individualized programs. Even though other state leaders may not choose to set up their accelerated junior and senior classes programs in exactly the same way, Chew nevertheless urged all policy makers to give special priority to what he considers the four essentials for a good assessment program: (1) developing the test items for the writing assessment, (2) developing training for raters, (3) implementing a consistent state-required writing program, and (4) using the testing program to improve the instructional program.

Edward Deluzain is at the opposite end of the spectrum from Dr. Chew. He is a teacher and chair of the English department at Moseley High School in Panama City, Florida, a school with about 1500 students in grades 10-12. With the goal of improving the school's instructional program, Deluzain initiated a local writing assessment program in 1982, developed a follow-up assessment in 1983, and will continue in-house assessment as long as such tests bring results in the classrooms of Moseley High School.

Deluzain analyzed the 1982 test results and found both summative and formative uses for these results. In particular, his finding that seniors' writing was measurably superior to that of the juniors, and that the juniors' writing was measurably superior to sophomores, was a definite morale booster for students and teachers alike.

The teachers were surprised to find that the performance of the accelerated junior and senior classes was lower than that of the accelerated junior class. However, all accelerated classes wrote better than the basic and average classes for all grades. Immediately, Deluzain and his colleagues began to strengthen the accelerated program, making it more specific and demanding. By the time the 1983 assessment took place, measurable improvement had been made in the performance of the accelerated students' writing as compared to the performance of the basic and average students.

The selected date for assessing writing allowed Dr. Deluzain to compare the relative standing of students who had been enrolled in direct writing classes the first semester with those who had been enrolled in literature classes the first semester. Contrary to his expectations, 67% of the samples from the literature classes were better than the samples from the writing courses in 1982. (Both groups had been required to produce one piece of writing per week all semester.) Again the faculty worked together to find ways to improve the instruction. They added more pre-writing and idea-building discussions to the writing courses based on literary works, so that by 1983 only 37% of the literature classes' samples were better. The faculty at Moseley High School are determined to continue to revise the curriculum in terms of weakness and strengths indicated by the writing assessment tests.

Deluzain concluded the "Teachers have a right to know when good teaching is succeeding, students have a right to know when hard work is paying off, and parents and the general public have a right to know when tax dollars are being well spent. Writing assessment programs tied to responsive curriculum improvement can be the means to giving this reassurance." Chew added that inevitably teachers will direct their instruction toward the format of the writing assessment test. However, if they get involved in preparing, rating, analyzing and auditing the curriculum in terms of the assessment test, as have Deluzain and the other teachers at Moseley High School, teaching toward the test can be the best means to improving students' writing.