Again, the data are on two disks (the front and back of one disk will work too). The disks are not protected, nor will they be. The data are available to everyone. For the time being I am willing to be the manager of the data base—to update it. If you want a copy of the disks, here is the arrangement I am making. If you have a blank disk send it along with a self-addressed, stamped envelope and I will gladly make a copy free of charge. The disk should be a soft-sectored, 5 1/4 inch, single density floppy disk (designed for the Apple Computer).

Again, if you have any suggestions or contributions to submit to the data base (additions or deletions) please send them along. Again, the data are free and available to anyone.
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About PT

NOTES FROM THE EDITOR

Patrick McGreevy

Susan Ryberg and her colleagues are working very hard to prepare for the 1984 National Precision Teaching Conference. The conference brochure is included in this issue. Please photocopy this brochure and share it with your colleagues. Encourage them to attend. It is important to emphasize that a conference like this is not designed just for experienced Precision Teachers. Many of the sessions will be helpful for beginners and those who have been using the Chart for a short period of time.

If you are planning to attend, please send in your registration and make hotel reservations as soon as possible. This will help Susan and her staff with conference planning and organization.

This issue marks the beginning of two new columns: Around the Chart and Teacher to Teacher. These columns are designed for teachers and other practitioners who are new to the Chart.

We are in the process of arranging for the indexing of JPT in one or more publications. We will keep you posted.

Several subscribers have suggested that we offer 2-year subscriptions. Beginning with Volume V (April, 1984), 2-year subscriptions will be offered.

I think all Precision Teachers owe John Eshleman a debt of gratitude. His was truly a labor of love. John and I are currently working out the details of making the data-base available in print form through Plain English Publications. More on this in the next issue.

TEACHER TO TEACHER

Caryn Robbins

I remember when Pat Flanagan began to teach me to chart, she would patiently correct me when I talked about "graphing my data." There is a transition period in learning to use the Chart, when you aren't yet thinking like a
When most of us started using the Standard Celeration Chart, we were accustomed to setting goals (aims) for our students and reporting their performance in terms of percent correct. Our "Chart parent" (to my knowledge, Steve Graf coined this term at the 1980 ABA Conference Overhead Transparency Chart-sharing Session to describe the person who taught us to use the Chart) tried to convince us of the wisdom of using frequency (number correct and incorrect during a certain time interval). Being new to frequency (sometimes called rate), we were somewhat apprehensive. No one else in our building was using frequency, let alone this strange and complicated looking chart. The other teachers were still using their old friend, percent correct. Since percent correct was our old friend too, we were somewhat unwilling to leave it behind.

When our "Chart parent" was not looking, we converted our student's correct and incorrect frequencies to percent correct, snuck a piece of plain (equal interval) graph paper and "plotted" our old friend. We then compared our new Chart with our old friend to see if they looked the same. To our surprise, they were very different. After several days of "courage collecting," we tiptoed up to our "Chart parent" and asked him why our new Chart looked so different from our old friend. He gave us an answer that sounded something like this, "... when correct and incorrect frequencies are collected and charted on the Standard Celeration Chart, we have a more sensitive and useful measure of student progress than is possible with percent correct and equal interval charts... keep counting and charting; you'll see what I mean..." Even though this answer was correct, it was not very helpful or satisfying. However, since our "Chart parent" was a nice person and sounded very convincing, we decided to give frequency and the Chart a fair chance.

After several months (by this time, we were beginning to see the value of frequency), our supervisor came by and noticed our students' new Charts. She also noticed that we had modified our students' goals (we were now calling them aims). Instead of stating the aims in terms of percent correct, we were now stating them in terms of frequency (e.g., 70 problems correct in one minute with 2 or less errors). Our supervisor was horrified! She asked us where our percents were and why we were using this strange new Chart. As luck would have it, our "Chart parent" was off at some behavior mod convention and we were left alone to answer our