HUMBOLDT STATE UNIVERSITY
ENGLISH Subject Matter Departmental Review

Portfolio Due Date: CONCURRENT WITH SED APPLICATION!
(The English SMDR Portfolio is due to Dr. Hobbel on the same day that your application is due to the Secondary Education Department)

A committee of professors in your chosen subject area will assess your Secondary Education (SED) application. They will conduct Subject Matter Departmental Review (SMDR), which may include an interview, presentation, and writing sample (depending upon your specific subject area). The SMDR committee will rank and select applicants for a SED departmental interview. Only those applicants who pass Subject Matter Departmental Review will be considered for admission. The SED coordinator will notify applicants of the SMDR results and schedule SED program interviews.

PROCEDURES:

1. **Assessment of Transcript**
   Candidates must possess an overall GPA as established by the CSU Chancellor’s Office; those whose grade point average falls below 2.7 will be informed of the appeals process. Candidates not satisfying course requirements as determined by a credential advisor will be directed to course work to alleviate any deficiencies. In order to be eligible for entry to the SED English program, candidates must qualify by either completing (1) CCTC-approved Subject Matter Major (English Education) or (2) earning a passing score on the CCTC-approved exams (the CSET in English).

   Students who do not hold a degree from an approved program must pass the CSET exams: Subtest I: Literature and Textual Analysis, Composition and Rhetoric; Subtest II: Language, Linguistics, and Literacy; Subtest III: Composition and Rhetoric, Literature and Textual Analysis; Subtest IV: Communications, Speech, Media, and Creative Performance. Most non-English majors (including those passing the CSET exams) are highly encouraged to take English 344/Literature for Young Adults, an advanced composition course for majors, and a speech course. Before making an appointment with an advisor, candidates should obtain an advising sheet from the English or Education Department and review their own transcripts; if the candidate is able to find equivalencies, then an appointment with an approved advisor can officially determine no deficiencies exist.

   All required exams must be passed before beginning the SED program in August.

2. **Assessment of Subject Matter Competency: Portfolio**
   All candidates will submit AN ELECTRONIC PORTFOLIO, emailed as a ZIP FILE to hobbel@humboldt.edu. The Subject Matter Competency Portfolio must contain the following:

   1. An introductory letter addressed to the assessment committee (this can be a copy of the cover essay submitted to the Secondary Education Department);
   2. A resume or curriculum vita,
   3. The Subject Matter Competency Essay (described on the following page), and
   4. Two writing samples from previous coursework, each addressing one of the following areas of study: literature, linguistics, creative writing, media studies, cultural studies, rhetoric, language acquisition or composition.

   **IMPORTANT NOTE:** Graduates of the Humboldt State University Teaching the Language Arts/English Education Major may submit their ENGL 490 portfolio in lieu of item number 4 on the preceding list.

   **Portfolios should be submitted to:** Dr. Nikola Hobbel, hobbel@humboldt.edu
   English Department
   Humboldt State University
Subject Matter Competency Essay Instructions

Read all three articles from the *Phi Delta Kappan*.

Drawing on at least two of the three articles, develop a 3-5 page typed essay that indicates your own perspective on the themes outlined in the articles. Consider what these themes have to do with your potential career as a secondary teacher of English. Draw on your own readings, observations, and experiences to enhance your analysis. Choose MLA or APA as a reference style.

Assessment of the Writing Samples

The California State University System defines and describes quality assessment programs for subject matter competency in English as including the following features:

1. Quantitative as well as qualitative measures should be used. HSU is responding to a need for quantitative measures through transcript analysis.

2. Qualitative observations and appraisals should be based on systematic and explicit criteria. HSU English Department faculty will read a writing sample submitted by the applicant. The writing sample will be assessed by two English content area experts: a local secondary teacher of English and an English/Language Arts Professor at HSU. The writing samples will be assessed on the following criteria: 1) Development of thesis and synthesis of ideas from provided articles; 2) Effective rhetorical style & use of evidence; 3) Understanding of educational issues; and 4) Grammar & Mechanics/APA/MLA.
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ASK ANY group of adults ranging in age from their early twenties to late fifties what they remember about middle or high school reading, and you will no doubt hear an unenthusiastic and often bitter chorus of such titles as *To Kill a Mockingbird*, *Lord of the Flies*, and other classic novels long considered standard and acceptable fare in English classrooms. The younger set may chime in with *Parrot in the Oven*, *Looking for Alaska*, or some other young-adult novels that have become contemporary classics.

Not many adults have great memories of assigned reading from English class, yet the one-size-fits-all class novel persists as the centerpiece of instruction in many middle and high school classrooms. As teacher educators and former English and reading teachers, we also know that getting students to read these selections continues to be difficult, even in the best of circumstances. A high school memory sums up this situation for us. Gay recalls a nighttime bus ride back from a National Honor Society field trip to an amusement park near the end of her junior year. Nearly a third of the students clustered at the back of the bus with the CliffsNotes for *The Scarlet Letter*, not because they needed to read it by the following morning but because they had to read it and write a critical analysis of it by the following morning! Even for these high-achieving high-schoolers, the goal was just to get the assignment finished.

DOUGLAS FISHER is a professor of language and literacy education at San Diego State University. GAY IVEY is an associate professor of reading and literacy at James Madison University, Harrisonburg, Va.
For struggling students, the choice is apt to be noncompliance. Often, the teacher notices that the students have not read the text and so reads it to them. We know that teacher read-alouds are a powerful tool for building vocabulary and background knowledge, but we worry that they are being used to supplant assigned readings. Read-alouds should extend students’ thinking, not replace it.

As an alternative, in the hope that students can be coerced into reading a novel that they have been assigned, teachers often resort to testing their knowledge about it. Some teachers give oral summaries of the contents so that students who have not completed their assigned readings can “keep up.” Others show the film version so that students have a sense of the content. Regardless of which alternative is selected, students are not reading more or reading better as a result of the whole-class novel. Instead, students are reading less and are less motivated, less engaged, and less likely to read in the future. Meanwhile, teachers continue their endless — and often fruitless — search for better ways to persuade students to read their assigned novel.

Given this frustration and resistance, what is it about a “class set” of novels that captivates teachers so much that its use dominates English language arts instruction? We often hear that curriculum standards dictate the decision and require, for example, that all sixth-graders read *The Giver* or that all ninth-graders read *Romeo and Juliet*. (Of course, the latter is a play, not a novel, but it is typically assigned and taught in the same way.) But even a cursory review of content standards from several state departments of education reveals that specific texts and authors are not actually named. Rather, students are expected to learn how to read, write, and speak about a variety of texts, and the standards typically emphasize literary devices, reading comprehension skills, and writing strategies.

We also hear quite frequently that class novels are selected because they are “good for students.” But we know that classics — and even award-winning contemporary classics — do not make the list of what adolescents prefer to read.

We know that classics — and even award-winning contemporary classics — do not make the list of what adolescents prefer to read.

In addition, we know that students still struggling to read do not get better at reading from tackling difficult books. It would be hard to locate one book that addresses the needs of all students in any given classroom. Life experiences that enable a reader to make sense of a book vary too greatly, and every class has students who read above or below their grade level.

The bottom line is that, when teachers require all students to read the same book at the same time, English classes are neither standard-centered nor student-centered. As a result, these classes can respond neither to the academic agenda (i.e., the sanctioned curriculum as defined by standards) nor to the student agenda (i.e., reading, writing, speaking, and listening that satisfy students’ own reasons to know, experience, and relate). Radical as it may seem to some readers, to us it’s only common sense to reconsider the use of the whole-class novel.

**WIDE, FOCUSED READING AS AN ALTERNATIVE**

Class novels may actually limit or restrict the variety, depth, and quantity of students’ reading. We would argue that we can expand students’ reading by significantly increasing the number and variety of texts in English classrooms and by offering a greater number of creative opportunities to read in school. We have identified a number of factors necessary to balance students’ preferences for reading with the demands of a standards-driven curriculum.

As an alternative to using the whole-class novel, we offer teachers five guidelines for practice.

1. **Identify universal themes rather than individual books as a way of guiding instruction.** In our professional development work with teachers in middle and high schools, we are consistently asked how to get students motivated to read. We suspect that the real question, the question behind the question, is “How do we get students to read *The Iliad*?” (Choose any other institutionalized assignment if Homer didn’t make your school’s list this year.) Research offers excellent advice on getting students to read: choose texts that matter to students, create contexts in which students find intrinsic reasons to read rather than reasons related to external rewards or consequences, and provide time to read in school. But motivation is also multi-dimensional and may be heavily influenced by such factors as the student’s own “perceived competence.”

The class-novel experience rarely meets these criteria. Instead, you have students with a text they do not like, which they
are directed to read for purposes other than their own, with little time in school to do so. To top it off, the books are typically so difficult that students feel overmatched by the challenges they present. And that feeling is not unreasonable, since these are the same kinds of texts that intimidate even competent adult readers.

Instead of defining instruction in English language arts by the books (“I teach The Odyssey.” “I teach Old Yeller.”), teachers should focus instruction on big ideas or universal themes, such as “The Hero's Journey,” “Matters of Life and Death,” or “Are the Greeks and Romans still with us today?” These ideas and concepts are surely within the grasp of most students, but it is difficult to find out what students know and can do within the context of one very hard book. Big ideas pique students' interest and allow every student in the class to engage with the topic using his or her own background, interests, and skills.

2. Select texts that span a wide range of difficulty levels. If our goal is to encourage students to read more and better, then we have to ensure that they are reading books they can read. Simply requiring students to read “grade-level” texts will not improve their skills. However, inviting students to read widely in response to a big idea, question, or theme requires that they have access to a significant number of books at a variety of levels of difficulty that provide diverse perspectives on the topic.

By the way, we don't want readers to think we're opposed to the specific books we've named in this article. In fact, they and myriad other “classics” are excellent examples of literature. Charlotte's Web might be a highly suitable addition to a collection of cutting-edge young adult and children's books that explore the theme of friendships with responsibility. Similarly, To Kill a Mockingbird might be an appropriate option in a study of discrimination, racism, and prejudice, but it need not be given higher status than more student-friendly, high-interest books on the topic, such as Chris Crowe's Getting Away With Murder: The True Story of the Emmett Till Case or Toni Morrison's Remember: The Journey to School Integration.

Our experience suggests that, when students read widely from books they have selected, they are more prepared and be challenged, and learn. Students want to read widely in multiple genres and media — graphic novels, manga, Internet sites, informational texts, and so on. All of these text sources can be used as students consider the big idea or theme that the class is exploring together. Themes we select should allow students to engage with contemporary issues — issues that they and we are struggling with — while reading both current and classic works. We agree with literary scholars who suggest that literature provides the reader with a mirror to examine oneself, a window to consider alternative experiences and beliefs, and a door to walk through forever changed. We just haven't found the book that does this for every member of every class at the same time.

3. Select texts that address contemporary issues and that are engaging. Students want to read about things that matter to them. They want to think, form opinions, challenge

4. Orchestrate instruction that builds students' competence. Another drawback of the whole-class novel is the type of instruction it engenders. Teachers using a single book with a group of students often revert to lecturing and assigning independent reading. From the perspective of the students, the teacher knows everything (from the “correct” symbolism to the appropriate predictions), and students have permission to remain passive.

Turning this situation around so that the teacher provides modeling, coaching, scaffolding, and guiding requires that the teacher use time differently. For example, the expert teachers we love to watch start with a read-aloud or shared reading. This time is not used to read something that the students should have already read but is an opportunity for the teacher to share his or her thinking about a text with the class. Then students move into groups — some are reading, others are discussing books, others are writing or getting peer feedback on their writing — while the teacher meets with specific students to provide guided instruction.

This organizational system allows teachers to move from assuming “all the responsibility for performing a task . . . to a situation in which the students assume all of the

When students read widely from books they have selected, they are more prepared to discuss the books with their peers and to write complex analyses of the themes and ideas. What's more, they are motivated to read more.
In other words, the teacher guides students through texts and models comprehension along the way. As students develop their understanding of the theme or response to the big idea or question, they are developing skills, building competence and confidence, and learning with and through texts. And as the students’ skills develop, teachers gradually cede to them the responsibility for learning.

5. **Teach literary devices and reading comprehension strategies using texts that are readable and meaningful.** As we have noted, the content standards in English language arts do not name or test students’ knowledge of specific texts or authors. Instead, students are expected to learn how to draw inferences from a text as a way of making sense of it. But students are not likely to have vast experience with inferring or with appreciating and understanding how an author uses particular literary devices to enrich a text or to contribute to a theme. Their lack of experience is compounded when most instructional time is consumed by efforts to get them to “get the story” of a few specific texts that they may not find interesting or that may be too difficult for them. Far too often, we try to teach to content standards by requiring that students read books with difficult vocabulary and concepts. The problem is that comprehension tools and literary devices don’t jump out at the reader in difficult texts; students simply don’t get good at reading comprehension, understanding literary devices, literary response, or writing by reading hard books. Students don’t learn how to write a persuasive text or how an omniscient point of view works by reading one difficult short story.

Students do develop an understanding of and appreciation for persuasive arguments by reading a number of texts, across genres and topics that they are accessible to them. And students do develop the ability to make inferences through repeated practice, first with very obvious examples modeled by the teacher and then with increasingly complex examples to which they apply what they have learned independently.

While we don’t know of students who got better at reading or learned to understand the classics through a focus on whole-class reading, we do know a significant number of students who got better at reading and who started reading more widely and frequently because their teachers used a range of texts, organized the course around a theme or big idea, and then provided instruction as outlined in their state’s content standards. We are on the same page as children’s author Walter Dean Myers, who writes, “It is only when readers have the ability to fully absorb the material being read that the process becomes pleasurable and a lifelong reader is created.” The whole-class novel assigned as independent reading won’t help students “fully absorb the material.” Helping that to happen takes a skilled teacher who guides his or her students through multiple texts, genres, and standards.

A common statement made by some English language arts teachers is that students need to know Shakespeare or Walt Whitman before they graduate. Should this “knowledge” be acquired at the expense of students’ knowing how to read and write independently and purposefully for a wide range of reasons? Traditional instruction in English language arts actually **limits** the reading and writing students can produce. Let’s work instead on expanding students’ understanding, interests, and thinking.

5. Ivey and Broaddus, op. cit.; and Worthy, Moorman, and Turner, op. cit.
7. Ivey and Broaddus, op. cit.
The problem with English language arts standards — and the simple, powerful solution

A close high school friend who went on to top corporate positions at Fortune 500 companies told me he had learned an indispensable lesson: Never distribute an important document before it’s been vetted multiple times for clarity and concision. Why? Because a document that is the least bit ambiguous or confusing will result in fruitless, misdirected effort throughout the organization.

As he told me this, I thought of the various standards documents in education. Every informed educator now knows that our state standards were — and still are — too long and confusing. The average document contains as much as twice the amount of topics and skills that could realistically be taught in a nine-month school year (Marzano & Kendall 1998).

Then, there is the language of the standards themselves — the sloppy, imprecise prose in which they’re so often written. I’m always amused that so many social studies or science concepts must be, in about equal parts, “described,” others “analyzed,” or “discussed.” It is perfectly plain that these verbs were assigned arbitrarily and that the language is a bluff; our tests never ask students to truly analyze or explain or discuss anything. They ask students to choose the correct answer on multiple-choice items.

The most troubling standards have to be those for English language arts. Current state ELA standards — still taught and tested by state assessments — require us to teach students to do things like “Segment spoken phonemes contained in one-syllable words from two to five phoneme sounds into individual phoneme sounds” or “Generate sounds from letters and letter patterns, including consonant blends and long- and short-vowel patterns (phonograms), to combine those sounds into recognizable words.”

Huh?

Just for fun, I occasionally ask audiences if they successfully taught their own children to read at home before they entered formal schooling. Almost all did. Then, I ask them if they used their state standards documents as a teaching aid. The typical response is laughter.

Common core standards

Now, we have the Common Core English Language Arts Standards. There is much to like here. I especially appreciate the ancillary documents, exemplar texts, and research, which call on students to closely read large amounts of increasingly complex texts and support their arguments and inferences with evidence from the texts.

That said, the explicit lists of Common Core ELA standards in bulk are a problem. Though better, they embrace the unproven notion that literacy consists of mastering an exhaustive collection of separate, often specious, individually taught skills — about 70 to 100 distinctive standards per grade level. When will we learn that no one ever became literate by being taught how to do things like “identify the central idea” of a text. Or (compounding the idiocy) by being taught to “identify two central ideas” in the next grade level (both from the Common Core; my emphasis). The belief that literacy is acquired in this way encourages such tortured formulations — or worse. Consider these two standards, from the 8th-grade Common Core:

- Compare and contrast the structure of texts, and analyze how the differing structure of each text contributes to its meaning and style, and
- Analyze how the points of view of the characters and audience or reader (e.g., created through the use of dramatic irony) create effects like suspense or humor.

I don’t know what these mean. Nor does Gerald Graff, the former president of the Modern Language Association. Nor do any of the ed-
Making inferences/drawing one’s own conclusions;

• Resolving conflicting ideas encountered in texts;

• Solving open-ended problems;

• Dismantling and supporting arguments with evidence (Conley, 2007).

If we embrace this approach from about 2nd grade and up, we won’t need to worry about performance on state assessments, the ACT, SAT, or whatever the Common Core assessment consortia eventually concoct. We may, however, need to worry about where to put the unprecedented numbers of students who would flood our universities or pursue post-secondary studies — where they would flourish.
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Students don’t learn in a vacuum. Higher knowledge is built on prior knowledge.

TEXT AND TRUTH

Reading, student experience, and the Common Core

Prereading is alive and well in the expectations for the Common Core.

BY SUSAN SANDLER AND ZARETTA HAMMOND

One of the rumors making the rounds of K-12 educators goes something like this: The Common Core State Standards don’t allow “prereading” — the pedagogical practice meant to help students better understand a text they’re about to read — or for that matter any classroom activities that contextualize a text through outside sources.

The interesting part of the rumor isn’t the rumor itself: It’s just a misinterpretation of the Publisher’s Criteria for the standards, which clearly state that “Student background knowledge and experiences can illuminate the reading . . .” (Coleman & Pimentel, p. 7). What makes the misunderstanding interesting and vitally relevant to teachers is that it sheds light on some of the practices and underlying assumptions that have diluted the potency of reading education for years.
Plainly stated: Prereading is no substitute for actual reading, but that doesn’t mean that drawing on information outside the core text is a bad idea. In fact, one of the best ways to teach analytical reading is to actively tap into students’ prior knowledge — the rich base of existing experiences and information that they bring with them to class each day.

The Common Core allows prior knowledge, and the growing body of literature about the neuroscience of learning tells us it’s key to the way humans build our interrelated networks of knowledge. As we move toward full implementation of the Common Core, we must make sure that we help students leverage their prior knowledge, both to help strengthen their analytical skills and to lay a solid foundation for further learning.

The controversy

Let’s start at the heart of the controversy by explaining why the Common Core guidance says what it does about prereading: Too often, well-meaning teachers are giving students a predigested version of the text before students ever get a chance to interact with the text. Doing that too often can cheat students of a chance to build their own analytical muscles as they tackle challenging text.

The teachers’ intentions are honorable — they’re merely trying to level the playing field among students who frequently have disparate academic and personal backgrounds. For example, most middle school students could read and understand the basic plot lines of *The Last of the Mohicans*, which shows up on the 8th-grade reading list. But not all students will know enough about the social, economic, and political implications of America’s westward expansion to understand the motivations of some characters and the historical significance of the book.

However, providing too much information up front in prereading activities can undermine the student’s ability to use his experience to figure out the text for himself, which is at the heart of analytical reading. The Common Core, designed to help make every student college- and career-ready, was built on the well-founded expectation that students must do better than merely mastering basic reading comprehension. It’s no accident that eight of the 10 anchor standards in reading involve analysis, inference, and/or evaluation.

Prereading activities that give students a preanalyzed version of the core text can actually prevent students from acquiring the foundational skills and capacity for analysis, inference, and evaluating evidence. This capacity only grows from wrestling with a text. Often, in prereading, teachers tell students what the text will cover, its key points and arguments, and why they’re important. By the time students get to the actual text, they may feel there’s no point in reading it, much less wrestling with it. If they do read it, they’ll have a much more limited opportunity to develop those crucial grappling skills because the text has already been predigested for them. Unsurprisingly, grappling with how a text is constructed and why is difficult if you already have the answers.

The reality

Some educators have interpreted cautions against misusing prereading to mean that teaching to the Common Core should exclude incorporating information outside of the text, up to and including the experiences and background that a reader brings to reading.

But let’s not substitute one misunderstanding with another: While activities that draw from beyond the text must never preempt or replace the text, they can and should be judiciously and thoughtfully used to help deepen students’ understanding of the text.

Specifically with regard to students’ prior knowl-
edge, prohibiting students from applying their experiences and knowledge as they read would be not only futile but actively counterproductive for the Common Core.

Students don’t learn in a vacuum. Higher knowledge is built on prior knowledge. Research confirms that making connections between new information and ideas and what we’ve already experienced plays a central role in learning (Bransford, Brown, & Cocking, 2000).

Prereading is no substitute for actual reading, but that doesn’t mean that drawing on information outside the core text is a bad idea.

Indeed, prior knowledge is crucial to developing some of the key skills required to meet the Common Core, especially analyzing, drawing inferences, and evaluating evidence. To master these skills, students must keep the text at the center while extrapolating from the literal words to a series of conclusions. Students can only do this by strategically checking the text against their existing bank of images, associations, ideas, and information.

The solution

Students will draw on prior knowledge on their own, but teachers can powerfully accelerate students’ mastery of analytical reading with active strategies that tap into what they already know.

Prompting

Rather than preloading background information or quickly supplying it when students become confused by the text, teachers can provide cues, clues, and prompts to help students use their untapped prior knowledge to navigate the text at key points. Teachers can help students leverage their own experience to construct analogies that help the student explain what’s going on in the text.

Bridging with enabling texts

Teachers can use “enabling” companion texts, which can pave the way to reading traditional challenging texts (Tatum, 2009). Enabling texts are closer to students’ lived experiences, and though they are no less challenging, their more familiar setting or context makes it easier for students to draw on their prior knowledge to analyze and infer (Willingham, 2009). This text acts as a bridge to a more traditional text that has similar themes and complexities but a less familiar setting.

Leveraging cultural knowledge

Part of becoming an analytical reader is developing the capacity to recognize various literary and rhetorical devices. Students often have prior experience with rhetorical and literary devices through popular culture, but don’t know the formal names for them.

The powerful utility of students’ prior knowledge was vividly illustrated by students at an underachieving urban high school who developed a strong mastery of literary analysis and reasoning techniques. The key was a culturally responsive scaffolding technique called cultural modeling, developed by Carol D. Lee, a professor of learning sciences and African-American studies at Northwestern University (Lee, 2007). Lee’s project designed a curriculum for the students’ English language arts classes that focused on thinking strategies and habits of mind that are key to literary analysis, and which are quite similar to the higher-order strategies built into the Common Core.

Students started by using these thinking strategies on various popular texts with which they were already familiar: film, television, music, and oral traditions. As they examined and identified literary devices such as satire or symbolism in the everyday examples they encountered, students readily demonstrated sophisticated and nuanced abilities to apply literary analysis strategies. The teacher, acting as mediator, helped students recognize these same media devices in written texts.

Students then read complex texts that were unfamiliar to them, but featured social codes and contexts familiar to them. For example, these classes of African-American students read and analyzed Beloved by Toni Morrison. After successfully applying the same literary analysis strategies to such texts, the students proceeded to confidently apply these strategies to texts that portrayed social worlds much less familiar to them. By the end of the project, they were masterfully analyzing texts by Dante and Shakespeare.

The bigger picture

The importance of clarifying the role of prior knowledge in reading goes beyond identifying useful teaching strategies. Understanding the importance of students’ prior knowledge is essential to strengthening students’ overall relationship to academic learning.
Simply put, it matters how we think and talk about the role of students’ experience in learning. If the misinterpretation of the Common Core guidance among principals, coaches, curriculum specialists, and others is allowed to ossify, and teachers internalize the idea that students’ prior knowledge doesn’t count, students themselves will get the same message loud and clear.

The Common Core does not ban prior knowledge.

Students living in poverty and students in under-served racial groups already receive so many messages that academic success is not for them. If they come to believe that academic learning has no connection to their lives, then learning will become less relevant and interesting, with a corresponding loss of motivation to do the hard work of mastering challenging skills (Pearson, Cervetti, & Tilson, 2008).

To obliterate any remaining doubt: As a careful read of the Publisher’s Criteria discloses, the Common Core does not ban prior knowledge. On the contrary, both the literature on the learning process and the rigor of the Common Core highlight the importance of existing knowledge in creating new knowledge.

If education is a construction project — a structure being built piece by piece as we help students learn new things and fit them together — then the foundation of student knowledge underneath holds it all up.
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<td>E. Total Free or Nominal Rate Distribution</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Total Distribution</td>
<td>31,444</td>
<td>31,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Copies Not Distributed</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Total</td>
<td>31,501</td>
<td>32,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Percent Paid</td>
<td>99.43%</td>
<td>99.04%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I certify that the statements made above are correct and complete.

Gijs de Leede, chief financial officer 10/1/2012