

of education; yet they are rarely explicitly practiced. Teachers agree to their importance but argue that time doesn't permit their inclusion in the curriculum because of the emphasis placed on basic skills and other requirements. We submit that basic skills and general education provide the vehicle through which thinking skills are developed. This would result in all the components including each of the other two virtually all the time.

In reading the above statements teachers would legitimately ask how they are expected to accomplish this seemingly impossible task, given that they already have too much to do. The solution lies not in what or how much is taught, but how it is taught. This places the responsibility exactly where it should be--with the curriculum developers and the teacher training institutions. Again, given that teachers depend on curriculum, materials must be designed to explicitly emphasize thinking skills and give teachers precise direction as to how it can be done with their textbooks and other curriculum products. Because the guides teachers depend on would focus specifically on both thinking skills and traditional content the teachers would then begin to include the skills as an explicit rather than an implicit part of their teaching.

Curriculum more often has been defined as what is taught rather than how it is taught. We are suggesting that to meet the needs of Florida's schools and students, the definition must be expanded to include provisions not only for curriculum content but how it is delivered.

Given further that curriculum effectiveness is dependent upon the teacher, teacher training institutions, school administrators, district level curriculum consultants, and inservice leaders have the responsibility to prepare and retrain teachers to be capable of delivering curriculum