was followed in office by W. F. Doughty who influenced the legislation providing for expansion of the State Department of Education. During his term, a constitutional amendment was passed authorizing a tax to be used for the maintenance of the schools and for providing free textbooks. Noting the importance of this legislation for the public schools, McClesky (11) wrote that public education in Texas did not come of age until the passage of the free textbook and compulsory attendance laws.

In modern times the state superintendent, now known as the Commissioner of Education, influences the legislature from his position as chief executive officer of the State Board of Education. In this capacity, he carries out the mandates of the board and the legislature and recommends to the legislature policies, rules, and regulations necessary for the operation of the schools.

The Legislature and the Curriculum

The legislature has played an active role in prescribing the school curriculum since the 1800's. The School Law of 1884 required the teaching of orthography, reading in English, penmanship, arithmetic, English grammar, modern geography, composition, and other branches prescribed by the trustees or the superintendent (7). Inspection of the Texas Education Code reveals the scope and diversity of legislative involvement in the curriculum process over the years. Section 21.102 of the Code required "at least ten minutes for the teaching of intelligent patriotism"; Section 21.104 mandated the teaching of physiology and hygiene, but permitted exemptions if parents objected. Section 21.105 provided for the teaching of kindness to animals in the primary grades, and the "protection of birds and their nests" (13, p. 176).

In 1971, the Sixty-Second Legislature directed the Central Education Agency to Develop curricula and materials for the teaching of the dangers of crime and narcotics. These units of study were required for all students in grades five through twelve. In addition, a nine-member Crime and Narcotics Advisory Commission was created to deal with the problems of drug abuse among students. This legislature further mandated that physical education be taught in the schools and directed the state commissioner to prepare courses of instruction for use in the schools (13).

In response to increased public interest in consumerism and economics, the Sixty-Third Legislature, in 1973, adopted a plan calling for the Central Education Agency to develop curricula and materials for the teaching of installment purchasing, budgeting, and price comparisons. Local districts were given the option of adding this course of study to the curriculum. Further legislative action in this area was taken in 1977 by the Sixty-Fifth Legislature "to insure the development of a comprehensive economic education for all children in grades one through twelve . . . it is the legislative intent that this program shall teach an understanding of the American economy" (13, p. 180). The legislature directed the State Board of Education to insure full implementation in grades one through twelve by the 1981-1982 school year, and to submit, through the Central Agency, regular reports on the progress of implementation efforts, along with suggestions or recommendations for improvement or for additional legislation.

The sections of the Texas Education Code discussed above were repealed in 1981 under provisions of House Bill 246, which gave greater responsibility to the state board for curriculum development and mandated that the board take steps to develop a well-balanced curriculum for grades kindergarten through twelve. The board's efforts in responding to this mandate are reported in Chapter V of this study.

History of the State Board

The history of the State Board of Education in Texas begins with the Law of 1871, described earlier in this chapter. The board as provided for in that law was short lived; it was replaced in 1876 as a result of the School Law of 1876. This law, enacted by the Fifteenth Legislature, put into effect the provisions of the Constitution of 1876. Under the provisions of this law, general control and supervision of the state's schools were vested in a State Board of Education made up of the governor, the comptroller, and the secretary of state. Duties of the board included distribution of funds, advising local school districts, publishing of summaries of school-related legislation, and the collection of statistics pertaining to the schools (7). The School Law of 1884 restored the office of state superintendent, who became the ex-officio secretary of the State Board of Education.

The idea of a non-political State Board was first proposed by State Superintendent S. M. N. Marrs in 1923 (7). He advocated a board that would formulate school policies and assume responsibility for appointing the state superintendent. In November, 1928, a constitutional amendment was adopted, authorizing an elected state board.

This board was created by the Forty-First Legislature in 1929, and consisted of nine members with overlapping six-year terms. The new board assumed the duties of the previous one,

in addition to administering financial programs, making budget recommendations, and appointing the State Textbook Commission.

The public schools functioned under this state structure until 1949 when the Gilmer-Aikin Bills were adopted. These bills provided for an elected board consisting of one member from each congressional district. Additionally, under provisions of Senate Bill 115, a Central Education Agency, made up of the State Board of Education, the State Commissioner of Education, and the State Department of Education was formed to oversee the operation of the public schools. Today this Central Education Agency is known as the Texas Education Agency (16).

State Department of Education

Prior to the passage of the Gilmer-Aikin Bills in 1949, the State Department of Education served several technical and clerical functions. Supervisors of high school programs reported to this department, which also analyzed census results and prepared information for local districts. In 1913, the state department was expanded into nine divisions with more diverse roles. The local school authorities sought advice from the state department on matters affecting their schools, and provided reports to the state board as required (7).

The present state department serves as the professional arm of the State Board of Education. Legal authority for the

department is vested in Section 11.01 of the Texas Education Code (9). The department enforces the regulations of the state imposed by state statute or state board action, and monitors the local districts to ensure compliance with minimum standards. The organizational structure divides responsibilities among the Commissioner of Education and two deputy commissioners.

The Commissioner of Education acts as the chief administrative officer for the Texas Education Agency and serves as the executive secretary of the State Board of Education. In this capacity, he carries out the mandates, regulations, and prohibitions established by the legislature or the State Board of Education, recommends policies, rules, and regulations necessary for the operation of the schools, and supplies the board of education with the information needed to make decisions. He prescribes the reports necessary to secure needed information from local school districts, and serves as a contact between the Texas Education Agency and other state and federal agencies (9).

The Deputy Commissioner for Programs and Personnel Development is responsible for the functioning of the departments for planning and evaluation, general education, programs for special populations, occupational education and technology, and professional development-instructional services. The planning and evaluation department deals with

assessment and evaluation of local district projects involving planning, budgeting, and accreditation standards. The general education department consults with local districts and regional service centers and provides leadership in curriculum development and guidance and special services. Vocational programs for students and adults are managed through the department of occupational education and technology.

Programs for special populations, including those for the bilingual student population, and compensatory and migrant education programs are administered through the department of special populations. Programs for special education students are handled through the department of special education. The department of professional development and instructional services is further divided into four offices that handle teacher certification, instructional resources, teacher education, and professional support and practices (9).

The Deputy Commissioner for Administrative Services heads three departments dealing with finance, business management, and field support services. The finance department is responsible for allocations of state and federal funds to the local districts. This department is also responsible for school administrative services. Business management deals with the business operations of the Texas Education Agency itself, and handles accounting, contract review and evaluation, special projects and budget control. The department

of field services and support manages a broad range of activities at the local district level. It also provides direction for the activities of the regional service centers and assists with desegregation plans, the problems of small schools, and regional program development and urban education (9). This brief description of the State Department of Education reveals the broad scope of its involvement in public education, and illustrates the potential this body has for influencing the school curriculum.

Summary

A state structure for the control of the public schools developed in response to the recognition of the desirability of a widely educated populace, and of a school system separate from church control. Legal authority for such a structure is provided in the state constitution. In recent years state involvement in public school affairs has increased due to greater dependence on funding, greater demand for accountability, reduction of the federal role in education, and assumption of larger roles by the governor and the legislature.

The state legislature is empowered by the state constitution to enact laws and resolutions necessary for the establishment, support, and maintenance of the public schools. It is subject to influences from the Commissioner of Education, and from various special interest groups, including business, agriculture, labor, and state level teacher organizations.

The enactment of House Bill 246 repealed numerous sections of the Texas Education Code dealing with the prescribed course of study.

The State Board of Education evolved from a three-man organization to one composed of elected representatives from each congressional district, which functions in tandem with the State Department of Education and the Commissioner of Education. The board implements legislative mandates and provides direction for the activities of the State Department of Education.

Activities of the State Department of Education include professional and clerical functions. The department monitors the local districts to insure compliance with state guidelines. It functions under the direction of the Commissioner of Education and two deputy commissioners who have broad responsibilities in numerous areas. Together with the Commissioner of Education and the State Board of Education, the State Department of Education assumes responsibility for the Texas public school system. These three entities are known collectively as the Texas Education Agency.

Significance

Research is limited concerning the history of the elementary school curriculum in Texas. Eby (6) and Evans (7) have written of the development of the schools in Texas through 1955, but there have been no attempts to organize

the information available on the Texas curriculum since that time. A study is needed that would report the significant laws and resolutions pertaining to curricular change and examine the efforts of the state board and the State Department of Education in responding to those legislative actions. Such a study would yield a body of knowledge useful to those who find past experience a valuable guide to the future.

Definition of Terms

The following terms have limited meaning and are thus defined for this study.

Curriculum is the course of study required by the state.

Curriculum development is defined as state level efforts made by the legislature, the State Board of Education, the Commissioner of Education, or the State Department of Education.

Curriculum legislation consists of laws passed by the Texas legislature which resulted in changes or additions to the elementary school curriculum.

Resolutions are actions of the legislature which do not carry weight of law, but which encourage, promote, or call attention to specific curriculum matters.

Texas Education Agency is the collective body of the State Commissioner of Education, the State Board of Education, and the State Department of Education, as cited in Section 11.01 of the Texas Education Code.

Central Education Agency is the Texas Education Agency as cited in Section 11.01 of the Texas Education Code.

Elementary school is a public school housing students enrolled in kindergarten through grade six.

Limitations

Interpretation of the data in this study is subject to the following limitations.

1. Although many curriculum laws and resolutions impacted the course of study in kindergarten through grade twelve, this study was limited to an investigation of state-level laws and resolutions which had an impact on the elementary school curriculum.

2. Discussion of State Board of Education and Texas Education Agency curriculum activities was limited to those that resulted from legislative action.

Sources of Data

Data for this study were collected from a variety of sources offering pertinent information about curriculum legislation in Texas. The following primary sources were used: (1) Texas Education Code; (2) Vernon's Civil Statutes; (3) Texas Education Agency publications; (4) structured interviews with present and former Commissioners of Education, State Board of Education members, and Texas Education Agency curriculum personnel; (5) structured interviews with current and former Texas legislators; (6) State Board of Education

publications, meeting minutes and agendas; and (7) biennial reports of the state superintendents.

Relevant library materials were used as secondary sources of information for this study.

Procedures

All information used in this study was examined for authenticity. Materials and documents were subjected to internal and external criticism in order to verify authorship and the veracity of the data.

This study concerns the state laws and resolutions which influenced the public elementary school curriculum in Texas during the years 1950 through 1983. Information gathered from legal documents, Texas Education Agency publications, and personal interviews yielded a greater understanding of the changing curriculum. Inspection of the Texas Education Code revealed the scope and diversity of mandated programs of study. Texas Education Agency publications offered additional information regarding the implementation of specific pieces of legislation. Minutes and agendas of the State Board of Education provided a record of its role in the curriculum.

Though relatively little has been written about the Texas curriculum in particular, the topic of curriculum reform in general is well documented in the literature. These sources were used in gathering relevant background data.

Importance of Historical Research

Historical research illuminates the past, reveals contemporary perspectives on a given topic, and provides a blueprint for future decision making. Borg and Gall note that "the historian's goal is to liberate us from the burden of the past by helping us to understand it" (3, p. 374). Tanner writes that the curriculum field "is suffering from a serious case of ahistoricism and wasting one of our most valuable resources: experience." She concludes that "professors and their doctoral students must undertake research in curriculum history" (12, pp. 38, 42).

Historical research about the laws that shaped the Texas public school curriculum over the last thirty years provides a source of information about the content of the laws, the interpretation of those laws by the State Board of Education, and the efforts at implementation via the State Department of Education.

Content by Chapter

This study consists of six chapters. An overview of the study is presented in Chapter I. Chapter II provides a brief historical perspective on the curriculum in Texas prior to 1950. Chapter III covers curriculum laws and resolutions during the years 1950 through 1965. A similar treatment of the years 1966 through 1980 is presented in Chapter IV. Curriculum efforts in the 1980's is the subject of Chapter V,

with particular emphasis on House Bill 246. Chapter VI contains a summary of findings, conclusions, and recommendations for further research.

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Aufderheide, J. Alan, "The Place of Educational Interest Groups in State Policy-Making Systems," unpublished doctoral dissertation, College of Education, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, 1973.
2. Barker, Eugene, The Life of Stephen F. Austin, Dallas, 1925.
3. Borg, Walter and Meredith Gall, Educational Research, New York, Longman, 1979.
4. Campbell, Roald and others, The Organization and Control of American Schools, Columbus, Merrill, 1975.
5. Carlisle, J. M., Biennial Report of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1896-1898, Austin, 1999.
6. Eby, Frederick, The Development of Education in Texas, New York, Macmillan, 1925.
7. Evans, Cecil, The Story of Texas Schools, Austin, Steck, 1955.
8. Good, H. G., A History of American Education, Ontario, Macmillan, 1956.
9. Institute of Public Affairs, Guide to Texas State Agencies, Austin, University of Texas Press, 1978.
10. Kendall, J. S., Biennial Report of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1898-1900, Austin, 1901.
11. McCleskey, Clifton, The Government and Politics of Texas, Boston, Little, Brown, and Company, 1969.
12. Tanner, Laurel, "Curriculum History and Educational Leadership," Educational Leadership, 41 (November, 1983), 38-42.
13. Texas School Law Bulletin, Austin, Texas Education Agency, 1978.
14. Texas State Directory, Austin, Sayers Publishing, 1984.

15. Thurston, Lee and William Roe, State School Administration, New York, Harper and Row, 1947.
16. Wallace, Ernest and David Vigness, Documents of Texas History, Austin, Steck, 1960.
17. "246," Texas Outlook, 67 (Spring, 1984), 6-8.

CHAPTER II

A BRIEF HISTORY OF CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT IN TEXAS, 1823-1950

Introduction

The elementary school curriculum in Texas was influenced by several factors. The Spanish mission schools, the private schools and the female academies offered extensive course lists; many of these courses were retained by the first public schools. The early state superintendents were successful in modifying the course of study. Legislative influence upon the curriculum dates from 1884. Each of these influences upon the development of the Texas elementary curriculum is examined in this chapter.

The development of public school curriculum in Texas began in 1823 with the opening of Isaac Pennington's school in the colony begun two years earlier by Stephen F. Austin. This colony school is thought to be the first English language school in Texas. It was followed in 1825 by Thomas J. Garner's school in Nacogdoches (9). Evans notes that "the staples of instruction were spelling, reading, writing, and arithmetic" (4, p. 36). Those same subjects were to be taught at Austin's Institute of Modern Languages, in addition to reading, writing (in three languages), history,

rhetoric, constitutional law, philosophy, astronomy, and chemistry (4). An attendance report of a Spanish language school in San Fernando de Bexar in 1828 lists the subjects to be taught as arithmetic, writing, spelling, primer work, and art (9).

The private academies which flourished in Texas between 1823 and 1837 also influenced the curriculum that would in later years be embraced by the public schools. In 1829, Thomas J. Pilgrim came from New York to Texas and opened a school at San Filipe de Austin. An advertisement in the Texas Gazette dated October 3 of that year announced the opening of the school, at which Pilgrim promised that "particular pains will be taken to correct the chastity of the students' sentiments, the purity of their morals . . . those branches will receive attention which are commonly taught . . . including the Greek, Latin, and Spanish languages" (9, p. 12). The following year Pilgrim ran a second advertisement listing the curriculum as "reading, writing, rhetoric, history, composition, aritomaic (sic), natural and moral philosophy, languages and mathematics" (9, p. 12). Pilgrim proved to be among the most mobile of teachers, opening a school at Gulph Prairie Settlement in 1830 and at Columbia during the years 1831 to 1836 (9).

Shortly after Pilgrim moved his school out of San Felipe de Austin, James Norton announced the opening of his school there. His advertisement listed the curriculum as

orthography, reading, writing, arithmetic, geography, and English grammar. The curriculum generally consisted of these basic subjects through the early 1840's. In 1843, R. B. Wells, a Methodist minister, opened a school in which the study of the three R's was augmented by the study of history, grammar, geometry, surveying, and Latin (8).

The female academies which were predominant during the 1840's and 1850's typically arranged their curricula according to the ages of the students and some offered fine arts instruction as a supplement to the more traditional academic subjects. The Victoria Female Academy, for example, opened in 1848 with a curriculum which included the classics, piano, vocal music, arts, drawing, and painting, in addition to reading, writing, and spelling taught from McGuffey's Readers and Webster's Blue Backed Spellers (9). Older students learned arithmetic, algebra, geometry, trigonometry, calculus, botany, philosophy, history, astronomy, Latin and English (9).

A similar, if less elaborate curriculum was offered at the Clarksville Pine Creek Female Institute. An 1842 advertisement in the Northern Standard listed reading, writing, orthography, and definitions as the beginning curriculum, with grammar, geometry, arithmetic, history, philosophy, rhetoric composition and chemistry added for older students (9). This arrangement seems to corroborate Tyler's observation that the curriculum prior to 1910 consisted of a group

of skills subjects (reading, arithmetic and writing) which were to be mastered before attempting the content subjects (geography and history, 15).

The coming of statehood in 1845 heralded the entry of state government into school affairs. The tenth article of the state constitution directed the legislature to establish free schools statewide and to furnish means of their support through taxation of property (9). Although a centralized school system was still years away, the constitution provided an important first step. It would be 1884 before the first list of required subjects was authorized. The School Law of 1884 required the teaching of orthography, reading in the English language, penmanship, arithmetic, English grammar, modern geography, composition and other subjects directed by the trustees or the superintendent (4).

Some local superintendents took the initiative in developing a course of study for their districts. One notable effort in this regard was that of Superintendent W. H. Foute who wrote the first course of study for the Houston Public Schools in 1882. The first grade curriculum was composed of reading, spelling, and arithmetic; these basic subjects were augmented by penmanship, vocal music, composition, calisthenics, physiology exercise and object lessons. Reading was taught with the aid of charts as well as reading books. Geography was added to the list of subjects for second graders, who were required to master the multiplication tables through

six, and to know the use of the dollar mark and the names of the various coins. Emphasis was placed upon reading with inflection and with good articulation (9).

Curriculum Development in Texas 1900-1945

Evans notes that by 1900 the Texas schools were making rapid progress in keeping with the popular educational notions of the day, and that the development of education in the state "showed a creditable parallel to the progress of education in the several states" (4, p. 6). Unruh (16) writes that by 1900 there was a national interest in Americanizing the immigrants that had begun arriving in 1880, and in equipping students to contribute to the national economy. There is some evidence that the first three men to serve as Texas' State Superintendent after the turn of the century were in tune with the national trends.

J. S. Kendall, who served from 1899 to 1901, urged the introduction of manual training and home economics into the curriculum (7). He was followed in office by Arthur Lefevre (1901-1905). Lefevre advocated a six year elementary school, and urged the elimination of courses and subjects "having no practical value" (4, p. 59). R. B. Cousins, who served from 1905 to 1909, advocated the addition of agriculture to the course of study, and implemented the additions of manual training and home economics to the curriculum first proposed by Kendall.

Eby notes that these years bore witness to a gradual broadening of the required curricular offerings. Physiology and hygiene were required in 1893, an event Eby credits to the Women's Christian Temperance Union (3, p. 199). In 1899, the humane treatment of animals was added to the list of required subjects, and in 1901, United States history, Texas history, and civil government were required in all elementary schools of the state (2).

The involvement of the United States in World War I proved to be another source of influence upon the curriculum. In 1917, the Texas legislature passed a new law reemphasizing the importance of Texas history to the curriculum, and specifying the amount of time to be devoted to it. Eby writes that schools played a "heroic" part in various war campaigns (Liberty Bonds, Food Conservation, and Red Cross), and that new emphasis was given to "patriotism, American ideals, American literature, and physical training" (2, p. 228).

The next event to influence the development of the elementary curriculum in Texas was the passage of a constitutional amendment in 1918 providing free textbooks for all public school students. The texts were first introduced into the classrooms in 1919. No longer were students required to provide whatever textbooks could be bought or borrowed; no longer were teachers at the mercy of the students' materials. The advent of free textbooks undoubtedly contributed to the standardization of the curriculum.

The problems of rural education dominated the 1920's. There was concern for equalization of opportunity, and for a curriculum that would take advantage of the latest scientific developments in transmitting knowledge to students. The need for equal opportunity for rural students was voiced by Columbia University president James Hosis in a 1924 address to the Texas State Teachers' Association. Hosis commented that "a child born in one of the communities of Texas will have the opportunity of attending a progressive school with a modern program and a modern type of teaching" while children in other neighborhoods "are destined to be the victims of a limited program . . . the next step in elementary education in Texas would seem to be a definite statewide and concerted attempt to equalize educational opportunity for all children" (5, p. 17).

Hosis's comments followed on the heels of the Texas School Survey results which were released in November, 1924. This survey, ordered by the legislature in 1923, contained the results of a study of all phases of public education made by the Education Survey Commission (14). This commission was chaired by Texas Governor Pat Neff. Tom Finty, Jr. of Dallas served as secretary. Other members of the commission were P. W. Horn, president of Texas Technological College, T. D. Brooks of Baylor University, R. M. Chitwood of Sweetwater, Burl Bryant of Wichita Falls and Gus Taylor of Tyler. G. D. Staton of Canton, A. E. Wood (Senator) of Granger,

Mrs. Chalmers Hutchison of Fort Worth, Mrs. Henry Redmond of Corpus Christi, and B. K. King of Douglas also served on the commission (14). George Works of Cornell University directed the work of the commission. The commission concluded that students in rural schools were two-thirds of a year behind the larger schools in reading achievement, were somewhat behind their city counterparts in arithmetic skills, and were "distinctly below the spelling standards of the larger town schools." Student achievement in geography in the rural schools was reported as "exceedingly meager" (14, p. 23).

The survey received high praise from T. H. Shelby of the University of Texas. He wrote that Texas was "in the beginning of the greatest movement ever launched in this state for the improvement of our educational status" (12, p. 13) and that "history will probably record no greater contribution to the science of education . . . than has been made by the school survey" (12, p. 13). He concluded that the survey had contributed to the techniques of school inquiry, to the improvement of school conditions through board actions and to understanding of the problems of education among the lay community, and termed the survey a "golden opportunity" (12, p. 14).

The push for educational equality shared the spotlight during the 1920's with ideas for an expanded curriculum that would take advantage of the latest developments in technology.

Power (11) envisioned an expanded curriculum which would include physical fitness ("out of a six-hour day, at least an hour will be given to training in physical education by experts who are not classroom teachers"), broadened resources including the "talking machine" and the typewriter, use of traveling art collections, a full hour of recitation daily in the auditorium, and current events. Oral expression, music, and elementary school chatauquas were also predicted as features of the curriculum, as were homogenous instructional groupings (11, p. 7). Power further predicted that students would man school banks and cafeterias in order to experience "actual situations which occur in adult life," and that students would receive instruction in the fine arts based upon the results of "carefully devised tests" (11, p. 9). Others who advocated an expanded curriculum were Hume who noted that "much has been said, but little has been done . . . to ground future citizens in the knowledge of the rudiments of finance" (6, p. 18) and Cobb (1) who advocated a stronger program of music instruction. Hume believed that some form of thrift education should be taught from kindergarten through twelfth grade, and that such education would "speed up the student's progress in other subjects, and develop his self reliance, his self control, and his ability to express himself" (6, p. 18). Cobb noted that less than 25 percent of the students were receiving adequate instruction in music in 1923, and decried the situation in which musical talent

and artistic ability often went undiscovered. He cited the lack of proper music education as "one of the most serious defects of American education" and asserted that children having musical talent should be taught to sing "as a matter of right" while those who do not have talent should receive instruction "as a matter of social necessity" (1, p. 5). It was nearly fifty years before the ideas of Hume and Cobb became realities.

Eby noted that by the mid 1930's changes in the curriculum were among the most significant in the development of public education, and that movement was

from a curriculum based on traditional and adult education, to one based upon the natural activities of the child; from a curriculum fixed, narrow, linguistic, to one rich in substantial knowledge and a growing body of knowledge adapted to special needs; from an education of mind alone to one of the entire organism--physical, social, mental, in unison (13, p. 897).

America's entry into the Second World War diverted interest from curricular matters. Unruh (16) cites the war as the main cause for lack of progress during these years. In Texas, however, concern for the needs of the handicapped prompted the Forty-Ninth Legislature to create a division of special education in 1945. The state department was charged with the responsibility of administering a special education program for the exceptional children of Texas, defined as "any child of educable mind whose bodily functions or members are so impaired that he cannot be safely or adequately educated in the classroom" (4, p. 24). In addition to the

regular subjects, speech correction, sight conservation, and health and safety habits were added to the curriculum for handicapped students.

Postwar Problems and the Enactment
of the Gilmer-Aikin Laws
1947-1950

At the end of the war, Texas faced a number of problems in public education. Lack of materials had precluded new construction and halted even the most basic structural and safety repairs. The school-age population was increasing faster than the facilities needed to house them could be built, and there was a critical teacher shortage (10). In March of 1947, Representative Claude Gilmer introduced House Concurrent Resolution 48, calling for the establishment of an eighteen-member study committee to recommend improvements for the public schools. The resolution was sponsored in the Senate by Senator A. M. Aikin. Members of the committee were House Representatives Gilmer; Ottis Lock, former superintendent of schools; Mrs. Rae Files Still, chairman of the House Education Committee, and a former classroom teacher. Members appointed by the Speaker were R. L. Thomas of Dallas, Peyton Townsend of Dallas, and J. C. Peyton of El Paso, director of the Texas Manufacturers Association. In addition to Senator Aikin, members from the Senate included Senator James E. Taylor and Senator Gus Strauss. The president of the Senate Allan Shivers (who

later became Governor of Texas) appointed to the committee C. B. Downing, superintendent at Albany; J. W. Edgar, superintendent of the Austin schools (later Texas Commissioner of Education); and H. A. Moore, superintendent of Kerrville Schools. The Governor appointed Beauford Jester; H. W. Stillwell, superintendent of the Texarkana Schools; B. F. Pittinger, former dean of education at the University of Texas; Nan Proctor, a teacher; Mrs. J. G. Smith, a past president of the Texas Parent Teachers Association; J. Turrentine, former dean of education at the Texas State College for Women; and Wright Morrow, a Houston lawyer who was also a National Democratic committeeman (13).

With twenty-five thousand dollars in house contingency funds to finance its task, the Gilmer-Aikin Committee set to work. Little progress was made by the committee during the first year until it met in December with Edgar Morphet, a nationally known expert in school finance. Morphet suggested that the committee organize statewide advisory committees to work with the various Gilmer-Aikin subcommittees. The committee chose to act on this advice and hired L. D. Haskew, the dean of the school of education at the University of Texas as its technical advisor. By September, 1948, a tentative draft of some thirty-three specific recommendations were published in a booklet entitled To Have What We Must (10).

The committee failed to get the proposed bills before a special session of the legislature; they were finally presented during the regular session in 1949. Three separate bills were proposed: Senate Bill 116, establishing a minimum foundation program for school finance; Senate Bill 117, establishing automatic financing; and Senate Bill 115 dealing with the reorganization of the state administration of the schools. It was this bill that drew heavy opposition, and that would ultimately influence the curriculum in Texas, if somewhat indirectly.

The provisions of Senate Bill 115 called for the consolidation of the existing educational divisions of the state administration into one central agency, to be known as the Texas Education Agency. The organization and functions of the various arms of the Texas Education Agency (TEA) were discussed in Chapter I of this study.

Opposition to Senate Bill 115 came from members of the State Board of Education, who rejected the idea of an elected board, from the State Department of Education which opposed the realignment of the existing divisions, and from state superintendent Woods, who also opposed the reorganization of the state department, and especially the provision calling for the state board to appoint the commissioner of education (10). Woods waged a campaign in the media against the passage of the bills, and supported a counter measure introduced in the House. Other opposition to the measures

came from a small group of textbook publishers who objected to the portion of the bill calling for multiple adoption of textbooks in the elementary grades (10). Despite the actions of the protesters, the bills passed in the waning days of the 1949 legislative session.

During the summer of 1949, the Governor appointed L. P. Sturgeon, then superintendent of the New Boston school system, to serve as acting commissioner of education until a permanent commissioner was selected by the state board. The board interviewed a number of candidates before selecting J. W. Edgar, who had served on the Gilmer-Aikin Committee. Edgar had served served as superintendent of the Orange, Texas schools during the Second World War before assuming the superintendency in Austin, and was experienced in the administration of federal aid to schools, having overseen the implementation of the Lanham Act in Orange. This act was the first measure to provide federal aid to impacted areas (10). With the selection of Edgar as the first commissioner of education, the provision for an elected state board in place, and with the state department streamlined into four departments, the stage was set for the beginning of a new era in public education in Texas.

Chapter Summary

During the early 1800's the Texas elementary school curriculum consisted of courses of study offered by the

private schools and female academies. The legislature authorized a course of study in 1884 which emphasized the language arts, geography and arithmetic. By 1900 a number of topics had been added to the curriculum, including physiology and hygiene, civics and history, and the humane treatment of animals.

The involvement of the United States in two world wars led to an emphasis in patriotism and physical training, and left the Texas school system in need of major reforms. The Gilmer-Aikin Bills, enacted in 1949, provided for automatic school financing, for a minimum foundation finance program, and for a reorganization of the state system of school administration.

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Cobb, B. B., "Music an Essential in Education," Texas Outlook, 7 (September, 1923), 5-6.
2. Eby, Frederick, The Development of Education in Texas, New York, Macmillan, 1925.
3. Eby, Frederick and Charles Arrowood, The Development of Modern Education, New York, Prentice Hall, 1934.
4. Evans, Cecil, The Story of Texas Schools, Austin, Steck, 1955.
5. Hasic, James F., "The Next Steps in Elementary Education in Texas," Texas Outlook, 8 (November, 1924), 17-18.
6. Hume, Dinsmore, "A Practical Talk on Thrift Education," Texas Outlook, 7 (November, 1923), 18.
7. Kendall, J. S., Biennial Report of the State Superintendent, 1900-1901.
8. Kenney, M. M., "Recollections of Early Schools," Quarterly of the Texas State Historical Society, Volume 1, 1897.
9. Ley, Mary and Mike Bryan, editor, Journey from Ignorant Ridge: Stories and Pictures of Texas Schools in the 1800's, Austin, Texas Congress of Parents and Teachers, 1976.
10. Pearson, Jim B. and Edgar Fuller, editors, Education in the States: Historical Development and Outlook, Washington, National Education Association of the United States, 1969.
11. Power, Leonard, "The Elementary School and Readjustment During the Next Ten Years," Texas Outlook, 6 (April, 1922), 7-9.
12. Shelby, T. H., "The Meaning and Importance of the Texas Educational Survey," Texas Outlook, 8 (February, 1924), 13-14.
13. Still, Rae Files, The Gilmer Aikin Bills, Austin, Steck, 1952.

14. "Texas School Survey," Texas Outlook, 8 (November, 1924), 21-23.
15. Tyler, Ralph, "Curriculum Development Since 1900," Educational Leadership, 38 (May, 1981), 599-601.
16. Unruh, Glenys, Responsive Curriculum Development, Berkeley, McCutchan, 1975.

CHAPTER III

LAWS, RESOLUTIONS AND STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION ACTIVITIES AFFECTING THE ELEMENTARY CURRICULUM 1950-1965

During the years 1950 through 1965, the Texas Education Agency and the state legislature directed major efforts toward assessing the current status of the state mandated curriculum. The Study Commission on the Elementary School Curriculum (1953), the Committee of Twenty Four (1957), and the Study of Public School Curriculum (1959) were statewide attempts to determine the strengths and weaknesses of the curriculum. Other actions of the legislature which affected the elementary school curriculum dealt with establishing a program for instructional television, alcohol and drug education, and programs for non-English speaking students. Kindergarten programs and prescribed studies exemptions were also the subjects of legislative attention.

This chapter deals with the curriculum study commissions that operated during the years 1953 to 1959, describes other laws and resolutions enacted by the Texas legislature between 1950 and 1965 which impacted the elementary school curriculum, and deals with the curriculum activities of the State Department of Education during those years.

Curriculum Study Commissions

Study Commission on Elementary School Curricula, 1953

The Study Commission on Elementary School Curricula was established by the State Board of Education in 1953 as an outgrowth of the Gilmer-Aikin Bills which charged the Texas Education Agency with the task of providing teaching materials and selecting a multiple list of textbooks for adoption by local districts. The commission was created "as a step toward the establishment of adequate statewide courses of study and proper textbook selection policies" (28, p. 34).

The commission was appointed by State Commissioner of Education, J. W. Edgar and consisted of two superintendents, three principals, three supervisors, two teachers and two college professors. The superintendents were T. W. Ogg of Brazosport and R. L. Williams of Corpus Christi. The principals were M. G. Bowden of Austin, Geneva Carl of Houston, and Mrs. H. H. Durham of Eastland. Elizabeth Hubach of Kilgore, Helen Wright of Nacogdoches, and Bruce Shulkey of Fort Worth were the supervisors appointed. The two teachers who served were Minnie Lee Mitchell of Dallas and Earline Moreman of Canyon. College professors were represented on the commission by Frances Merritt, Assistant Professor of Education at Howard Payne College (later Howard Payne University) and Witt Blair, Dean of the School of Education at North Texas

State College (later North Texas State University) in Denton (20).

This commission worked with the Commissioner of Education and the State Department of Education to develop a foundation instructional program in keeping with the intent of the Minimum Foundation Program Act. The commission outlined long-range projects, including defining the objectives of the elementary school, determining the curriculum necessary to meet the objectives, and determining the type of curriculum materials needed to implement the curriculum (28).

Committee of Twenty Four, 1957

The Committee of Twenty Four was created by the Fifty-Fifth Legislature through House Concurrent Resolution 105. Its purpose was to study the school program and involve local citizens in determining the future course of public education (5). The governor, lieutenant governor, the speaker of the house, and the State Board of Education each appointed six members to the committee. The resolution was sponsored in the House of Representative DeWitt Hale and in the Senate by Senator A. M. Aikin and became known as the Hale-Aikin Committee of Twenty Four (5).

In order to elicit the widest possible public response, an organizational plan was developed. Under the plan, each of the 254 counties in the state selected a chairman to compile comments from citizens and transmit them to Austin.

In most cases, this chairman was a school administrator who served as the temporary, organizing chairman. The job of the temporary chairman was to hold a meeting with each school board within the county in order to form a nominating committee. At least twenty-four persons, a majority of whom were to be laymen, were to be nominated, and their names submitted to the state committee in Austin. Once this task was completed, the temporary chairman then organized a meeting of the board-selected group who in turn chose a permanent chairman, vice-chairman, and secretary (7).

To assist these local committees in their work, the state committee developed and distributed a study guide which emphasized consideration of four topics. These topics were the school program, finance, teacher supply, and school construction. Within each topic, specific items for discussion were suggested.

With regard to the school program, four items were suggested. These dealt with subject offerings, standards, services, and special programs. In the area of finance, the committees were asked to consider methods of financing education using state and local funds, methods of financing school construction, the role of federal funds in education, and high school transfers. Teacher supply questions suggested for study included present and future projections of teacher supply and demand, attractiveness of teaching as a profession,

maximum utilization of teachers and the adequacy of teacher preparation programs. In the area of school construction, committees were asked to discuss shortages, the local ability to finance new construction, and future needs (7). In all, the state committee suggested 167 questions for consideration by the local committees.

The Hale-Aikin Committee of Twenty Four, referred to as the "grass roots committee" (7, p. 16) enjoyed widespread support from state officials, teacher organizations, and the general populace. Governor Price Daniel called the project "one of the most important ever undertaken in the history of our public school system" (11, p. 9). The Texas State Teacher's Association (TSTA) published a booklet, Education . . . An Investment in the Future, and distributed 105,000 copies statewide, including some 15,000 to local committee members (11). By August of 1958, all 254 counties in the state had submitted reports to Austin, evidence of the support of the general public for this project (13). The study was termed "the most phenomenal record in Texas history for such a citizen operation" (25, p. 13). It was further noted that by contrast, 133 counties had responded to a similar study conducted in 1948 in connection with the Gilmer-Aikin Bills (31). The Hale-Aikin Committee of Twenty Four finalized its report during the autumn of 1958 and submitted its recommendations to the legislature in January of 1959.

The recommendations dealing with curriculum are those pertinent to this study and are reported below.

Committee of Twenty Four Curriculum
Recommendations

In considering curriculum needs, the committee recommended that the legislature "provide in statute the framework for a public school curriculum that will meet the needs of Texas children" and "require each public school system to provide adequate instruction" in numerous subject areas (3, p. 19). Recommended courses included English, spelling, writing, reading, arithmetic, the constitutions of Texas and the United States, citizenship, the American heritage, patriotism, the history and geography of Texas, the history and geography of the world, use of the English language, basic English for non-English speaking preschool children, mathematical concepts and skills, scientific knowledge, health and physical education, fitness, including the harmful effects of alcohol and narcotics, and "such other instruction as may be required by the State Board of Education or by local boards" (3). The committee further recommended that the curriculum include vocational education and foreign language instruction, and encouraged the creation of a special program for non-English speaking children, and the hiring of special teachers for the academically talented. Despite support from the governor's office (Daniel had pledged to "recommend to the legislature the enactment of those

recommendations . . . made by the Hale-Aikin Committee of Twenty Four"), the legislature passed only one of the curriculum recommendations (11, p. 9). A program for pre-school vocabulary training for non-English speaking children was established through the enactment of House Bill 51.

This law defined an eligible child as "one who will reach the age of six on or before September 1 of the ensuing year, and who will at that time be eligible for initial enrollment in the first grade; and one who does not speak and understand the common English words necessary for normal progress in the first grade of Texas schools" (17, p. 51). An advisory committee was established for the program which began in the summer of 1960. Members of this committee were R. L. Williams, superintendent of the Corpus Christi schools; Elizabeth Scrivener of Eagle Pass, a teacher; Mrs. A. X. Benavides of Brownsville, also a teacher; Henry J. Otto of the University of Texas; and principals A. X. Benavides of Brownsville and Felix Tijerina of Houston (16).

Tijerina's appointment to the commission was particularly fitting. In 1958, as national president of the League of United Latin American Clubs (LULAC), he led the movement to establish schools outside the regular public school program in order to equip Spanish-speaking students with English language skills before their entry into the regular public schools. The schools, known as Little Schools of the 400, had as a goal student mastery of 400 essential English

vocabulary words, and were the forerunners of bilingual education programs in Texas (15).

Now Tijerina and the rest of the commission members set about the task of providing direction to a new program within the public school system. Under the new plan, school districts could apply for the program at least sixty days prior to the beginning of instruction. Programs were to operate for forty to sixty days between the end of one school year and the beginning of the next, for four hours daily. Each child was to receive a minimum of two hours' instruction daily (16). During the summer of 1960, 136 school districts participated in the program, serving 15,486 pupils. The State Department of Education held three workshops for the 614 teachers involved in the project. Some 305 teachers from 71 school districts attended the workshops, which had as their focus acquainting teachers with instructional materials and methods relating to the program (17).

Study of Public School Curriculum, 1958

The Study of Public School Curriculum was initiated by the State Board of Education on January 6, 1958 in order to evaluate the state's instructional program in light of more stringent high school graduation requirements. Under the direction of W. R. Goodson, director of school accreditation at the Texas Education Agency, eleven commissions were established. The commissions were to study the areas of

health and physical education, mathematics, science, educational guidance services, social studies, English language arts, foreign languages, vocational education and industrial arts, safety and driver education, business education, and fine arts (17). Each commission functioned under the leadership of a chairman.

Commission chairmen and their respective commissions were O. T. Freeman, principal of Wichita Falls High School, health and physical education, Z. T. Fortescue, superintendent at Port Arthur, mathematics; Hollis A. Moore, superintendent at Tyler, science, and T. P. Baker, director of instruction at Austin, English language arts. Others were Ohland Morton, superintendent at Edinberg, foreign language; Bascom B. Hayes, superintendent of Brazosport, vocational education and industrial arts; and Floyd Honey, principal of Monterey High School in Lubbock, safety and driver's education. The commission for business education was chaired by superintendent O. J. Baker of Dickenson; the fine arts commission by Q. M. Martin, superintendent at Carthage, and the educational guidance committee by E. T. Robbins, superintendent at Alamo Heights, San Antonio (1).

During the 1958-1959 school year, each of the commissions worked to develop a report outlining the recommended curriculum for each subject area. The commissions enjoyed wide latitude in determining the scope of their individual reports. Members were invited to comment not only on the

curricular content, but also on teacher training, requirements for graduation, accreditation standards, and standards for instructional materials and supplies (1).

Seventeen preliminary reports were printed and distributed to all school districts in July of 1959. School staffs were invited to examine the materials and submit suggestions to the Texas Education Agency by March 1, 1960. Some 200 schools from across the state agreed to study the reports in depth and provide written recommendations. Inspection of the contents of the preliminary reports reveals the scope of the recommendations made by the various commissions. The reports of the commissions dealing with subjects taught in the elementary school, and thus pertinent to this study, are summarized below.

Mathematics commission preliminary report.--The mathematics commission identified the characteristics of a desirable mathematics curriculum. Recommendations included an emphasis on the structure of the number system, and on general operations with whole numbers. The commission suggested that greater consideration be given to the meaning of processes involved in problem solving, and to oral mathematics activities. Other areas of emphasis in desirable programs, the commission noted, were generalizing, estimation skills, measurement skills, and the use of precise mathematical vocabulary (24).

Science commission preliminary report.--The preliminary report of the science commission suggested a program to be developed around the three broad areas of living things, matter and energy, and earth and sky. The living things component was to include topics such as the varieties of life, the human body, and basic processes. Among the topics to be covered under the matter and energy component were light and heat, machines, electricity and magnetism, and sound. Earth and sky topics included units of time, ages of the earth, weather, atmosphere, and distance and space (25).

The commission also identified six objectives of an effective elementary science curriculum, including providing a program built on scientific, experimental, and problem solving activities; developing scientific attitudes among students; guiding interest in science; fostering conservation attitudes and activities; developing broad understandings; and developing the understandings associated with the evolution of scientific principles (25). Materials necessary for teaching science were suggested, and basic teacher competencies were identified.

English language arts commission preliminary report.--This commission developed a philosophy statement stressing the need for a language arts program that would "develop the individual to the fullest extent of his capacity in using the English language with ever-increasing competence, power, and

pleasure" (1, p. 31). The recommended elementary curriculum encompassed reading, literature, oral and written communication, and urged the integration of facts, processes, and skills. Stress was placed upon the importance of developing student competence in reading and writing for specific purposes and upon the role of literature "as a source of rich personal development" (1, p. 45). The commission further recommended that schools stress legible handwriting, correct spelling, clear enunciation, and conventional English usage.

Foreign language commission preliminary report.--The foreign language commission outlined factors to be considered in deciding which foreign language should be taught, presented some characteristics of foreign language learning, and recommended a sequence of instruction. The sequence recommendation emphasized the importance of beginning language instruction early, noting that the primary grades offer the best starting point for foreign language learning (29).

Class size and length of class periods were also addressed by the commission. Recommendations were that maximum class size should not exceed thirty students, and that classes should meet for thirty minutes three days a week, or thirty minutes daily for students in grades four through six, and fifteen to twenty minutes daily for those in grades one through three (29). This commission also addressed standards for teacher preparation and for administrative responsibilities.

Fine arts commission preliminary report.--The fine arts commission reviewed the status of music and art instruction in the schools and made separate preliminary reports. A joint recommendation of both committees was that music and art be required in the elementary schools and that 100 minutes weekly be devoted to music instruction and 150 minutes a week be allotted to art instruction (21, 22). Both commissions further recommended that special art and music teachers be employed and that regular classroom teachers be employed who had at least six semester hours of college work in both art and music. It was suggested that art and music be correlated to other subjects in the curriculum.

The art commission noted that art should be for all children and that children should be encouraged to express their ideas, to develop artistic talent as a way of communicating with others, and to "educate their emotions" (21, p. 7). Suggested activities for art instruction were included in the guide. It was recommended that subject matter for art experiences be based on student experience, that motivation for art activities be encouraged through discussion, reading, and field trips, and that initial experiences in any artistic medium be manipulative and exploratory in nature. A lesson sequence was recommended that included motivating students, using materials correctly, guiding student production, and evaluating the finished product.

The report of the music committee outlined the necessary materials for teaching music in the elementary school, and recommended additional materials as desirable. Among those deemed necessary to the program were staff liners, record players, records, textbooks, rhythm instruments, pitchpipes, piano or auto-harps, and melodic instruments (22). Among the list of desirable teaching aids were biographies of musicians, pictures of orchestras and instruments, music flash cards, and tape recorders. Accreditation standards for secondary programs were also included in the preliminary reports for both art and music.

Health and physical education preliminary report.--The report of this commission was structured around a "principles and standards approach" which outlined the guiding principles for health and physical education, and then suggested standards in numerous areas, including class size, minimum and maximum numbers of allowable credits for high school graduation, teacher certification and allocations, funding, grading policies, and program content.

With regard to the elementary school program, the commission recommended that a full-time physical education teacher be employed for each campus having at least sixteen teachers, that physical education be taught as "an instructional period in which skills, knowledge, desirable social contact, and appreciation are developed" (23, p. iv). An

instructional program for elementary students was suggested. Recommendations for the primary grades included emphasis on group games of low organization, such as folk games and singing games; creative movement, and stunts emphasizing balance and coordination. At the intermediate level, recommendations included emphasizing body conditioning and body building exercises, sports type games, and rhythmic activities.

Three broad goals were expressed in the report. These were the development of physical fitness to enable students "to most efficiently and effectively meet the demands of daily life" (23, p. 1); the encouragement of recreational participation in team and individual sports, and the development of cultural attitudes conducive to spectatorship.

Social studies preliminary report.--Members of the social studies commission identified four broad aims for an elementary social studies curriculum and recommended a scope and sequence for instruction. The four aims were geared toward developing among students an appreciation of the American heritage, an understanding of the past, the ability to make effective decisions, and the ability to adapt to a changing world (26).

The scope and sequence portion of the report identified key concepts for each grade level and suggested topics appropriate for each. Key concepts and their corresponding grade levels were the home and school (grade one), the

neighborhood and community (grade two), the expanded community (grade three), peoples of the world and their communities (grade four), the American continents (grade five), and the Eastern continents (grade six) (26).

Suggested topics for first-grade students included family relationships, home and school, health and safety, plants and animals, weather, seasons, and citizenship. Among the topics for study in the second grade were workers, community helpers, communications, transportation, and use of community facilities. These topics were continued in grade three, with emphasis on similarities and differences among peoples and ways of making a living.

Concepts suggested for fourth-grade students included land types and climates, "global concepts of the size of the world" (26, p. 2), adaptations of peoples to the environment, and ways in which man has overcome natural barriers. The suggested topics for fifth-grade students were explorers in the new land, colonization, American independence, the growth of nations, and life in the Americas. It was further suggested that the historical emphasis be placed upon "story and biography rather than strict chronology" (26, p. 3).

The suggested topics for sixth-grade students had as a focus the cultures of Europe, Asia, and Africa, adaptation of the Eastern peoples to the environment, problems of the Eastern world, and United States involvement in the East.

Another emphasis was the study of contributions of the old world to American history and way of life (26).

All seventeen of these preliminary reports were presented to the State Board of Education in mid-1960. These recommendations from the eleven commissions provided guidance to the State Department of Education in the formulation of leadership documents and state frameworks.

Other Laws and Resolutions Affecting the Curriculum

Aside from the activity generated by the various curriculum studies, the years 1950 through 1965 were relatively uneventful from the standpoint of curriculum-related legislation. The legislature enacted three laws and five resolutions during this time which had an effect upon the curriculum. It should be noted that resolutions do not carry the weight of law and expire at the end of the legislative session in which they are passed. However, certain resolutions were responsible for the addition of some infused elements of the curriculum, particularly in the late 1960's and early 1970's. The legislature used resolutions to emphasize, encourage, or otherwise draw attention to specific topics or courses of study that were deemed important at a certain time. For these reasons, this study includes a description of resolutions enacted by the various legislatures which had a bearing on the curriculum.

Senate Concurrent Resolutions 17, 56--
Curriculum Study Resolutions

Despite the massive curriculum study activity which transpired during the 1950's, the Fifty-Sixth Legislature was not satisfied. On May 26, 1959, two resolutions were passed which called for additional studies of the Texas curriculum. While the wording of Senate Concurrent Resolution 17 provides insight into the reasons for requesting the curriculum study, the legislative intent behind Senate Concurrent Resolution 56 seems less clear.

By the time the Hale-Aikin Committee presented its findings to the legislature, the space race engendered by the Russian launching of Sputnik was escalating. In writing the preface to F. M. Hechinger's The Big Red Schoolhouse (10), Woodring commented that the launching of the satellite "was a blow to our national ego and carried an implied threat to our security [but] it didn't change the problems of American education . . . it did bring us to a greater awareness of the problems" (10, p. 13).

In enacting Senate Concurrent Resolution 17, the legislature appears to have reacted to the Russian challenge. The resolution, in calling for another study of the curriculum, cited "international events which have caused Americans to focus greater attention . . . to the subjects and courses taught, and on a weak and anemic curricula" (17, p. 4). This resolution established the Texas Educational Standards

Commission, which was directed to conduct a study of the Texas curriculum and report thereon to the Fifty-Seventh Legislature (17).

Senate Concurrent Resolution 56, enacted on the same day, called for a more detailed look at one specific component of the curriculum. The legislature requested the State Board of Education to conduct a study of the natural resources curricula to determine "means by which instruction in natural resources and their appreciation and conservation may be incorporated into the curricula of the Texas public elementary schools" (17, p. 42). Although the reason for this resolution is not clear, it has been noted that numerous special interest groups influenced the legislature in regard to the curriculum. It seems reasonable to hypothesize that this may be such a case.

House Concurrent Resolution 53--Citizenship

In 1951, the legislature adopted this joint resolution calling for a one-year course in American citizenship to be offered in the high schools, emphasizing "the study of Government, Civics, Constitutions, and other historic documents" (30, p. 1572). A one-half semester course in Texas history was also requested. The legislature praised the efforts already underway in citizenship education, but noted that "even greater emphasis upon the fundamental principles upon which the American way of life is founded is necessary

in order to achieve stronger state and national unity to meet the tests that lie ahead" (30, p. 1572). While this resolution did not address the elementary curriculum, it was the forerunner of a later resolution dealing with citizenship education in the elementary grades, and therefore is included in this study.

House Simple Resolution 79, Senate
Concurrent Resolution 90, Senate
Bill 149--Instructional
Television

These three legislative actions were responsible for the introduction of instructional television to public education. House Simple Resolution 79, enacted by the Fifty-Third Legislature directed the legislative council to investigate the possibilities of Television School of the Air to take advantage of the emerging medium, and to make maximum use of the eighteen educational channels reserved for Texas by the Federal Communications Commission in June, 1953 (2). The Texas Commission for Educational Television was established to study instructional television, to gather and disseminate information, and to make recommendations to the governor and the legislature. The second official body dealing with educational television was established by the State Board of Education. The Advisory Committee on Television was formed to study problems and make recommendations. Commissioner of Education J. W. Edgar appointed Mortimer Brown, vice chairman

of the Educational Television Study of the Southern Work Conference, as chairman of the committee (2)

In 1955, the Fifty-Fourth Legislature approved Senate Concurrent Resolution 90, authorizing Commissioner Edgar to continue the work of the Texas Commission for Educational Television (12). Ten years later, the Fifty-Ninth Legislature passed Senate Bill 149 which provided for reimbursement to local school districts for contracted services for instructional television (2). Senate Bill 149 provided the impetus for the rapid expansion of educational programming. By 1970, virtually every area of the curriculum could be supplemented with instructional television.

House Bill 56--Kindergarten

When the Fifty-Seventh Legislature authorized local districts to offer a kindergarten program in the public schools, it was the beginning of the realization of a movement begun many years earlier. In 1921, Mabel Osgood of Denton, state chairman of kindergartens, wrote a letter "to the friends of Texas children" urging them to open kindergartens in their districts. Osgood quoted P. O. Claxton, then the United States Commissioner of Education: "the kindergarten is a vital factor in American education. It ought to be a part of every city, town, and village" (14, p. 5).

Although House Bill 56 acknowledged the need for kindergartens, each district was allowed to vote on whether or not to offer the program (12). It was another ten years before a mandated kindergarten program was begun through provisions of House Bill 780. This bill is discussed in Chapter IV.

Senate Bill 282--Prescribed Studies

Senate Bill 282, enacted by the Fifty-Fourth Legislature, amended Article 2911 of the Civil Statutes dealing with the prescribed course of study. The bill exempted students from those portions of the curriculum dealing with the study of diseases, their symptoms and treatment. Further, it exempted students from viewing pictures relating to disease when the parent or guardian provided written notice that such viewing conflicted with the student's religion. Academic penalties against such students were prohibited (12).

Curriculum Activities of the State Department of Education 1950 to 1965

Implementation of the various provisions of the Gilmer-Aikin Bills provided the focus for State Department of Education activities during the early 1950's. The statewide objectives that had been selected and approved by the newly organized State Board of Education were directed toward the problems of small schools, the improvement of reading instruction, and the renewed emphasis on the teaching of citizenship and moral values (28). In addressing the needs of small

schools, members of the State Department of Education worked to identify characteristics of those schools and to specify activities that would enable them to "relate the total program to community life" (28, p. 43).

In this regard, State Commissioner J. W. Edgar noted that such topics as vocational education, safety education, and health education were "making a direct contribution to the day-to-day life of the student." Edgar also noted that "the needs of the entire community are coming within the scope of the school program" (4, p. 9). He stated that when it was discovered that in some districts, as many as one-third of the mothers worked outside the home, the curriculum had been adjusted "to include consumer education, home management, and other things to help these youngsters with everyday problems" (4, p. 9).

The second task, improvement of reading instruction, also received attention during this time. The instructional services division of the State Department of Education published teaching guides for distribution to local districts. These guides provided suggestions for enriching the reading experiences of students, and also stressed the improved teaching of basic skills (28).

In the area of citizenship and moral education, the staff of the State Department of Education assisted local districts in the development of instructional activities. This was in response to House Concurrent Resolution 53 described earlier

in this chapter (28). Further leadership in the area of citizenship education was provided through participation of the state department personnel in the textbook selection process. During the 1952 to 1954 biennium, all textbooks and other instructional materials offered for adoption were examined to determine the degree of emphasis given to citizenship instruction. In addition, the personnel of the state department participated in the work of the Texas State Teachers' Association Subcommittee on Social Studies, provided consultative services for student council workshops and individual schools, and initiated a study of citizenship programs in schools (27).

Members of the state department's staff also provided assistance to local districts in dealing with alcohol and narcotics education, resource use, and health and safety education (27). In addition, a number of curriculum bulletins were published and disseminated to the schools, and studies dealing with the problems of migrant children and "the place of foreign language in the elementary school" were conducted (27, p. 32).

In the area of alcohol and narcotics education, the staff developed materials for use in the schools, pursuant to state board action and legislative mandate. In 1954, the State Board of Education issued a proclamation for the adoption of physiology and health books. The proclamation specified that materials considered for adoption must contain

"at least one chapter dealing with the effects of alcohol and narcotics" (27, p. 37). This requirement was in compliance with House Bill 136, which had been enacted by the Forty-Eighth Legislature, mandating the inclusion of alcohol and narcotics education in the curriculum (27). A number of organizations cooperated with the state department in the production of materials for distribution to the schools. These organizations included the Women's Christian Temperance Union, the Association of Texas Drys, the State Department of Public Safety, the State Department of Health, and the Texas Commission on Alcoholism (27).

Other areas of the curriculum which received the attention of the State Department of Education during these years were resource use education and health and safety education. Resource use education had as its focus the conservation of cultural, natural, and human resources. The role of the state department involved the coordination of information on this topic, and its dissemination to the schools. In order to facilitate this task, a guidebook entitled Resource Use Education was published, in cooperation with numerous state agencies. The state department staff also sought the cooperation of other state agencies in the preparation of materials relating to health and safety education. Four teaching guides were developed during this time. The Elementary Teacher and Safety Education was published to assist elementary teachers in planning appropriate instruction.

By 1956, the state department had developed program guides for almost every area of the curriculum. Thirteen curriculum bulletins were published during the 1954-1956 biennium. Those for use in the elementary school and thus significant to this study were Music in the Elementary Schools, Health in the Texas Schools, Introduction to Money and Banking, and A Child's View of the Texas Forests. As the work of the 1958 curriculum study panels got underway, the state department staff provided assistance to them and continued to assist local districts with instructional matters.

Chapter Summary

Curriculum study projects dominated the activities of the legislature and the Central Education Agency during the years 1950 through 1965. Other laws and resolutions dealt with the establishment of instructional television, the authorization of local option kindergartens, and the provision of curricular exemptions for certain students. Activities of State Department of Education personnel included developing curriculum materials, conducting studies of pertinent educational issues, and providing consultive services to local districts.

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. "A Close-Up Look at Curriculum," Texas Outlook, 43 (April, 1959), 30-45.
2. Brown, Mortimer, Hugh Proctor, and Lee Wilborn, "ETV: How It Came to Texas--and What Texas Is Doing About It," Texas Outlook, 42 (March, 1958), 18-21.
3. "Citizens of Texas Recommend," Texas Outlook, 43 (January, 1959), 16-19.
4. Edgar, J. W., "What's Right with Education," Texas Outlook, 37 (September, 1953), 9.
5. "Fifty-Fifth Legislature Moves Education Forward," Texas Outlook, 41 (July, 1957), 6.
6. "Hale-Aikin Final Report Near," Texas Outlook 42 (October, 1958), 13-14.
7. "Hale-Aikin Local Committees' Report Due May 1," Texas Outlook, 42 (January, 1958), 16.
8. "Hale-Aikin Results Pour In, Are Pored Over," Texas Outlook, 42 (June, 1958), 13.
9. "Hale-Aikin Study to Focus Attention on School Needs," Texas Outlook, 41 (November, 1957), 10.
10. Hechinger, Fred M., The Big Red Schoolhouse, New York, Doubleday, 1968.
11. "Key Officials Support Hale-Aikin Report," Texas Outlook, 42 (July, 1958), 9-31.
12. Laws and Resolutions Affecting Public Education, Austin, Texas Education Agency, 1959.
13. "One Hundred Per Cent--All County Reports in for Hale-Aikin Study," Texas Outlook, 42 (August, 1958), 7.
14. Osgood, Mabel, "To the Friends of Texas Children," Texas Outlook, 5 (May, 1921), 5.

15. Pearson, Jim and Edgar Fuller, editors, editors, Education in the States: Historical Development and Outlook, Washington, National Education Association of the United States, 1969.
16. "Policies, Advisory Groups Approved for Deaf, Non-English Speaking Programs," Texas Outlook, 43 (August, 1959), 5.
17. Public Education in Texas: 41st Biennial Report, Austin, Texas Education Agency, 1960.
18. "State Board Briefs," Texas Outlook, 42 (February, 1958), 10.
19. "State Board Begins Guidance Study," Texas Outlook, 42 (March, 1958), 5-48.
20. State Board of Education, Official Agenda, November 9, 1953, p. 8.
21. Texas Curriculum Studies, Report of the Commission on Fine Arts: Art, Austin, Texas Education Agency, July, 1959.
22. Texas Curriculum Studies, Report of the Commission on Fine Arts: Music, Austin, Texas Education Agency, July, 1959.
23. Texas Curriculum Studies, Report of the Commission on Health and Physical Education, Austin, Texas Education Agency, July, 1959.
24. Texas Curriculum Studies, Report of the Commission on Mathematics, Austin, Texas Education Agency, July, 1959.
25. Texas Curriculum Studies, Report of the Commission on Science, Austin, Texas Education Agency, July, 1959.
26. Texas Curriculum Studies, Report of the Commission on Social Studies, Austin, Texas Education Agency, July, 1959.
27. Thirty-Eighth Biennial Report, Austin, Texas Education Agency, 1954.
28. Thirty-Seventh Biennial Report, Austin, Texas Education Agency, 1952.

29. "Two Commissions Report," Texas Outlook, 43 (December, 1959), 28-29.
30. Vernon's Civil Statutes, 1951.
31. "Will Texas Win the Science Race?," Texas Outlook, 42 (April, 1958), 13.

CHAPTER IV

LAWS AND RESOLUTIONS AFFECTING THE ELEMENTARY CURRICULUM 1966-1979

When the Texas Education Agency made its Forty-Fifth Biennial Report covering the years 1966 to 1968 it was noted that "English, mathematics, history, government, and science are still the basics of education" (8, p. 16). A comparison to the curriculum of fifteen years earlier reveals that little had changed in the interim. In 1953 Commissioner of Education J. W. Edgar commented that students were learning the traditional subjects (4) in addition to health, safety, and conservation. By 1979, however, the picture had changed significantly, owing to acts of the various legislatures. During the years covered by this chapter, the legislatures added four subjects to the curriculum through law, advocated two more through resolution, and created three programs that affected the curriculum for various special student populations.

Laws mandating instruction in crime prevention and drug education, free enterprise, consumer education, and economics education were passed. Career education and citizenship were added to the curriculum by resolution; programs for kindergarten students, bilingual students, and gifted students resulted in curriculum changes for those groups.

This chapter consists of four major sections. The first deals with additions to the curriculum resulting from law. The second section contains a description of curriculum components added through resolution, and the third deals with the development of those legislated programs affecting specific groups of students. In the final section, the activities of the State Department of Education as they relate to the curriculum legislation are noted.

Curriculum Additions by Law

The nature of the laws and resolutions enacted by the legislature during this period appear to indicate a concern for helping students cope with a changing society. Laws were enacted dealing with crime prevention and drug education, free enterprise education, consumer education and economics education.

House Bill 467, Senate Bill 506--Crime Prevention and Drug Education

Crime prevention and drug education became part of the elementary curriculum as a result of House Bill 467 and later, through Senate Bill 506. House Bill 467 was enacted by the Sixty-First Legislature on June 10, 1969 and took effect September 1, 1970. The provisions of the bill were twofold. First, it directed the Central Education Agency to "develop curricula and teaching materials for units of study on the dangers of crime and narcotics to be required for all students

each academic year for grades five through twelve" (18, p. 69). The Central Agency's response to this mandate is discussed in the final section of this chapter. Second, it established the Crime and Narcotics Advisory Commission. The commission was to be composed of nine members who were appointed to two-year terms. The Governor, Lieutenant Governor, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives were each to appoint three members representing variously, the medical community, business, judicial, and public school groups. The commission was charged with, among other things, the responsibility of advising and assisting the Central Education Agency in the development of curriculum and materials (29).

The next step in the development of crime and drug education was taken by the State Board of Education in 1971. Policy 3261, Authorization and Description of Crime Prevention and Drug Education Program stated that instruction should be provided at all grade levels (1). The policy also specified the elements of instruction to be included; among these were decision making, interpersonal relations, values clarification skills and communication skills, as well as the legal, social, psychological, and cultural aspects of drugs and crime.

In 1973, the Sixty-Third Legislature enacted Senate Bill 506, establishing "a comprehensive program to provide for an effective state-supported administration of course preparation, instruction, and teaching in the public schools of this state as required by law on the dangers and prevention of crime,

narcotics, and drug abuse [which] shall be developed under policies and regulations of the Central Education Agency" (20, p. 30). This bill, which took effect September 1, 1973, required the involvement of the regional service centers, school districts, and the Central Education Agency in teacher preparation and instructional materials development, and provided funds for salaries of support personnel in the regional centers and at the agency. The next event in the history of crime prevention and drug education occurred in 1979, when the State Board of Education deleted all references to valuing and values from both policies and procedures.

Although some members of the legislature felt that drug education was a highly significant component of the curriculum, no funds were appropriated for its continuance past August 31, 1979 (3, 16, 24, 26). Drug education laws were among those repealed in 1981 under provisions of House Bill 246. This bill is discussed fully in Chapter V.

House Bill 1118--Free Enterprise Education

Free enterprise education became part of the elementary curriculum as a result of House Bill 1118, enacted in 1973 by the Sixty-Third Legislature and of State Board of Education action. The law as enacted mandated "instruction in the essentials and benefits of free enterprise" for high school students, but the state board amended its accreditation standards to require free enterprise instruction in the

elementary curriculum as well (7). This law was in response to the State Board of Education's Goals for Public School Education in Texas, first identified in 1970 (30). Within these goals, three broad free enterprise education outcomes were identified. These were (1) knowledge of the fundamental economic structure and processes, of contributions of the free enterprise system, and of individual participation in it; (2) acquisition of occupational skills needed to advance in the free enterprise system; and (3) ability to apply economic knowledge to practical life situations (30).

Learner outcomes for free enterprise education were also identified. Among these were student ability to define a number of related terms including scarcity, market, price, and money; and student ability to give examples of opportunity cost, economic interdependence, specialization and division of labor, goods and services, and forms of money. The State Department of Education provided leadership through workshops and seminars in the implementation of these concepts within the local districts.

House Bill 155--Consumer Education

Consumer education was another component added to the curriculum by the Sixty-Third Legislature. House Bill 155 directed the Texas Education Agency to develop appropriate teaching guides and curriculum materials necessary to achieve the state board goals (7). These broad goals were further

defined in terms of learner outcomes. These outcomes included the concepts of "support of the freedom of consumers to choose how to spend their income" (7, p. 70), acknowledgement of government regulation of competition, and support of competition in the marketplace.

Senate Bill 1040--Economics Education

The history of economics education began in 1919 when the Department of Education approved economics as a separate course and authorized, but did not require, its addition to the high school curriculum. Parker (27) noted that by 1965, some 430 high schools in Texas offered a specialized economics course. He observed that improvement in economics education was needed in order to achieve economic literacy and suggested that economics be made a required part of the curriculum.

Eight years later the Sixty-Fifth Legislature enacted Senate Bill 1040, known as the Economic Education Act of 1977. This bill was written "to insure the development of a comprehensive economic education program for all children in grades one through twelve" (22, p. 151). Its stated intent was to establish a program that would "teach a positive understanding of the American economy, how it functions, and how the individual can function effectively within our economy as a consumer, worker, and voter . . . the program shall teach the positive values of a basically private-enterprise economy . . ." (22, p. 151).

The bill specified the roles of the State Board of Education and the Central Education Agency in implementing the economics education program. The state board was directed to adopt regulations to insure a minimum time schedule allowing for economics courses in grades ten through twelve by the 1978-1979 school year, in grades seven through nine by the 1979-1980 school year, in grades four through six by 1980-1981, and grades one through three by 1981-1982. The board was further directed to combine funds from all available sources, public and private, "in order to achieve maximum benefits for improving economics education" (22, p. 152). The Central Education Agency was directed to develop and implement appropriate inservice activities, evaluate the effectiveness of economics education programs in local school districts, and make reports and recommendations to the legislature and the state board regarding the status of economics education and the need for improvements, modifications, or additional legislation. Responses of the Central Agency to this directive are noted in the final section of this chapter. State board member Gregg ranked this law as the third most important influence on the curriculum because of its emphasis on the benefits of the free enterprise system (13).

Curriculum Additions by Resolution

Career education and citizenship education became state priorities in the late 1960's to the mid-1970's and entered

the curriculum through resolutions adopted by the Sixty-Third and Sixtieth Legislatures respectively. Both topics were to be infused into the curriculum.

House Concurrent Resolution 127--Career
Education

The State Board of Education provided the initial impetus for career education in the elementary school. In October, 1972, the board called for the development of programs to ensure the "economic and occupational competence of Texas students" (15, p. 10), and in 1975 identified career education as one of the three top priorities facing the schools (37). The purpose of this curriculum addition was to "guide students in gaining skills, understanding and experience to benefit them in the business and industrial community" (37, p. 71).

The Sixty-Third Legislature responded to this priority by enacting House Concurrent Resolution 127 (9). The resolution contained a directive to the Texas Education Agency to "implement and expand career awareness and occupational skills development" (9, p. 10). Implementation was to be accomplished by infusing career awareness concepts into the existing curriculum.

The task of implementation was delegated to the twenty regional education service centers. One notable effort was made by the service centers in Regions 10 and 11, in which a "Partners in Career Education" program involving 160 school districts was developed (15). A group of educators from both

service centers worked together to identify some seventy-seven learner outcomes, prepare teaching materials and outline strategies. The rights to these materials were later purchased by a member of this group (14). The major focus of the career education program was directed toward helping Texas students achieve marketable skills. Walter Rambo coordinated this project at the Texas Education Agency.

In 1983, the legislature again addressed career education through enactment of House Bill 54. This bill is described in Chapter V.

House Concurrent Resolution 46--Citizenship

Citizenship education was first encouraged through the adoption of a resolution enacted by the Fifty-Second Legislature in 1954 and later through House Concurrent Resolution 46, adopted by the Sixtieth Legislature in 1967. In adopting the resolution, the Sixtieth Legislature cited "rapid change, growing complexity, and dissolution of the family unit" (19, p. 128) which contributed to "widespread ignorance, especially among juveniles, of the laws, a person's rights and responsibilities and the possible consequences of violating them" (19, p. 128). The lawmakers directed the Central Education Agency to prepare texts, course outlines, visual teaching aids, and other necessary materials for a sixteen-hour course in citizenship to be made available for use in the sixth and seventh grades by September 1, 1968. The

legislature also recommended that the agency seek the cooperation of numerous state agencies and organizations in the preparation of the course materials, including the Texas Youth Council, the Department of Public Welfare, the Department of Public Safety, the Texas Department of Corrections, the State Bar Association, the Texas Congress of Parents and Teachers, and the Hogg Foundation for Mental Health.

In developing the course materials, the agency's staff focused on three basic concepts. These were government of laws, liberty under law, and the rights and responsibilities of citizens under law (7). These concepts were expanded and refined in 1970 in the State Board of Education's Goals for Public Education in Texas. Learner outcomes identified for citizenship education included students' abilities to recognize the necessity for and function of rules in society, to describe the effects of majority rule on individual rights, to identify rights guaranteed by the Bill of Rights, and to identify examples of responsible citizenship (30).

The State Board of Education, in July 1969, provided a new framework for social studies education which allowed the local districts to decide grade placement of content (25). The elementary social studies curriculum was based upon an interdisciplinary approach emphasizing at each grade level the way of life in world regions, the American heritage, and "values essential for effective citizenship" (25, p. 22).

Time allocations were left to local district option, so that the amount of emphasis placed upon the citizenship component of the social studies curriculum varied from district to district.

Programs for Special Populations

Three programs for various special student populations were created by several legislatures. A program for five year olds, another for foreign language speakers, and a third for gifted and talented students impacted the curriculum delivered to those groups of students and indirectly influenced the elementary school program offered to all students.

House Bills 56, 240, 787--Kindergarten Programs

As noted in Chapter III, public school kindergartens at local district option were first authorized through provisions of House Bill 56 enacted by the Fifty-Seventh Legislature in 1961. The first public school kindergartens which school districts were compelled to offer were opened in September, 1970 under provisions of House Bill 240. This bill, enacted by the Sixty-First Legislature, provided for a program for students of at least five years and five months of age who had no knowledge of English (10).

During the 1972-1974 biennium, the Sixty-Third Legislature took steps to make a kindergarten program available to more students. House Bill 787 authorized districts to offer

a ninety-day kindergarten program and required all public school districts to offer a kindergarten program to all Texas children who were at least five years old by September 1 of each year (28). The effect of this legislation was almost universally felt among Texas school districts. By 1978 some 200,628 students were enrolled in public kindergartens in the 1,113 school districts in the state (35).

Senate Bills 121, 477--Bilingual Education

In the area of bilingual education, Texas Education Agency action preceeded action by the legislature by several years. In 1968 the agency established an Office of Bilingual Education. In the years between 1968 and 1971, the State Board of Education and the Commissioner of Education created a state-wide Advisory Committee on Bilingual Education; an agency-wide Task Force on Bilingual Education was established, and a state-wide design for bilingual education was developed (12). In 1969, the Sixty-First Legislature enacted House Bill 103, authorizing the use of a language other than English for instruction in bilingual programs (12).

Some school districts were already operating bilingual programs on a local basis, funded in part by grants from Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. During the first year of its existence (1969-1970) the Title VII program funded nineteen projects in three education service centers and twenty-five school districts; the next year an additional

thirteen projects were added. These combined efforts during two years of operation served thirty-nine districts, 15,000 native Spanish speakers and 2,000 native English speakers (12).

The first official statement on bilingual education in the Texas schools came in June 1971 when the State Board of Education identified five priorities in this area. These were (1) providing a program for all students entering school for the first time who spoke no English; (2) continuing the program for students in the primary grades who had not mastered English; (3) providing bilingual instruction for students in the middle and upper elementary grades who had not mastered English, but who had learned curriculum content; (4) giving bilingual instruction to secondary students who had mastered curriculum content; and (5) implementing a program of language development and culture confluence concepts for students at all levels who were fluent in English, whether they were native speakers of English or Spanish (31). This policy was aimed at reducing the dropout rate among the half million Mexican American students then enrolled in Texas schools. Severo Gomez, then the assistant commissioner for international and bilingual education at the Texas Education Agency noted that the drop out rate was 80 percent. He attributed this to the fact that "school seems to offer them so little" (31, p. 7).

In August, 1973, the Sixty-Third Legislature enacted Senate Bill 121, providing the legal framework for bilingual education. Beginning with the 1974-1975 school year, each school district having an enrollment of twenty or more students in any language classification in the same grade level was required to offer a program of bilingual instruction. This instruction was to begin in first grade and was to be increased by one grade level per year through grade six (20).

The law spelled out program content requirements and specified the method of instruction to be employed. The bilingual education program was to be a full-time program of instruction encompassing (1) subjects required by state law or district policy; (2) comprehension, speaking, reading, and writing in English and the native language; (3) history and culture of the native country and the United States. Students were to participate in regular classes for art, music, and physical education. Districts were to provide "meaningful opportunity to participate fully with other children in all extracurricular activities" (20, p. 4).

Other sections of the law defined enrollment requirements, specified the types of facilities to be used and limited the student-teacher ratio. Specifications for teachers, program finance, and textbooks were also addressed. The following year, this bilingual program was extended to kindergarten students through provisions of House Bill 1126.

In 1981, the Sixty-Seventh Legislature amended the law to include special language classes in addition to bilingual education (23). Senate Bill 477 also required that language surveys be conducted each year by the language assessment committee in order to determine student proficiency in English. The wording of section 21.454 was amended to emphasize "carefully structured and sequenced mastery of English language skills" (23, p. 105).

Because bilingual education was primarily a methodology, its impact on the elementary curriculum in general was limited to the confluence of cultures element of the program. The purpose of this concept was to sensitize learners of all nationalities to respect and accept cultural differences, and was most strongly felt in school districts from San Antonio southward. In 1983, some 133,854 students were enrolled in bilingual education programs (2).

The curriculum materials adopted for use in bilingual education programs were geared toward the development of learner skills first in the home language, then in English. There was some correlation between the stated objectives found in these curriculum materials and in those adopted for use with native speakers of English.

House Bills 280, 1610--Programs
for the Gifted and Talented

A differentiated curriculum for the 145,000 Texas students designated as gifted or talented was required in

1975 by the Sixty-Fourth Legislature through House Bill 280. In establishing provisions for gifted programs, gifted and talented students were defined as those with extraordinary learning or leadership ability or outstanding talent in the creative or vocational arts whose development requires programs or services beyond the level of those ordinarily provided in regular school programs (21). The commissioner of education was directed to appoint a full-time director of programs to assume responsibility for development of a state-wide implementation plan to include coordination of instructional programs and techniques. Ann G. Shaw was named to this post. The bill further provided that demonstration programs be set up as models for local districts to follow; pilot programs in each region began in September 1977 (38).

This legislation was replaced in 1979 by House Bill 1610, enacted by the Sixty-Sixth Legislature (32). Under provisions of this bill, exemplary programs for gifted students were funded through the Foundation School Program, requirements for state funding were outlined, and funding limits were established. Minor changes in the definition of gifted and talented students were also made.

The curriculum of typical programs emphasized higher level thinking skills, problem solving and higher order questioning. The contribution of the gifted program to the elementary curriculum in general was that it helped to focus attention on the need for emphasizing skills such as analysis, synthesis,

and evaluation rather than recall of facts (17). The Texas Future Problem Solving Program is illustrative of the emphasis placed upon these thinking skills. This project was designed for imaginative students having strong academic skills. The goal of the program was to encourage students to find creative solutions to problems they may encounter in the future. Elementary students in grades four through six have competed in national problem solving events since 1981; in that year Texas teams garnered first place in team problem solving and in Best Solution Competition (32).

Inspection of statistics gathered relative to the gifted and talented program provides insight into its effects upon students. During 1982, the last year for which data are available, 92 percent of Texas students participating in the program expressed a desire to continue in it and 75 percent said the program made school more enjoyable. Additionally, 88 per cent of students felt they had better research skills, 81 percent felt they had improved in problem solving abilities, and 69 percent felt more capable of organizing their work as a result of their participation in the program. Ninety percent of the teachers felt that the students' self-concepts improved as a result of participation in the program; 81 percent of parents surveyed agreed (32).

The effect of the gifted education program upon the curriculum in general has been described as a "trickle-down" effect as teachers gained expertise in the strategies used

with gifted students and as parents became more sophisticated in their expectations (17). It was also noted that "teacher competencies developed through inservice opportunities served to strengthen the general education program of the districts" (32, p. 9), and that the legislation creating the program was highly significant because it filled a big gap that existed (13). In 1982, 21,957 students were served by the program.

Activities of the State Department of Education

Assessment of student performance in several subject areas, a survey of instructional resources, and preparation of various curriculum materials were the major activities of the State Department of Education during the years 1966 through 1979. The Texas Assessment Project, the Texas Instructional Resources Study, and the various curriculum materials are described below.

Texas Assessment Project

The Texas Assessment Project was mandated in 1977 through provisions of Senate Bill 1. The purpose was to assess the achievement of public school students (6). Phase I of the testing was conducted in the spring of 1978 and involved approximately 94,000 public school students. The subject areas over which students were tested included reading, writing, mathematics, and citizenship. Under Phase II of the plan conducted in April and May of 1979, achievement in

economics and career education was measured. Testing in the economics area involved 22,450 fifth-grade students. The test was designed to measure student learning in basic economics, the free enterprise system and consumer education. Career education concepts tested were career planning, getting a job, responsibilities to the job, and the relationship between education and careers. Some 14,625 eighth graders were involved in the career education testing (34).

In 1980, the State Department of Education made recommendations to the legislature for improvements in the economics education program. Among the most significant of the recommendations was the suggestion that the legislature direct the State Board of Education to designate the most essential elements of each part of the curriculum, including economics (33). This recommendation was acted upon the next year through provisions of House Bill 246. This bill is described in Chapter V of this study.

Texas Instructional Resources Study

The Texas Instructional Resources Study was initiated by the State Board of Education in January, 1971 in order to assess the status of instructional resource availability and use and to comply with the Sixty-First Legislature's mandate to develop "a broader flexible program of services, including extensive instructional media and materials" (SB 230). After an initial seventeen-month survey involving some 450 school

districts, the state board recommended nine activities to further develop the study during the 1972-1973 academic year. The recommendations included dissemination of information regarding the status of the survey; development of a needs assessment instrument to assist districts in determining resource needs; analysis of textbook adoption procedures; creation of a pilot program for an automated instructional materials system; development of a design to assist school districts in evaluating various educational devices; and development of a plan to address computer services. Other goals were to develop a plan for statewide telecommunications network; to develop pilot demonstrations of local learning resource centers; and to initiate preliminary plans for statewide inservice programs (36).

Curriculum Materials

Health education, crime and narcotics education, and economics education appear to have been major emphases for curriculum materials development during the early 1970's. The health curriculum guide for use with elementary school students was distributed to local school districts in December of 1971. Teaching suggestions and supplementary information were provided for the topics to be included in the curriculum. These topics were consumer health, communicable diseases, chronic and degenerative diseases, environmental health and safety, community health, growth

and development, health and fitness for daily living, nutrition, tobacco, alcohol, and drug abuse, and sex education (5). The guide was in loose-leaf binder form and emphasized a conceptual approach to health education. Pilot programs for the new guide were conducted at all levels in 1972.

Materials for crime and narcotics education were first developed for dissemination to the local districts in September of 1970 and were revised in the late 1970's. These materials were incorporated into the Framework for Health Education (11) which was field tested in the spring of 1980.

A number of topic concepts were identified. Among these were decision making, appropriate use of drugs, social mores relating to drug use, treatment modalities for various drug dependencies, experimentation with drugs, and types of drugs. For each topic concept, essential learner outcomes for grades kindergarten through twelve were identified.

In the area of economics education, the State Department of Education established seven economic education centers at Texas colleges and universities. These were located at North Texas State University (Denton), West Texas State University (Canyon), the University of Texas (Arlington), Angelo State University (San Angelo), University of Houston (Clear Lake City), Baylor University (Waco), and Lamar University (Beaumont). A pre-center was established at the University of Texas at Austin. Three chairs were also endowed for free

enterprise education. These were located at the University of Texas at Austin, St. Mary's University in San Antonio, and at Baylor University.

The purpose of these centers and the endowments was to provide support to the public schools for economic education including curriculum planning, teacher inservice, instructional materials development, and consultation. To this end, numerous workshops were conducted for teachers and administrators, and some twenty-three economics publications were produced for school use (33).

The publications created for use in the elementary school included Teaching Economics in the Elementary Grades, 1-6, which offered suggested teaching units for each grade level. The framework document for social studies education was revised to include suggested descriptions for course content in free enterprise and economics education, and a brochure, Teaching Elementary School Students About Business was distributed to schools. A bibliographic aide, Economics, A Resource Guide was also made available to schools (33).

The State Department of Education also participated in assessing the level of student achievement in economics. The description of this activity, undertaken as part of the Texas Assessment Project, is described elsewhere in this section.

Chapter Summary

During the years 1966 through 1979, the legislature responded to the changing needs of students by mandating instruction in crime prevention, drug education, consumer education, and economics education. Career education and citizenship education were encouraged through resolutions, and were to be infused into the existing curricular framework.

The needs of special student populations were also addressed through the creation and expansion of specific programs. Recognition of the importance of pre-first-grade training led to the expansion of the kindergarten program. An extensive program for bilingual students was established, and programs for the gifted and talented were established and expanded.

The State Department of Education conducted assessment of student achievement in economics and career education, as well as in reading, writing, mathematics, and citizenship. A survey of instructional materials was conducted, and curriculum materials for several subject areas were developed and disseminated to schools. These included materials for health education, crime and narcotics education, and economics education.

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Authorization and Description of Crime Prevention and Drug Education Program; Policy 3261, Austin, State Board of Education, 1971.
2. Cardenas, Oscar, Texas Education Agency, personal interview, August 28, 1984.
3. Ceverha, Bill, Texas House of Representatives, speech, Richardson, Texas, September 4, 1984.
4. Edgar, J. W., "What's Right with Education," Texas Outlook, 37 (September, 1953), 9.
5. "Elementary Health Education Guides Designed for New Impetus in Curricula," Texas Outlook, 55 (December, 1971), 47.
6. Fifty-First Biennial Report 1978-1980, Texas Education Agency, Austin, 1980.
7. Forty-Eighth Biennial Report 1972-1974, Texas Education Agency, Austin, 1968.
8. Forty-Fifth Biennial Report 1966-1968, Texas Education Agency, Austin, 1968.
9. Forty-Ninth Biennial Report 1974-1976, Texas Education Agency, Austin, 1976.
10. Forty-Sixth Biennial Report 1968-1970, Texas Education Agency, Austin, 1970.
11. Framework for Health Education, K-Grade 12, Texas Education Agency, Austin, 1980.
12. Gomez, Severo, "New Impetus for Bilingual Education," Texas Outlook, 55 (August, 1971), 22-24.
13. Gregg, E. R., personal correspondence, August 20, 1984.
14. Harrison, Jacque, personal interview, August 22, 1984.
15. Hinkley, Carolyn, "Texas Schools Emphasize Working World," Texas Outlook, 57 (March, 1973), 10.

16. Jones, Buddy, personal interview, August 28, 1984.
17. Lawrence, Ruth, personal interview, August 23, 1984.
18. Laws and Resolutions Affecting Public Education, Texas Education Agency, Austin, November, 1969.
19. Laws and Resolutions Affecting Public Education, Texas Education Agency, Austin, August, 1967.
20. Laws and Resolutions Affecting Public Education, Texas Education Agency, Austin, September, 1973.
21. Legislation Affecting Texas Public Schools Enacted by the 64th Texas Legislature, Texas State Teachers' Association, Austin, 1975.
22. Legislation Affecting Texas Public Schools Enacted by the 65th Texas Legislature, Texas State Teachers' Association, Austin, 1977.
23. Legislation Affecting Texas Public Schools Enacted by the 67th Texas Legislature, Texas State Teachers' Association, Austin, 1981.
24. Mauzy, Oscar, personal interview, August 24, 1984.
25. "New Era for Texas Social Studies," Texas Outlook, 53 (November, 1969), 21-22.
26. Parker, Carl, personal correspondence, August 28, 1984.
27. Parker, Van, "Economics, the Great Education Gap," Texas Outlook, 53 (August, 1969), 16-17.
28. "School Districts Plan to Implement New Laws," Texas Outlook, 57 (September, 1973), 14.
29. "Schools Lay Plans to Fight Crime, Narcotics Through New Required Units, Grades 5-12," Texas Outlook, 53 (December, 1969), 49.
30. Social Studies Subgoals and Suggested Essential Student Objectives, Texas Education Agency, Austin, 1980.
31. "State Board Announces Bilingual Policy," Texas Outlook, 55 (July, 1971), 7.
32. State Funding of Exemplary Programs for Gifted/Talented Students, Texas Education Agency, Austin, January, 1983.

33. Status Report of the Economic Education Program, Texas Education Agency, Austin, December, 1980.
34. "TEA Extends Statewide Assessment Project," Texas Outlook, 63 (March, 1979), 24.
35. Texas Almanac 1980-1981, published by the Dallas Morning News, Belo Corp, Dallas, 1979.
36. "Texas Instructional Resources Study Expands," Texas Outlook, 57 (January, 1973), 66.
37. "Texas Public Schools--1975 and Beyond," Texas Outlook, 59 (January, 1975), 70-71.
38. Wightman, Marj, "The Gifted, Talented Child," Texas Outlook, 61 (May, 1977), 42-44.

CHAPTER V
STATE LEVEL CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT,
1980-1983

The movement toward curriculum reform was the major focus of public education in Texas in the early 1980's. The Study of Texas Curriculum carried out in response to Senate Concurrent Resolution 90 (Sixty-Sixth Legislature) led to passage of House Bill 246 in 1981. This bill repealed the existing laws mandating courses of study and directed the State Board of Education to identify the essential elements of a well-balanced curriculum (7).

The passage of House Bill 246 was the culmination of several attempts during the 1960's and 1970's to overhaul the curriculum. These forerunners of House Bill 246 included The Governor's Committee on Public Education (1968), the Subcommittee on Goals of the House Committee on Public Education (1976) and the Subcommittee on Curriculum Reform of the House Committee on Public Education (1978).

This chapter is composed of six sections. The first contains a description of the work of the 1968, 1976, and 1978 curriculum committees; the second section contains a history of the work of the Senate Concurrent Resolution 90 study committee and the attendant advisory committees.

Implementation of House Bill 246 provisions for curriculum reform is the subject of the third section. The fourth section contains a description of the revised state curriculum as outlined in Texas Administrative Code Chapter 75, and the fifth section deals with other legislative activity in the 1980's which affected the curriculum. The final section of this chapter contains a description of related State Department of Education activities.

Curriculum Reform Committees

The status of public school education in general and the curriculum in particular provided the impetus for three separate efforts at assessment and reform carried out between 1968 and 1978. These efforts are described below.

Governor's Committee on Public Education--1968

A study of public education was undertaken in 1968 under mandate from the Fifty-Ninth Legislature. Its purpose was "to study the status of public school education . . . and recommend to the governor and the legislature a definite long-range plan that will enable Texas to emerge as a national leader in educational aspiration, commitment, and achievement". (1, p. 25). In its published report, The Challenge and the Chance, the committee observed that student performance on the ACT College Entrance Test was below the national median and that students in small schools

were performing significantly below their counterparts in larger schools. The committee recommended assessment of student achievement as a basis for evaluating school programs (1).

Subcommittee on Goals of the House
Committee on Public Education,
1976

The focus of this committee, chaired by Representative Al Brown of San Antonio was to assess the status of student achievement of basic skills in reading, writing, and mathematics. The committee determined that lack of a comprehensive set of goals was hampering student performance, and offered three suggestions. The first recommended a more specific definition of student goals for reading, mathematics, and writing; the second called for increased accountability for student learning, and the third for periodic objective assessment of student progress (1). The committee also recommended smaller classes at the elementary level and an increased emphasis on discipline.

Subcommittee on Curriculum Reform of the
House Committee on Public Education,
1978

The recommendations of this subcommittee, chaired by Representative Wilhelmina Delco of Austin, bear strong resemblance to those of the Curriculum Study Panel created by House Concurrent Resolution 90. The subcommittee recommended that the legislature adopt statutory definitions of

basic skills and work skills, that more money be appropriated in order to reduce class size, and most significantly, that existing statutes dealing with curriculum be repealed. The subcommittee's recommendations were submitted to the Sixty-Sixth Legislature as House Bill 921. Under provisions of the bill, school districts would have been required to offer a group of basic skills courses and work skills courses (1). Basic skills courses were defined as reading, language arts, mathematics, social studies, science, health, and physical education. Work skill subjects were defined as industrial arts, home and family life, business and office education, distributive education, agricultural education, health occupations, vocational education, trade and industrial education, technical education, and career education. The provisions of the bill further stipulated that in kindergarten through grade three, 95 percent of instructional time would be devoted to basic skills courses; and in grades four through six, 90 percent (1). Supporters of this bill were unsuccessful in achieving its enactment.

Senate Concurrent Resolution 90
Curriculum Study Panel

By 1980, concern for the increasingly complex curriculum and for student mastery of basic academic skills had become widespread. Ogletree (11) writes that by 1979, Texas law mandated some thirty-one subjects, roughly categorized into four broad areas. These areas included English, mathematics,

citizenship, and health and physical development. Laws pertinent to the elementary curriculum included those pertaining to mastery of English--speaking, reading, and comprehending, and grammar, composition, penmanship, and orthography (spelling).

Laws in the mathematics area included those mandating the study of arithmetic and mental arithmetic. The citizenship area encompassed a wide variety of mandated topics. Among those pertinent to the elementary curriculum were patriotism, free enterprise, economics, confluence of cultures, geography, kindness to animals, protection of birds and their nests, and the dangers of crime and narcotics. In the area of health and physical development, there were laws mandating the study of physiology and hygiene, physical education, and the effects of alcohol and narcotics (1). Noticeably absent from this list was any mention of mandated science instruction. Under authority of the Texas Education Code section 21.108, the Commissioner of Education could require other curriculum elements; state board policy therefore required the study of science (1).

In the elementary school, the daily schedule centered upon instruction in English language arts, science, mathematics, social studies and physical education. Weekly schedules included art, music, drama, and health. Other subjects to be covered included citizenship, conservation of natural resources, and economic education, including free

enterprise education. Career education, drug education, and safety education were to be integrated into all program areas (14).

In 1980 it was noted that "student time on subject and teacher time in curriculum planning are affected by these infused elements. They are also cited as one reason teachers cannot get around to all the curriculum coverage expected for some school subjects" (14, p. 10).

In addition to concern over this fragmentation of the curriculum, there was increasing legislative concern in regard to the failure of students to master basic skills. Results of a statewide criterion-referenced test was the second catalyst for the enactment of Senate Concurrent Resolution 90. The Sixty-Sixth Legislature addressed the basic skills issue through enactment of Senate Bill 350 which mandated student competency tests in reading, writing, and mathematics (2). These tests became known as the Texas Assessment of Basic Skills (TABS). Senate Bill 350 emerged the victor over a spate of other minimum competency testing bills introduced in the Sixty-Sixth Legislature, including Senate Bill 26 (Mengden), House Bill 519 (Jackson), House Bill 526 (Smothers) and House Bill 904 (Schleuter). All of these bills called for competency testing in one or more of the basic areas of reading, writing, and mathematics. The language of Senate Bill 350 required the Central Education Agency to "adopt and administer appropriate criterion-referenced assessment

instruments . . . in reading, writing, and mathematics" (2). In commenting upon the significance of curriculum related legislation, State Board of Education member E. R. Gregg stated that he feels Senate Bill 350 is second only to House Bill 246 in importance (6). Gregg believes that the tests help detect where help is needed.

The first TABS tests were administered to some 433,000 students in fifth and ninth grades during February and March of 1980 (2). The fifth-grade test measured achievement of thirty-two objectives; on the first administration, none of the objectives were mastered statewide. On the mathematics portion of the test, 86 percent of Texas fifth graders mastered the objective dealing with addition by regrouping and 85 percent could correctly select an appropriate unit of measure for determining weight-mass, liquid volume, length, temperature, and time. The only reading objective mastered statewide was correct use of context clues to understand word meaning. Eighty-seven percent of the state's fifth graders demonstrated mastery of that objective. The highest percentage of mastery among fifth graders occurred in the writing portion of the test. In this area, 99 percent of students demonstrated legible handwriting; 94 percent could organize ideas for a specific purpose and audience, and 90 percent could correctly complete commonly used forms. Finally, 87 percent mastered objectives dealing with capitalization rules (2).

Mathematics objectives generally not mastered on this first administration included those relating to solving word problems involving multiplication and division, identifying geometric terms and figures, interpreting place value, and using pictorial models to identify equivalent fractions. Reading objectives not mastered related to sequencing events, drawing conclusions, predicting outcomes, identifying main idea, and distinguishing between facts and non-facts. Use of correct English and application of punctuation rules were the writing objectives not mastered (2).

These student performance scores and the fragmented curriculum described earlier in this section prompted the Sixty-Sixth Legislature to enact Senate Concurrent Resolution 90. Lawmakers cited "various provisions of state legislation, federal programs and State Board of Education policy [that] over a period of years have had the cumulative effect of fragmenting curriculum requirements" (14, p. 2) in ordering a statewide study of the curriculum. The resolution stated that the study "should have as its major product a realistic and relevant statement of the desired elements to be included in a well balanced curriculum" (14, p. 2). The provisions of the resolution further stipulated that the state board recommend to the Sixty-Seventh Legislature the necessary changes in the law to insure that the desired elements would become state policy.

As a result of this resolution, a curriculum study panel was formed to assess the status of the curriculum and to make recommendations to the State Board of Education. The panel consisted of six members of the State Board of Education, eleven members of the Texas Senate, five members of the Texas House of Representatives, and two members of the Governor's Advisory Committee on Education. Members of the state board who served on the panel were Joe Kelley Butler, of Houston, chairman, W. W. Carter of Amarillo, W. H. Fetter of LaMarque, E. R. Gregg of Jacksonville, Mary Ann Leveridge of East Bernard and Marjory Vickery of Lewisville.

Texas senators serving included Oscar Mauzy of Dallas, William Patman of Ganado, O. H. Harris of Dallas, Grant Jones of Abilene, Bill Meier of Euless and Jack Ogg of Houston. Others were Tati Santiesteban of El Paso, W. E. Snelson of Midland, Carlos Turan of Corpus Christi, R. L. Vale of San Antonio and Lindon Williams of Houston.

House of Representatives members who served on the panel were Hamp Atkinson of Texarkana, Bill Blanton of Carrollton, Paul Elizondo of San Antonio, Bill Haley of Center and Ernestine Glossbrenner of Alice. Johnnie Marie Grimes of Dallas and Arnulfo Aliveria of Brownsville represented the Governor's Advisory Committee on Education.

Joe Kelley Butler (4) noted that the panel conducted twenty-one public hearings during the spring of 1980. More than a thousand testimonies were taken from a cross section

of Texas citizens. Of particular interest to this study is the content of testimony gathered relative to state prescription of subject matter. The Curriculum Study Panel reported that most of the elements of the existing state curriculum were listed by title only, with nothing about subject content specified. As a result, the actual curriculum content was determined by textbook selection, local districts, and individual teachers. Concern was expressed that a comprehensive framework of objectives and essential elements be developed (16). Other testimony on this topic dealt with the prescription of content in specific subject areas and courses, and revealed diverse opinions regarding the appropriateness of such topics as sex education, prayer in schools, crime prevention, drug education, evolutionist-creationist theories, values clarification, behavior modification and secular humanism.

The panel also solicited advice from an advisory committee composed of educators and lay citizens. After weighing the advice from these groups, the panel made its recommendations to the State Board of Education (4). These recommendations were aimed toward achievement of two broad goals. First, the panel desired that "a well-balanced curriculum" be offered by every school district; second, that the "basic, essential knowledge, competencies, and skills . . . be clearly defined" (15, p. 5).

The panel noted the importance to goal achievement of realistic expectations, acceptance of individual learner differences, relevance in the curriculum, and cooperation among members of the legislature, the State Board of Education and local school boards. Five recommendations were made to the state board for consideration. The first was to require all districts to offer a well balanced curriculum composed of English language arts, mathematics, science, health, physical education, fine arts, social studies, economics, business education, other languages, and vocational education. The second recommendation was that the state board designate the most essential parts of each subject to be included in the well balanced curriculum.

A third recommendation was that the State Board of Education "ensure that virtually all students master these basic or essential elements" (15, p. 6). Responsibility for periodic review and update of the curriculum to be lodged with the state board and the legislative education committees, was the fourth recommendation. Finally, the panel recommended "consideration of repealing present laws mandating courses, subjects, or elements to be included in the curriculum" (15, p. 6).

The panel made eight recommendations for state board action. The most significant to this study was the recommendation which addressed infused curriculum elements. The panel recommended that the state board rescind its requirements

for those elements which had been incorporated into the existing curriculum framework, noting that "no curriculum elements should be required by the state to be infused by school districts" (15, p. 8). The list of subjects infused into the elementary curriculum at this time included crime prevention, drug education, safety education, citizenship, conservation, and economic education. The panel suggested that infused elements either become an official component of course content or be eliminated from state curriculum requirements.

Enactment of House Bill 246 and State Board
of Education Implementation Efforts

The state board presented these recommendations to the Sixty-Seventh Legislature in 1981. The result was the enactment of House Bill 246, which has become known as the curriculum revision bill. The new law repealed previous legislation that specified courses or topics to be taught, established twelve subject areas constituting a well balanced curriculum, and directed the State Board of Education to establish essential elements by grade level for each of the subject areas (3).

In order to carry out these tasks, the State Board of Education established advisory committees and work committees. Advisory committees included the Public School Boards of Trustees Advisory Committee and the Public School Professional Personnel Advisory Committee. The first committee was

composed of local school trustees representing a cross section of Texas school boards; the second was made up of school administrators and teachers from across the state (20). Both groups were to advise periodically regarding the content of the curriculum and the process for developing recommendations to the board.

Examinations of the preliminary documents generated by these two groups reveals that there was general agreement on the major questions to which the members addressed themselves. With regard to the elementary curriculum, the committees considered five basic questions.

1. Should instruction be organized differently for kindergarten through grade three than for grades four through six?
2. If so, how should it differ?
3. How should textbooks be provided to support the essential elements?
4. How should computer literacy essential elements be addressed?
5. How can instruction in other languages be encouraged in the elementary school?

In considering the curriculum for kindergarten through grade three, the committees agreed upon six recommendations, with minor differences in ideas regarding their implementation. The recommendations and suggestions for implementation are summarized in Table I (20).

TABLE I

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS AND IMPLEMENTATION SUGGESTIONS OF THE
PUBLIC SCHOOL BOARDS OF TRUSTEES ADVISORY COMMITTEE AND THE
PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Recommendation	Trustees	Professionals
1. English language arts and math must receive no less than 50 percent of daily instructional time.	Approved	Approved
2. Physical education must be taught daily.	Approved	P.E. and health must be taught at least 150 minutes per week.
3. Essential elements for other subjects must be taught during the year.	Essential elements in social studies, health, science must be taught during each grading period.	Other subjects taught on weekly basis in compliance with a locally developed written plan.
4. Adopt textbooks for mathematics and English language arts.	Textbooks for English language arts should be adopted based upon reading level. Manipulative materials for math should be adopted. Workbooks for English should be adopted.	Recommend a multiple adoption for English and mathematics.

TABLE I--Continued

Recommendation	Trustees	Professionals
<p>5. Systems or teachers manuals for other subjects should be provided.</p>	<p>Recommend that textbooks be adopted for use with kindergarten through grade three students in science and social studies.</p>	<p>Approved</p>
<p>6. Some essential elements of subjects besides English and mathematics should be covered through supplemental reading.</p>	<p>Approved</p>	<p>Approved. Recommend that special attention be focused on science and social studies in supplemental reading.</p>

Source: Working Papers of the Public School Boards of Trustees Advisory Committee and Public School Professional Personnel Advisory Committee, Texas Education Agency, Austin, 1981.

The committees approved a similar set of recommendations for the curriculum in grades four through six, specifying time requirements of ninety minutes a day for English language arts, forty-five minutes a day for mathematics and social studies, and thirty minutes a day for physical education and science (20). In addition, they recommended that essential elements in the fine arts be taught, and that appropriate textbooks for all subject areas be adopted. Each of the committees approved the recommendations; the Boards of Trustees Committee again suggested that English textbooks be based upon reading level rather than grade level. Both groups further agreed that the concept of computer literacy should be supported, but disagreed on the question of lengthening the instructional day. The Boards of Trustees Committee suggested further study; the Professional Personnel Committee felt that a longer school day was unnecessary (20). These recommendations were approved by the committees on January 21 and 27, 1983 and submitted to the State Board of Education.

A second part of the state board's implementation plan involved dividing the state into zones and grouping the curriculum areas into clusters. The four geographical zones were each comprised of five education service center regions. Zone I included Austin, Corpus Christi, Edinburg, San Antonio, and Victoria; Zone II included Amarillo, El Paso, Lubbock, Midland, San Angelo. Service center regions in Zone III

included those in Abilene, Fort Worth, Richardson, Waco, and Wichita Falls; and Zone IV was comprised of service center regions in Beaumont, Houston, Huntsville, Kilgore, and Mount Pleasant. Curriculum clusters were established as follows: Cluster A included English language arts, mathematics, fine arts and other languages; Cluster B was comprised of vocational education, science, health, and physical education; Cluster C included social studies, economics, business education, and Texas and United States history (3).

This organizational plan was used to facilitate the work of the 350 educators appointed by the Commissioner of Education who served on work committees. Two-day regional work sessions for each subject area cluster were held in each of the four geographical zones between January and August of 1982. Administrators, generalists, and subject matter specialists participated in discussions on essential elements, grade level designations for essential elements, and course offerings. Following completion of this phase, the twelve chairmen met in Austin to combine the results of the work sessions into a single report.

By March, 1983, preliminary documents outlining essential elements of the twelve content areas were ready for distribution. Between April 11 and May 1, 1983, workshops were held in the twenty regional service centers as a precursor to the regional hearings which were held

July 5 through August 5, 1983. Testimony on the proposed curriculum changes was solicited from professionals, parents, and patrons of the public schools regarding curriculum organization, graduation requirements, essential elements and general issues. During the fall of 1983 the State Board of Education studied the proposals and the attendant testimony, held a first reading, and filed authorization of the new curriculum rules. A second reading was held in February of 1984. Amendments were approved for the third reading. On March 10, 1984, adoption of the new curriculum was finalized, and an implementation schedule to begin in 1984 was authorized (5). After almost four years, the curriculum revision process was complete.

Participation in the process was broad based, involving lay members of school districts, board members, and school personnel. In addition to the oral testimony gathered during the regional hearings, some 4,435 written testimonies were either presented at the hearings or sent to Austin (7). It was further observed that the most prevalent general trend arising from the testimony was "positive response to the general design of the proposed curriculum as well as to the state board's open process for developing and reviewing the proposals" (7, p. 8).

In commenting on the curriculum revision process in general, State Board of Education member E. R. Gregg stated that no other curriculum legislation "even comes close" to

having the impact of House Bill 246 (6). Gregg, who was a member of the House Concurrent Resolution 90 curriculum study panel, identified two aspects of House Bill 246 which he feels are most significant to the curriculum. First is the requirement of twenty-one credits for graduation as opposed to eighteen; second, Gregg stated that the mandated essential elements in the twelve curriculum areas serve as "the backbone" of the law.

State Board of Education member Mary Ann Leveridge commented that "Texas is the only state that has gone through the process of making a major reform and a renewal of standards for curriculum for children across the state" (7, p. 9). Since that time, South Carolina has passed a similar education reform bill mandating tougher graduation requirements and academic testing as a condition of graduation (13).

Senator Oscar Mauzy, also a member of the Senate Concurrent Resolution 90 Study Panel, commented that the impact of House Bill 246 will be greater at the elementary level. He feels that the provisions of the bill will help prevent students getting to high school without the necessary skills, and cited "toughened requirements" as the most crucial facet of the bill (9). Texas State Senator Carl Parker feels that the most significant aspect of the bill is that the curriculum delivered to students will be regulated on a statewide basis (12).

The role of the State Department of Education in this process was to advise the various committees in their work. The staff also developed initial discussion documents for eleven of the twelve mandated subject areas, and served as resource specialists at the regional meetings (3).

Revised State Curriculum

With the ratification of the new curriculum guidelines in March of 1984, the specific provisions were codified in Texas Administrative Code Chapter 75. These provisions detailed broad areas to be included in each of the twelve subject areas, and specified the essential elements in each subject, but left the development of certain specific curriculum components to the local districts (18). Components of the elementary school well balanced curriculum were outlined.

The elementary well balanced curriculum addressed time requirements in kindergarten through grade six for English language arts, mathematics, physical education, fine arts, health, science and social studies. School districts were directed to develop and implement a written instructional plan outlining the ways in which the essential elements were to be addressed in physical education, fine arts, health, science, and social studies (14, 17). These time requirements are summarized in Table II.

Analysis of time requirements shown in Table II reveals an apparent emphasis upon English language arts and

TABLE II
 COMPONENTS OF THE ELEMENTARY WELL-BALANCED CURRICULUM AS DEFINED BY THE
 TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY

Grades	English Language Arts	Mathematics	Physical Education	Fine Arts	Health	Science	Social Studies
K	No less than 40% of instructional day	No less than 20% of instructional day	daily	weekly	weekly	weekly	weekly
1-3	No less than 120 minutes per day	No less than 60 minutes per day	daily	weekly	weekly	100 minutes per week equivalent	100 minutes per week equivalent
4-6	No less than 90 minutes per day	No less than 60 minutes per day	120 minutes per week equivalent	120 minutes per week equivalent	60 minutes per week equivalent	No less than 45 minutes per day	No less than 45 minutes per day

Source: Texas Administrative Code Chapter 75, Texas Education Agency, Austin, 1984.

mathematics in grades kindergarten through three, as well as upon daily instruction in physical education. Since no time requirements are specified for health and fine arts instruction, it seems reasonable to assume that the emphasis placed upon these subjects will vary according to the plans developed by the local districts.

In grades four through six, approximately one-third of the instructional day must be devoted to English language arts and mathematics. Science and social studies appear to receive somewhat less emphasis; physical education and fine arts appear to receive least emphasis. Since time requirements for each subject area are specified for these grade levels, it seems reasonable to assume that there will be less variance among local school district plans. Implementation of these time requirements was to begin in August of 1984. Further research will be needed in order to assess their impact upon the curriculum.

Other Legislative Actions Affecting the Elementary Curriculum, 1980-1983

Two actions of the legislature in 1983 involved the elementary school curriculum. House Bill 54 dealing with career education, and Senate Concurrent Resolution 15, dealing with health education were enacted.

House Bill 54--Career Education

House Bill 54, sponsored by Representative Bill Blanton, directed the State Board of Education to develop and implement a statewide plan for career education in the public schools (8). Local districts were given the authority to develop a plan consistent with the one developed by the state. Local plans approved by the Texas Education Agency qualified districts for \$2,000 plus fifty cents per student in average daily attendance. House Bill 54, which became effective August 29, 1983 (19), was the result of a study directed by Representative Blanton. It was expected that career education would be infused into the new essential curriculum elements. Passage of this bill was not perceived as being in opposition to the spirit of House Bill 246 (10). The response of the State Department of Education to this bill, if any, will be outlined in their biennial report covering the years 1982-1984.

Senate Concurrent Resolution 15--Health
Education

Senate Concurrent Resolution 15 was sponsored in the Senate by Parker and in the House by Hackney. The legislature requested that the Texas Education Agency "emphasize health education, particularly chronic diseases, including diabetes" (8, p. 10) in all grades of public school. The resolution was a result of a study of health education chaired by Senator Parker (10). As was noted in Chapter III,

resolutions expire at the beginning of the next legislative session after their passage; therefore, the effect of this resolution on the curriculum is still undetermined.

Activities of the State Department of Education

In response to the State Board of Education's request to identify essential curriculum elements, several curriculum areas received the attention of the State Department of Education staff during the early 1980's. Among these were mathematics, science, social studies, English language arts, fine arts, and health and physical education.

In the area of mathematics, the staff continued to develop test items for the annual administration of the Texas Assessment of Basic Skills (TABS), and worked to revise the elementary mathematics program outline. The State Department of Education staff also cosponsored the State Conference for the Advancement of Mathematics Teaching and participated in the review of textbooks adopted by the State Board of Education. Several publications relating to the TABS were produced, and inservice workshops attended by some 4,900 professional educators were conducted.

Science education activities included providing assistance and advice to local school districts in improving science safety, the environment, energy education, and the improvement of reading skills in science were held.

Approximately 2,600 teachers and administrators participated

in these sessions. Seven publications relating to science education were produced.

In the area of social studies, State Department of Education staff members initiated an annual conference for social studies supervisors and participated in the textbook review process. Three publications dealing with economics education and one relating to geography skills were published. Inservice workshops attended by 2,000 teachers and administrators were conducted.

Activities in the area of English language arts were concentrated on the development of TABS test items. Staff members also reviewed textbooks adopted for use in the schools and produced several documents relating to basic skills.

Staff members addressed the fine arts curriculum by hosting two state conferences for art supervisors and administrators, and by cosponsoring an exhibition of student art work in Austin. A national conference on theatre for children and youth was also organized. Inservice workshops for 3,700 professionals were conducted, and textbooks were reviewed.

Health and physical education curricula were addressed through provision of technical assistance to local districts, and through workshops and publications. During the biennium, fifteen demonstration sites for physical education programs were selected. Inservice workshops involving some 2,000

teachers and administrators were held and A Framework for Health Education K-Grade 12 was published. Other curriculum activities of the State Department of Education staff included preparing discussion documents for the curriculum revision work committees and advising those groups (3).

Chapter Summary

The statewide study of the curriculum, undertaken in 1980 as a result of House Concurrent Resolution 90, followed several earlier committee efforts in regard to curriculum revision. These included a 1968 Governor's Committee, a House of Representatives subcommittee on goals, and a House of Representatives curriculum reform subcommittee. House Concurrent Resolution 90 provided the framework for a statewide study of the curriculum that led to the enactment of a curriculum revision bill in 1981. This bill, House Bill 246, repealed some twenty existing curriculum laws, and increased state level control of the curriculum.

The State Board of Education worked with advisory groups and work committees to identify appropriate components of the new curriculum in each of the twelve subject areas. Regional hearings on the proposed new curriculum were held statewide, and the new rules were formally adopted in March of 1984.

Under these new rules, the State Board of Education in Texas Administrative Code Chapter 75 specified time requirements for instruction in several of the twelve subject areas,

and identified the essential elements to be addressed within each area. Development of specific curriculum strategies and planning for certain time requirements were left to the local school districts.

Activities of the State Department of Education during this time included writing discussion documents for the curriculum study committees, and serving as resource persons for the regional meetings. In addition, numerous workshops relating to the various subject areas were held for teachers and administrators, and a variety of curriculum documents was produced.

The state legislature addressed two curriculum topics in 1983. A career education bill was enacted, as was a resolution dealing with health education, but these were perceived as being unlikely to have significant impact upon the new curriculum.

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. A Study of the Texas Curriculum, 1979-1980, Texas Education Agency, Austin, 1980.
2. Biennial Report 1978-1980, Texas Education Agency, Austin, 1980.
3. Biennial Report 1980-1982, Texas Education Agency, Austin, 1982.
4. Butler, Joe Kelley, Letter to State Board of Education Members, September 4, 1980.
5. Curriculum Focus, Texas Education Agency, Austin, February, 1983.
6. Gregg, E. R., personal correspondence, August 27, 1984.
7. House Bill 246--The Curriculum Revision Process, Texas Education Agency, Austin, 1982.
8. Legislative Summary 1983, Texas Association of School Boards, Austin, 1983.
9. Mauzy, Oscar, personal interview, August 24, 1984.
10. Myers, Cis, personal interview, August 27, 1984.
11. Ogletree, Earl J., "The Status of State-Legislated Curricula in the U. S.," Phi Delta Kappan, 61 (October, 1979), 133-134.
12. Parker, Carl, personal correspondence, August 27, 1984.
13. Pipho, Chris, "Education Reform Comes in Big Packages," Phi Delta Kappan, 66 (September, 1984), 5-6.
14. Please Advise . . . A Guide for Participation in Public Hearings on the Texas Public School Curriculum, Texas Education Agency, Austin, 1980.
15. Recommendations to the State Board of Education from the Curriculum Study Panel (HCR 90, 66th Texas Legislature), Texas Education Agency, Austin, September 4, 1980.

16. Report of Testimony Presented to the Curriculum Study Panel in 21 Public Hearings, Texas Education Agency, Austin, 1980.
17. Response to House Concurrent Resolution 90 as Enacted by the Sixty-Sixth Legislature, State Board of Education, Austin, May, 1980.
18. Texas Administrative Code Chapter 75, Texas Education Agency, Austin, 1984.
19. Texas School Law Bulletin, Texas Education Agency, Austin, 1984.
20. Working Papers of the Public School Boards of Trustees Advisory Committee and Public School Professional Personnel Advisory Committee, Texas Education Agency, Austin, 1981.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY, OBSERVATIONS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The acts of the various Texas legislatures in regard to the elementary school curriculum, and the responses of the State Board of Education and the State Department of Education to these acts served as the focus for this study. In this chapter, the development of the state legislature's involvement in the curriculum, and the curriculum-related activities of the State Board of Education and the State Department of Education are summarized. An analysis of the influence each of these bodies had upon the curriculum during the years 1950 through 1983 is offered, along with a summary of findings regarding the laws and resolutions that are described in this study. Finally, some observations, conclusions, and recommendations for further study are made.

The State Legislature and the Curriculum

The history of the elementary school curriculum in Texas dates from the first colonial school established in 1821 and from the private academies which proliferated during the early to mid-1800's. The curriculum in the colony schools consisted of spelling, reading, writing, and arithmetic.

Many of the academies offered a wide range of subjects, depending upon the ages of the children in attendance.

In 1884, the state authorized a list of required subjects including spelling, reading, penmanship, arithmetic, English grammar, modern geography, composition, and other subjects as directed by the trustees or the superintendent. Over the following fifty years, the curriculum was gradually broadened to encompass such topics as physiology and hygiene, kindness to animals, and Texas history and civil government.

The involvement of the United States in two world wars influenced the legislatures to reemphasize history, patriotism, American literature, and physical education in the school curriculum. During this same period, roughly 1920 to 1949, there was concern on the part of educators for the problems of rural schools. Inequities in facilities and course offerings were noted, particularly at the end of World War Two.

The Texas legislature reacted to this concern. In 1947, a resolution calling for a study of the public schools was enacted. This study resulted in the enactment of three bills concerning the public schools. These bills, known collectively as the Gilmer-Aikin bills, were enacted in 1949. They provided for a minimum foundation program for school finance, established a system of automatic financing for the schools, and provided for reorganization of the state structure for the administration of the public schools.

In 1950, as these bills took effect, there was a continuing interest in assessing the school programs. Between 1953 and 1959, three separate studies of the curriculum were carried out; however, they resulted in almost no curriculum-related legislation.

Beginning in the mid-1960's, the legislatures enacted laws and resolutions which added six topics to the curriculum and provided the legal framework for the creation of programs for kindergarten students, bilingual students, and gifted and talented students. Almost 100 years had passed since the first state curriculum had been authorized. By 1979, there were laws mandating some 31 curriculum topics. These complex curriculum requirements and concern over the student performance on minimum competency tests provided the impetus for yet another study of the curriculum.

This study, authorized in 1980 through House Concurrent Resolution 90, provided the information and engendered the public sentiment necessary for curriculum reform. The following year, House Bill 246 was enacted. The bill repealed twenty existing curriculum laws and directed the State Board of Education to establish a well balanced curriculum and to specify the essential elements for each of the twelve subject areas to be included in the new curriculum. The subject areas included English language arts, mathematics, fine arts, other languages, vocational education, science, health,

physical education, social studies, economics, business education, and Texas and United States history.

In 1983, the legislature enacted a bill and a resolution affecting the elementary school curriculum, the former dealing with the establishment of state-approved career education plans and the latter with health education; specifically, to encourage the schools to emphasize diabetes awareness within the elementary health curriculum. It was expected, however, that these measures would not constitute additions to the newly revised curriculum, but would become part of the essential elements of the state adopted curriculum.

Analysis

Since the legislature has the sole authority to make laws affecting the schools, its influence upon the curriculum has been considerable, in both a direct and an indirect manner. The direct influence is readily apparent when an inspection of the curriculum is made. Beginning with a list of required subjects first authorized in 1884, the elementary school curriculum gradually expanded as the legislature mandated additional topics or courses of study. Although resolutions enacted by the legislature expire on the first day of the next legislative session following enactment, the resolutions calling for an emphasis upon citizenship and career education, described in chapter four of this study, resulted in the

infusion of these topics into the curriculum. It was noted that by 1980, the legislature had created a complex and disorganized curriculum through enactment of pet issues, to the exclusion of other topics. This fragmented curriculum was one reason given for the reform efforts described in Chapter V of this study. In a larger sense, the legislature influences the curriculum through its control of the financing mechanism for the public schools. The crime and narcotics education program, and the program for gifted and talented students, both described in Chapter IV of this study, are examples of the indirect influence the legislature may have upon the implementation of mandated curricular offerings through monetary controls. In the case of the crime and narcotics education program, funds were provided for program implementation from 1973 through 1979. After that time, state funds were not continued, and the legislation pertaining to the program was repealed in 1981.

In the case of the program for gifted and talented students, the original legislation providing for the program did not include funding provisions. The original legislation was replaced with a bill providing for financial support. In 1982, the program was providing services to some 21,957 students. If the recent attention given to the public schools at the state level is an indicator, it seems reasonable to assume that state control of the curriculum from all official

bodies, including the legislature, will intensify as the implementation stage of the reform measures gets underway.

The State Board of Education and the Curriculum

The State Board of Education, authorized in Chapter 11 of the Texas Education Code, is charged with the task of setting policies and regulations, and developing the rules for fulfilling the responsibilities given to it by the legislature or the Central Education Agency. The State Board of Education has taken several forms over the years. In 1871, the governor, the attorney general, and the state superintendent were empowered to act as the state school board, and to make laws governing the public schools. This board was abolished in 1873. The board continued with appointed members until November of 1928 when a constitutional amendment was enacted, which provided for the election of members. The first elected board consisted of nine members. In 1949, the Gilmer-Aikin bills provided for the election of state board members by congressional district. In 1981, there were twenty-seven members.

Analysis

In its role as policy maker, the state board wields great influence over the curriculum. Examples of this influence include the board actions regarding crime prevention and drug education programs, free enterprise education,

consumer education, career education, citizenship education, and bilingual education. In the cases of crime prevention and drug education and free enterprise education, the state board amended accreditation policies to require those subjects in all elementary school grades. Consumer education was a result of legislation enacted in response to a state board goal calling for the support of consumers' freedom to choose their spending habits, and support of competition in the marketplace. Career education also received its initial impetus from the state board through its identification as a top priority of education in the 1970's. In the area of citizenship education, the board provided for its inclusion in the curriculum by adding it to a state framework document for social studies education which was given to schools in 1969. Finally, in the area of bilingual education, the board established five priorities for bilingual education in 1971; this led to the enactment in 1973 of a bill providing for the legal framework for bilingual education.

Under provisions of House Bill 246, enacted by the Sixty-Seventh Legislature, the duties of the state board in regard to the curriculum were significantly expanded. The board was directed to establish a well balanced curriculum and to specify the essential elements of instruction in each of the twelve subject areas. During 1982 and 1983, the board worked with advisory groups and work committees to

accomplish this task. The new curriculum was given final approval in March of 1984, and an implementation schedule was adopted. It seems likely that the influence of the state board upon the curriculum will become even stronger in future years as a result of this latest reform legislation.

The State Department of Education and the Curriculum

A structure for the state administration of the public schools was created by the Law of January 31, 1845. In 1913, the State Department of Education was expanded to include nine divisions which handled numerous facets of public school administration. The department was reorganized in 1949 under provisions of the Gilmer-Aikin Bills, and currently functions under the leadership of the Commissioner of Education and two deputy commissioners.

Curriculum-related activities of the State Department of Education as they pertained to specific pieces of legislation were described in Chapters III, IV, and V of this study. Generally, these activities may be described as curriculum development, inservice activities, program evaluation, and test development.

Analysis

In its role as a curriculum development agent, the State Department of Education influences the curriculum through its leadership documents, which generally specify goals and

objectives, scope and sequence, concepts and skills to be mastered, and strategies for teaching them. These documents are widely disseminated among the local school districts. Inservice activities provide another avenue through which this department may influence the curriculum. Since teachers and administrators are the usual audiences for such activities, there seems to be the potential for additional input to the local districts regarding state expectations. Finally, through program evaluation and test development, the state department staff has the opportunity to reevaluate, modify, and refine the curriculum based upon the assessment results. The Texas Assessment Project, described in Chapter IV of this study, and the Texas Assessment of Basic Skills described in Chapter V are examples of evaluation efforts that resulted in modifications to the curriculum.

During the curriculum reform activities of the early 1980's the state department staff served as resource persons to the various work committees established by the State Board of Education. It seems reasonable to assume that this provided additional opportunity for this department to influence the curriculum. It also seems likely that the influence of this agency, like that of the legislature and the State Board of Education, will intensify as a result of the 1981 reform efforts.

Summary of Findings

During the years 1950 through 1983, the Texas legislature enacted laws and resolutions which added six topics to the elementary curriculum. These topics included crime prevention and drug education, citizenship education, free enterprise education, consumer education, career education, and economics education. In addition, three programs for various special populations were created, including those for kindergarten students, bilingual students, and gifted and talented students.

By 1981, the status of these various curriculum additions had changed significantly as a result of curriculum reform efforts mandated by House Bill 246. The basic subjects first authorized in 1884--spelling, reading, English grammar, geography, composition, penmanship--survived in some form as part of the essential elements of the basic twelve curricular areas. The topics added to the curriculum between 1950 and 1981 were repealed as separate topics through House Bill 246; however at least some concepts for these areas were retained as essential elements of the basic curriculum. Those additions included citizenship education, free enterprise education, consumer education, economics education, career education, and crime prevention and drug education. A synopsis of the history of each of these additions is provided below.

Citizenship education, first encouraged in 1951 through joint resolution of the House of Representatives and the Senate, was reemphasized in 1967 by resolution. This subject was to be infused into the curriculum. The State Department of Education provided materials for use in the schools.

Instruction for high school students in free enterprise education was first mandated in 1973, and entered the elementary school curriculum as a result of State Board of Education action. Numerous curriculum support documents were generated at the state level.

Consumer education became part of the curriculum in 1973 by law. Enactment of the law was in response to State Board of Education goals. Career education was also the result of state board goals, and became an official part of the curriculum through resolution enacted in 1975. Responsibility for implementation of career education was delegated to the local school districts.

The Economic Education Act of 1977 provided the legal framework for the entry of economics into the elementary school curriculum. This bill provided for a comprehensive curriculum in economics for all students in grades one through twelve. A statewide effort to implement this law was undertaken, and numerous documents were produced by the State Department of Education.

Crime prevention and drug education for students in grades five through twelve was mandated in 1969. In 1971, the State Board of Education required instruction in this topic for all students. After 1979, no funds were appropriated for continuance of the program.

The three programs created for special student populations are still in operation. A synopsis of the history of the programs for kindergarten students, bilingual students, and gifted and talented students is presented below.

The push for public kindergarten programs dates at least to the 1920's, but it was 1961 before official action was taken. In that year, the Fifty-Seventh Legislature authorized local school districts at their option, to offer a kindergarten program. In 1970, districts were compelled to offer such a program for students who lacked proficiency in the English language. During the 1972-1974 biennium, the legislature authorized school districts to offer a ninety-day program for all students of at least five years of age. In 1981, approximately 200,600 students were enrolled in public kindergartens in Texas schools.

The bilingual education program in Texas began in 1968 with the establishment of an office of bilingual education at the Texas Education Agency. In 1971, the State Board of Education established an advisory commission for bilingual education and identified five priorities for the program. The program was formally established in 1973 by the

Sixty-Third Legislature. The original legislation was modified by the Sixty-Seventh Legislature in 1981 to include special language classes in the bilingual education program. During the 1982-1983 school year, some 133,854 students in grades kindergarten through six were enrolled in bilingual education programs in Texas public schools.

Programs for gifted and talented students were established by law in 1975. The original legislation was replaced in 1979 by the Sixty-Sixth Legislature. The new bill provided for funding for exemplary programs, and established a formula for allocating money to local district programs. In 1982, a total of 21,957 students in grades kindergarten through twelve were enrolled in programs for gifted and talented students.

Observations

Inspection of the data gathered for this study yields the following observations.

1. During the years 1950 through 1983, the Texas legislatures enacted numerous laws and resolutions which affected the elementary school curriculum.

2. The State Department of Education provided leadership for the school districts in responding to the legislation through developing curriculum materials, conducting inservice sessions, and evaluating and updating programs.

3. The State Board of Education provided the impetus for several curricular additions, and modified standards to include more elementary students in mandated curricular programs.

4. The 1981 curriculum study project initiated as a result of House Concurrent Resolution 90 and the resulting House Bill 246 reform legislation led to major reform of the elementary curriculum. The resulting provisions of the Texas Administrative Code, Chapter 75 required local districts to develop plans for addressing the essential elements of each curriculum area.

5. Some twenty curriculum laws were repealed as a result of the enactment of House Bill 246. Twelve curricular areas were established.

Conclusions

In the light of the foregoing observations, the following conclusions are drawn.

1. The elementary school curriculum in Texas evolved in a piecemeal fashion as new curriculum topics were added.

2. The State Department of Education influenced the curriculum through production of curriculum documents, through inservice activities, and through evaluation of existing programs.

3. The State Board of Education wields considerable influence over the curriculum through its power as the policymaking body of the Texas Education Agency.

4. State level influence over the curriculum was increased as a result of reform legislation enacted in 1981. State influence will intensify as the implementation phase of the reforms takes place. This may occur through expansion of the TABS test to evaluate student progress in additional curriculum areas.

5. The state-mandated curriculum is streamlined and more stringently organized as a result of the repeal of certain curriculum laws and the establishment of the essential elements.

Recommendations

As the elementary school curriculum continues to evolve, further study will be needed in order to provide a continuing record of this evolution and to analyze the events that may influence future curriculum trends. The following recommendations for further research are therefore made.

1. A study will be needed that will document and analyze the efforts of the Texas public schools to implement the provisions of Texas Administrative Code Chapter 75.

2. Research into the influence of the state adopted textbooks upon the curriculum is also needed.

One goal of this study was to provide future scholars with a complete, yet concise body of information about Texas curriculum laws that would serve as a beginning point for continued research into the field of curriculum history. This continuing examination of the past is crucial to a better understanding of the present, and to more productive planning for the future.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Barker, Eugene, The Life of Stephen F. Austin, Dallas, 1925.
- Borg, Walter and Meredith Gall, Educational Research, New York, Longman, 1979.
- Campbell, Roald and others, The Organization and Control of American Schools, Columbus, Merrill, 1975.
- Eby, Frederick, The Development of Education in Texas, New York, Macmillan, 1925.
- Eby, Frederick and Charles Arrowood, The Development of Modern Education, New York, Prentice Hall, 1934.
- Evans, Cecil, The Story of Texas Schools, Austin, Steck, 1955.
- Good, H. G., A History of American Education, Ontario, Macmillan, 1956.
- Hechinger, Fred M., The Big Red Schoolhouse, New York, Doubleday, 1968.
- Institute of Public Affairs, Guide to Texas State Agencies, Austin, University of Texas Press, 1978.
- Ley, Mary and Mike Bryan, editors, Journey from Ignorant Ridge: Stories and Pictures of Texas Schools in the 1800's, Austin, Texas Congress of Parents and
- McCleskey, Clifton, The Government and Politics of Texas, Boston, Little, Brown, and Company, 1969.
- Pearson, Jim and Edgar Fuller, editors, Education in the States: Historical Development and Outlook, Washington, National Education Association of the United States, 1969.
- Still, Rae Files, The Gilmer-Aikin Bills, Austin, Steck, 1952.
- Texas Almanac 1980-1981, Dallas Morning News, Belo Corp., Dallas, 1979.

Thurston, Lee and William Roe, State School Administration, New York, Harper and Row, 1947.

Unruh, Glenys, Responsive Curriculum Development, Berkeley, McCutchan, 1975.

Wallace, Ernest and David Vigness, Documents of Texas History, Austin, Steck, 1960.

Articles

"A Close-Up Look at Curriculum," Texas Outlook, 43 (April, 1959), 30-45.

Brown, Mortimer, Hugh Proctor, and Lee Wilborn, "ETV: How It Came to Texas--and What Texas Is Doing About It," Texas Outlook, 42 (March, 1958), 18-21.

"Citizens of Texas Recommend," Texas Outlook, 43 (January, 1959), 16-19.

Cobb, B. B., "Music an Essential in Education," Texas Outlook, 7 (September, 1923), 5-6.

Edgar, J. W., "What's Right with Education," Texas Outlook, 37 (September, 1953), 9.

"Elementary Health Education Guides Designed for New Impetus in Curricula," Texas Outlook, 55 (December, 1971), 47.

"Fifty-Fifth Legislature Moves Education Forward," Texas Outlook, 41 (July, 1957), 6.

Gomez, Severo, "New Impetus for Bilingual Education," Texas Outlook, 55 (August, 1971), 22-24.

"Hale Aikin Final Report Near," Texas Outlook, 42 (October, 1958), 13-14.

"Hale-Aikin Local Committees' Report Due May 1," Texas Outlook, 42 (January, 1958), 16.

"Hale-Aikin Results Pour In, Are Pored Over," Texas Outlook, 42 (June, 1958), 13.

"Hale-Aikin Study to Focus Attention on School Needs," Texas Outlook, 41 (November, 1957), 10.

Hinkley, Carolyn, "Texas Schools Emphasize Working World," Texas Outlook, 57 (March 1973), 10.

- Hosic, James F., "The Next Steps in Elementary Education in Texas," Texas Outlook, 8 (November, 1924), 17-18.
- Hume, Dinsmore, "A Practical Talk on Thrift Education," Texas Outlook, 7 (November, 1923), 18.
- Kenney, M. M., "Recollections of Early Schools," Quarterly of the Texas State Historical Society, 1 (1897), 3.
- "Key Officials Support Hale-Aikin Report," Texas Outlook, 42 (July, 1958), 9-31.
- "New Era for Texas Social Studies," Texas Outlook, 53 (November, 1969), 21-22.
- Ogletree, Earl J., "The Status of State-Legislated Curricula in the U.S.," Phi Delta Kappan, 61 (October, 1979), 133-134.
- "One Hundred Per Cent--All County Reports in for Hale-Aikin Study," Texas Outlook, 42 (August, 1958), 7.
- Osgood, Mabel, "To the Friends of Texas Children," Texas Outlook, 5 (May, 1921), 5.
- Parker, Van, "Economics, the Great Education Gap," Texas Outlook, 53 (August, 1969), 16-17.
- Pipho, Chris, "Education Reform Comes in Big Packages," Phi Delta Kappan, 66 (September, 1984), 5-6.
- "Policies, Advisory Groups Approved for Deaf, Non-English Speaking Programs," Texas Outlook, 43 (August, 1959), 5.
- Power, Leonard, "The Elementary School and Readjustment During the Next Ten Years," Texas Outlook, 6 (April, 1922), 4.
- "School Districts Plan to Implement New Laws," Texas Outlook, 57 (September, 1973), 14.
- "Schools Lay Plans to Fight Crime, Narcotics Through New Required Units, Grades 5-12," Texas Outlook, 53 (December, 1969), 49.
- Shelby, T. H., "The Meaning and Importance of the Texas Educational Survey," Texas Outlook, 8 (February, 1924), 13-14.
- "State Board Announces Bilingual Policy," Texas Outlook, 55 (July, 1971), 7.

- "State Board Begins Guidance Study," Texas Outlook, 42 (March, 1958), 5-48.
- "State Board Briefs," Texas Outlook, 42 (February, 1958), 10.
- Tanner, Laurel, "Curriculum History and Educational Leadership," Educational Leadership, 41 (November, 1983), 38-42.
- "TEA Extends Statewide Assessment Project," Texas Outlook, 63 (March, 1979), 24.
- "Texas Instructional Resources Study Expands," Texas Outlook, 57 (January, 1973), 66.
- "Texas Public Schools--1975 and Beyond," Texas Outlook, 59 (January, 1975), 70-71.
- "Texas School Survey," Texas Outlook, 8 (November, 1924), 21-23.
- "Two Commissions Report," Texas Outlook, 43 (December, 1959), 28-29.
- Tyler, Ralph, "Curriculum Development Since 1900," Educational Leadership, 38 (May, 1981), 599-601.
- Wightman, Marj, "The Gifted, Talented Child," Texas Outlook, 61 (May, 1977), 42-44.
- "Will Texas Win the Science Race?" Texas Outlook, 42 (April, 1958), 13.
- "246," Texas Outlook, 67 (Spring, 1984), 6-8.

Unpublished Materials

- Aufderheide, J. Alan, "The Place of Educational Interest Groups in State Policy-Making Systems," unpublished doctoral dissertation, College of Education, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, 1973.

Personal Correspondence and Interviews

- Brockette, Marlin, personal correspondence, April, 1984.

- Cardenas, Oscar, Texas Education Agency, personal interview, August 28, 1984.
- Ceverha, Bill, Texas House of Representatives, speech, Richardson, Texas, September 4, 1984.
- Gregg, E. R., personal correspondence, August 20, 1984.
- Harrison, Jacque, personal interview, August 22, 1984.
- Jones, Buddy, personal interview, August 28, 1984.
- Lawrence, Ruth, personal interview, August 23, 1984.
- Mauzy, Oscar, personal interview, August 24, 1984.
- Myers, Cis, personal interview, August 27, 1984.
- Parker, Carl, personal correspondence, August 28, 1984.

Public Documents and Reports

- A Study of the Texas Curriculum, 1979-1980, Texas Education Agency, Austin, 1980.
- Authorization and Description of Crime Prevention and Drug Education Program; Policy 3261, State Board of Education, Austin, 1971.
- Biennial Report 1978-1980, Texas Education Agency, Austin, 1980.
- Biennial Report 1980-1982, Texas Education Agency, Austin, 1982.
- Butler, Joe Kelley, Letter to State Board of Education Members, Austin, September 4, 1980.
- Carlisle, J. M., Biennial Report of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1896-1898, Austin, 1899.
- Curriculum Focus, Texas Education Agency, Austin, February, 1983.
- Fifty-First Biennial Report 1978-1980, Texas Education Agency, Austin, 1980.
- Forty-Eighth Biennial Report 1972-1974, Texas Education Agency, Austin, 1974.

Forty-Fifth Biennial Report 1966-1968, Texas Education Agency, Austin, 1968.

Forty-Ninth Biennial Report 1974-1976, Texas Education Agency, Austin, 1976.

Forty-Sixth Biennial Report 1968-1970, Texas Education Agency, Austin, 1970.

Framework for Health Education, K-Grade 12, Texas Education Agency, Austin, 1980.

House Bill 246--The Curriculum Revision Process, Texas Education Agency, Austin, 1982.

Kendall, J. S., Biennial Report of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1898-1900, Austin, 1901.

_____, Biennial Report of the State Superintendent, 1900-1901, Austin, 1902.

Laws and Resolutions Affecting Public Education, Austin, Texas Education Agency, 1959.

Laws and Resolutions Affecting Public Education, Texas Education Agency, Austin, November, 1969.

Laws and Resolutions Affecting Public Education, Texas Education Agency, Austin, August, 1967.

Laws and Resolutions Affecting Public Education, Texas Education Agency, Austin, September, 1973.

Legislation Affecting Texas Public Schools Enacted by the 64th Texas Legislature, Texas State Teachers' Association, Austin, 1975.

Legislation Affecting Texas Public Schools Enacted by the 65th Texas Legislature, Texas State Teachers' Association, Austin, 1977.

Legislation Affecting Texas Public Schools Enacted by the 67th Texas Legislature, Texas State Teachers' Association, Austin, 1981.

Legislative Summary 1983, Texas Association of School Boards, Austin, 1983.

Please Advise . . . A Guide for Participation in Public Hearings on the Texas Public School Curriculum, Texas Education Agency, Austin, 1980.

Public Education in Texas: 41st Biennial Report, Texas Education Agency, 1960.

Recommendations to the State Board of Education from the Curriculum Study Panel (HCR 90, 66th Texas Legislature), Texas Education Agency, Austin, September 4, 1980.

Report of Testimony Presented to the Curriculum Study Panel in 21 Public Hearings, Texas Education Agency, Austin, 1980.

Response to House Concurrent Resolution 90 as Enacted by the Sixty-Sixth Legislature, State Board of Education, Austin, May, 1980.

Social Studies Subgoals and Suggested Essential Student Objectives, Texas Education Agency, Austin, 1980.

State Board of Education, Official Agenda, Austin, November 9, 1953, p. 8.

State Funding of Exemplary Programs for Gifted/Talented Students, Texas Education Agency, Austin, January, 1983.

Status Report of the Economic Education Program, Texas Education Agency, Austin, December, 1980.

Texas Administrative Code Chapter 75, Texas Education Agency, Austin, 1984.

Texas Curriculum Studies, Report of the Commission on Fine Arts: Art, Austin, Texas Education Agency, July, 1959.

Texas Curriculum Studies, Report of the Commission on Fine Arts: Music, Texas Education Agency, Austin, July, 1959.

Texas Curriculum Studies, Report of the Commission on Health and Physical Education, Texas Education Agency, Austin, July, 1959.

Texas Curriculum Studies, Report of the Commission on Mathematics, Texas Education Agency, Austin, July, 1959.

Texas Curriculum Studies, Report of the Commission on Science, Texas Education Agency, Austin, July, 1959.

Texas School Law Bulletin, Texas Education Agency, Austin, 1978.

Texas School Law Bulletin, Texas Education Agency, Austin, 1984.

Texas State Directory, Julie F. Sayers, editor, Austin,
Sayers Publishers, 1984.

Thirty-Eighth Biennial Report, Texas Education Agency,
Austin, 1954.

Thirty-Seventh Biennial Report, Texas Education Agency,
Austin, 1952.

Vernon's Civil Statutes, Austin, 1951.

Working Papers of the Public School Boards of Trustees
Advisory Committee and Public School Professional
Personnel Advisory Committee, Texas Education Agency,
Austin, 1981.