

GENIP Questionnaire Summary

The Successes of GENIP

Where has GENIP made a difference? How? Why was it successful?

- *Provides an excellent forum for network and exchanging information. In earlier days, was a major distributor and contributor to the national geography standards movement.*
- *I think the most critical role GENIP has played for the past two decades (?) has been linking the goals, plans, and activities of the various geographic education organizations together. This has helped us avoid duplication of efforts, work together when extra support was needed or appropriate, and generally stay out of each other's way. Although there wasn't much that GENIP could actually do to impact upon the agenda of an organization as big and powerful as NGS (and even the other three organizations), the role GENIP played in being the glue that held together the larger community of scholars and activists working on behalf of educational reform in our discipline has proven to be invaluable over the years.*
- *I think that GENIP has made a difference by taking the lead in maintaining relations between and among the four professional associations and with external groups such as NCSS and NASA. Without this coordinating function I believe that there would be much less progress in geography education. I also think that GENIP provides some focus on geography education for the two organizations with the least amount of inherent interest in the topic (AAG and AGS). GENIP has also made a difference by being a single point of contact to the discipline of geography for external groups.*
- *GENIP has made a difference in the education community because as a consortium of the four major geography associations in the United States, it is able to speak with a single voice on issues in geography education. In so doing, it has also improved communication among its supporting organizations and increased collegiality and institutional relationships as well. Since its founding in 1985 by Barry Bishop at NGS and Sam Natoli at the AAG, GENIP has served as a facilitator in a number of significant initiatives that have marked geography's coming of age as a core academic subject in the schools. These include:*
 - *Promoting the implementation of the Five Essential Themes through an ambitious publishing program and presentations at local, state, regional and national conferences*
 - *Assisting in the development of the framework for the NAEP geography assessments at grades 4, 8, and 12, and providing a review function for the tests in cooperation with the Educational Testing Service*
 - *Facilitating the development and implementation of the Advanced Placement Human Geography Program (e.g., encouraging a professional dialog among college departments on the value of such a program of studies, promoting the program to high schools through publications, presentations, workshops, institutes, arranging initial funding between ETS and NGS to launch the project, etc.)*
 - *Developing a publication program with the assistance of Rand McNally to provide*

teacher-friendly instructional programs on the Five Themes, and the National Standards as well as assessment and lesson models

- *Participating in the development and implementation of the National Geography Standards in a variety of ways and in a variety of venues*

- *Initiating, organizing and implementing the development of such significant national curricular efforts as Mission Geography (NASA) and Teaching to the Standards: A Scope and Sequence in K-12 Geography*

- *Supporting programs in geography education initiated by each of its four supporting organizations and serving as “critical best friends”*

- *GENIP is successful because its member organizations and their representatives operate openly and in a climate of trust recognizing that because geography is a small discipline, it can succeed in the schools only through the cooperation of its professional advocates.*

- *The on-going commitment of its sponsoring organizations to promoting GENIP’s mission. Its flexibility and its simple administrative structure allowing it to respond quickly to requests, issues, etc.*

- *Its consistent commitment to involvement in “can do” projects and its willingness to take responsible risks.*

- *Representing various initiatives in geography education at national and regional meetings through program presentations, participation on panels, presence in the exhibit area in an effort to raise the profile of geography in the K-12 academic community.*

- *In coordinating among the 4 key geography organizations initiatives that relate to k-12 geographic education. This is completed through continued/ regular dialogue and facilitation of coordinating task forces to work on projects initiated by GENIP. These initiatives were successful because of the commitment of all 4 organizations to promote geographic education without too much concern for what organization is in control of any specific project.*

- *GENIP performs a valuable service by maintaining active channels of communication and collaboration among the geography organizations. As a coordinating body, GENIP provides a mechanism for the geography organizations to exchange ideas and to plan synergistic activities that would be less likely to occur without such a framework. In doing so, it draws on the relative strengths of each organization to maximize impact (or at least increase the potential for significant forward motion).*

- *Its role in encouraging creation of an AP course. By mobilizing support from so many parts of the geographical community.*

- *It has enhanced the efforts of NCGE and encouraged the other 3 organizations to increase their focus on and allocation of resources to K-12 geo-ed by the simple dynamic of asking each organization to report regularly on what it has accomplished and what it plans to do. Meeting together and discussing possibilities often results in creativity on the spot.*

- *GENIP has made a difference by bringing the major geographic organizations in the United States together to address issues and weigh in with their combined influence to sway policy, lend influence, and keep the geographic torch well lighted.*

- *GENIP is the closest we have to consortium in geography.*

- *GENIP has made it possible for all four organizations to speak for geography education*

with one voice. This has been powerful in terms of developing and implementing the Standards, validating the NAEP assessments, establishing AP Human Geography, addressing NCLB issues, communicating with organizations and agencies on a variety of issues that affect geography, including educational policy and funding. GENIP also ensures regular and formal communication among the organizations about geography education. Without GENIP, we would not be attuned to each other's initiatives and we would not be doing much collaboration.

What are the most significant achievements of GENIP?

- *Wide distribution and adoption of national geography standards.*
- *Sarah's NASA-funded project; bringing visibility to geography at the national level (via site visits to NCATE etc.); work on updating and dissemination of Geography for Life; support (and co-sponsorship?) of the updated version of The Power of Placer video course for Annenberg.; providing much needed start-up funding for other projects such as Finding a Way.*
- *Completing "Mission Geography"; maintaining connections between and among the four org's; precipitating and coordinating the response to NCLB; providing the seed money to support the development of "GIS in Schools"; the 21st Century Skills project; Travelocity Award; the five themes books; brokering the relationship between Cambridge Studios and the geography community; we could claim success for AP Human Geography but I don't know if that would be fair.*
- *The successful publications program it has developed over the years directed primarily to classroom teachers and curriculum directors (on the themes, the standards, assessments, curriculum models, etc.).*
- *Its role in the development of Mission Geography. Its role as a conduit to other professional organizations, federal and state agencies, and the media. Its role as a generous professional citizen through its funding (full or partial) of special projects proposed by its member organizations (e.g., research projects on NCLB, state licensure and course requirements, encouraging geography education's visibility in the political arena etc.). Its role in NAEP, AP, the Standards movement, and NCATE (minimal).*
- *To facilitate an understanding of common themes in geography, in promoting the national geography standards, and in facilitating crucial discussion and dialogue on geographic education at a national level.*
- *Promoting implementation of the national geography standards and standards-based instructional materials. Raising awareness of the importance of geography education within and outside of the discipline. Supporting a productive internship program. Helping establish a public-policy analyst position.*
- *AP and support for curriculum and materials development.*
- *The distribution of Geography for Life, research funding acquired, research funding granted, and a regular presence in geoed for the membership of the four organizations.*
- *GENIP projects have provided important data on geography education (reports developed by the interns), solid curriculum materials (Mission Geography), funding that has supported the*

development of new publications and projects, the Travelocity award.

How well do we meet the needs of:

–the four organizations?

- *Serves an important networking function and individuals within GENIP are key contributors to broader NGS initiatives.*
- *Very well. GENIP is our discipline's only organization/structure that has the distinct function of allowing space for geography's four professional organizations to exchange information on what they're doing for the cause of geographic education.*
- *I can't judge that.*
- *Difficult to assess since the purpose of GENIP is the greater good of geography education and not addressing the need of a particular supporting organization. However, the Project has been responsive to organizational requests that do promote the greater good (e.g., NGS internship program, involvement with ARGUS, etc.).*
- *Generally well given a limited budget.*
- *Insofar as the four organizations and the discipline share a stake in improving geography's status in American education, GENIP provides a valuable service. GENIP also extends the impact of projects undertaken by the individual geography organizations.*
- *Very well. Keeping all informed about K-12 efforts and other activities as well. That reduces duplication of effort and waste of resources and encourages better inter-organizational relations overall.*
- *From my perspective it seems that Genip has met needs that would otherwise have gone unattended.*
- *GENIP serves the needs of all organizations very well. But not all members are aware of that. I still hear rumblings that GENIP seems to be an independent organization, rather than a committee that serves the needs of the broader community. I suggest we have a report in the newsletters and on the websites after each GENIP meeting, with a photograph, so that people know who is involved and what we are doing. We should also have a GENIP page on each websites with more detailed information. I think we can also suggest that the organizational reports include a call for specific assistance as appropriate, either from GENIP or from one or more individual organizations. If it's a line item it makes it clear that the opportunity for collaboration, support, etc. is there.*

–the discipline of geography?

- *Helpful.*
- *Unfortunately, I don't think many geographers are even aware that GENIP exists outside the world of geographic education. This is sad but true. Even those folks who know what the*

acronym GENIP stands for (!) are unclear about why it exists or the work that it has done over the years in support of geographic education.

- *I think we serve geography well by working on its public image in a way the orgs do not.*
- *Effective instructional programs in the schools ultimately benefit the discipline. Although it is probably too soon to tell, it is likely that the ASP program will encourage more students to major in geography and geography related programs at the college level. GENIP's efforts have also been directed to helping teachers recognize the power of geography as a system of analysis and to understanding its integrity and structure as an academic discipline. In this way, one likes to think that there is less trivialization of geography in the schools now than there was prior to 1985 when GENIP was founded.*
- *Generally well.*
- *Insofar as the four organizations and the discipline share a stake in improving geography's status in American education, GENIP provides a valuable service. GENIP also extends the impact of projects undertaken by the individual geography organizations.*
- *Very well. By bringing to bear the combined weight of all four organizations on an issue or effort. It has been more effective than each organization supporting or endorsing a project singly. Also better coordination of individual efforts on individual projects.*
- *GENIP is a consortium that puts some weight behind geographic initiatives and policy suggestions both within the parent organizations and the general community of geod.*
- *Very well.*

–teachers?

- *Only very indirectly.*
- *I'll take a wild guess here and say that most teachers also are totally unaware of GENIP (unless they are on a search for grant funding for one of their classroom-based projects in geographic education).*
- *Not all that well. "Spaces and Places" was popular but we have not revised it.*
- *There is little awareness among teachers about GENIP. That is probably as it should be. It was never meant to be a stand-alone organization in geography education. Through its programs and its publications and its various initiatives, it has affected thousands of teachers – but in an indirect way. In a sense, GENIP's lack of visibility is its strength.*
- *This needs more attention and requires more resources than GENIP can access.*
- *Helping transform geography into a standards-based subject is perhaps the pinnacle achievement of GENIP. Though GENIP does not directly engage in teacher-training activities, it provides important guidance and dissemination outlets to the organizations that do so.*
- *Not sure GENIP has helped teachers more than NCGE and NGS Geographic Alliances have.*
- *Service to teachers in providing funding opportunities; materials development that provides teachers with top rate curriculum materials.*
- *Very well, in broad terms and by developing Mission Geography. But our purpose has*

not been – and should not be - direct service to teachers and students.

-students?

- *Say no more – no chance they've heard of it either unless one of their profs is absent from class to attend a GENIP meeting perhaps.*
- *Not at all.*
- *Same as with teachers.*
- *Marginal.*
- *Helping transform geography into a standards-based subject is perhaps the pinnacle achievement of GENIP. Though GENIP does not directly engage in teacher-training activities, it provides important guidance and dissemination outlets to the organizations that do so.*
- *Not directly, but certainly indirectly.*
- *No comment.*

The Failures of GENIP

What are the failures of GENIP?

- *Too small and unable to do much more than meet and make small investments.*
- *None come to mind actually except my own feelings of not being able to help out during or after I attended meetings. It always felt like the 'Sarah and Roger show' (as we often called it) with help from other members not really being asked for or needed. This truly isn't a complaint, but rather is a reflection of the way the leadership structure was set up in the early days I think. Each group has one or more representatives and their responsibility is simply to present a list of what's happening in our various organizations to the group at meetings. While this is essential to help fulfill the function of GENIP as a coordinating body, when projects came up, it was impossible to figure out how to step in and offer help or support in some tangible way. So I often left meetings feeling uncomfortable and guilty for not helping out on other projects and tasks.*
- *We do not follow through with all the contacts we make. We were not able to mount a large and sustained dissemination of the Standards. We have not developed a new fund-raising product.*
- *GENIP has not addressed these issues:*
 - *Geography's primary weakness is it lacks a well-defined public image or definition. Few Americans know what geography is, let alone its importance to a well-educated electorate or how studying geography can contribute to solving the problems. The discipline does not elicit powerful positive associations for people; in fact, it often calls up negative memories of memorizing place locations or dreary lessons on the principal products of Peru. The campaign to argue the value of geography and to institutionalize it in the curriculum is difficult when the vast majority of policy makers are unfamiliar with the subject and do not believe it serves any real purpose.*

○ *This fundamental weakness is frustrating because there is so little that geography educators can do to effect general perception. Geography is a small discipline with little mass; geography educators are an even smaller number. Size is a weakness in that there are simply insufficient numbers of us to do all the work that needs to be done, from research to dissemination to serving as readers on the Advanced Placement Human Geography examination. We may lack the mass critical to ramp up.*

○ *As a result of uncertain public understanding and small size, geography has struggled, sometimes successfully and sometimes not, to establish and maintain a place in the curriculum. Geography's position in the social studies, not as an independent subject, is clearly a weakness (although its designation as a core subject independent of the social studies is a strength.)*

○ *These problems are exacerbated by a fourth, and perhaps most irksome, weakness—teacher preparation. Teacher preparation is considered the *bête noire* of geography education in the United States (Boehm, Brierley, and Sharma, 1994). Few US teachers have formal training in geography. Unfortunately, teacher preparation programs have failed to produce a supply of adequately-trained geography teachers capable of implementing innovations of the past two decades in geography education (B, Stoltman, and Lee 2004). Changes in how US teachers are prepared may lead to further difficulties in producing geography-literate teachers. These four weaknesses--lack of accurate public image, small size, tenuous position in the curriculum, and inadequate supplies of geography specialists teachers—feed back into each other to weaken geography education.*

• *Along with the rest of the geography education community, GENIP allowed NCLB to become law without any effort to promote funding for geography as a school subject; As a result of the tenth anniversary of their publication, the failure to develop a more organized approach to reviewing/updating, revising the National Geography Standards with a target date for a new edition. GENIP has limited its involvement in the standards movement to content standards. A set of teaching standards published close behind Geography for Life would likely have had an important impact on the preparation of geography teachers over the long haul.*

• *Probably needs to meet or at least have calls or e-mail communication more frequently.*

• *NCLB springs to mind, yet GENIP has responded in an admirable manner and has catalyzed important activity on the public-policy front. There are a number of areas where GENIP has failed to follow through on its commitments (e.g., supplying an article to the NCSL, proposing a research project for ECS). With limited human and financial resources, GENIP may be spreading itself a little too thin. It may do "more with less" by focusing on fewer priorities. It should also publish the results of its own research (e.g., status of standards and assessment in the states) so that others can make use of it.*

• *To make itself better known and better understood. There is some resentment circulating over members of GENIP taking on projects some people feel others should have had the chance to compete for. It is not fair, but the sentiment exists. Greater and more frequent turnover of members on the Steering Committee might help.*

• *Failure to obtain a 10 million dollar grant with continuous renewals.*

• *I don't think we communicate adequately with the members of our organizations.*

What are the opportunities that GENIP has missed? Why did this happen?

- *None noted. I think the function is to serve as an overseeing body and thus, it's not GENIP's role to coordinate projects of its own.*
- *We did not encourage the development of Standards support materials.*
- *NCLB.*
- *Note above answer.*
- *National agenda's in NCLB that missed funding geography. Possibly because we did not have enough point people in DC, although this is better now.*
- *I am not aware of any.*
- *No comment.*
- *We were not attuned to the need for lobbying to ensure NCLB funding for geography. I think we simply were not aware of the need, or attuned to what other disciplines were doing.*

The Viability of GENIP

What are its strengths and weaknesses in terms of:

finance?

- *Very minimal.*
- *I don't know the status of GENIP's bank account or budget so can't comment on this.*
- *We need a new product or we will shortly be out of business; what we are doing now is not sustainable.*
- *GENIP's financial success is enviable. Its resources are well managed and its annual budget is a thoughtfully prepared document reflective of the programs and goals established by the Steering Committee. On occasion, the Committee has been more conservative than was necessary.*
- *Limited.*
- *GENIP might consider exploring more grant opportunities to promote funded, collaborative activity among the geography organizations.*
- *GENIP is financially sound and promises to stay so. Support from the four organizations is important politically and psychologically, but it is no longer as crucial as it was in the early days. That is a good sign.*
- *No comment.*
- *The income from sales of Geography for Life has been a huge benefit. But we cannot count on substantial income over the long term from it or the other publications. We have had steady support from the organizations, but AGS and NCGE both have very tight budgets that make even modest GENIP support significant line items.*

administration?

- *Excellent leadership and coordinator but this is largely a volunteer organization – needs someone dedicated to following through.*
- *Works ok as far as I can tell – although my answer above about Sarah and Roger doing all the work may indicate that a discussion about how others can contribute may be in order.*
- *This needs a total overhaul. We need to rethink the representation scheme (executive directors vs. other members; the role of the project coordinator, appointment of a permanent Chair vs. revolving chair)*
- *Crisp. Spartan. Efficient. Professional. Uncomplicated. GENIP is managed well with the cooperative interaction of a coordinator and Steering Committee chair.*
- *Roger and Sarah do an excellent job.*
- *As a whole, GENIP seems to perform efficiently and with due respect for the diversity of perspectives among its members.*
- *Strong. But on general principles (see “Failures” above) there should probably be more frequent turnover. This is painful advice, because leadership in recent years has been so good. But if GENIP seems to be locked up by the same small group of people for too long, no matter how capable, its image suffers. Also, even the best run out of steam and ideas after a while.*
- *No comment.*
- *We could not possibly have better leadership than Roger and Sarah. Both do incredible work for GENIP. NCGE does a good job handling the financial administration and sales. No complaints.*

What would/do the founders of GENIP think of us now? In other words, how do we stand from an historical perspective?

- *Don't know.*
- *I think GENIP is fulfilling exactly the mission of the original founders. The only exception to this is the question of GENIP doing its own projects now. I think the original mission was simply to serve as an overseeing body for the four other organizations.*
- *I think they would be impressed with how hard we work; the contacts/ appointments we make during the biannual meetings (Friday) were not part of the original scheme. And they would approve of the way we continue to serve as a steering committee and not as a separate entity.*
- *They are smiling upon GENIP. It has endured and had played a major role in the progress of geography education over two decades. And it has done it quite unassumingly.*
- *It has been very positive.*
- *I'm not able to comment.*
- *They would be surprised at how strong GENIP is financially and programmatically and at the high level of representation on the Steering Committee. They would be stunned at the*

establishment of AP and proud that GENIP played such a key role in making that happen.

- *Successes outnumber greatly any failures, and organizationally that is positive.*
- *I think we have really evolved with the times, responding to opportunities and challenges associated with APHG, NAEP, NCLB, etc.*

Who are our peers? Who else is effective in the carrying out a GENIP-like mission in the education field?

- *None in geography education. Any individual geography organization could undertake some of the specific projects.*
- *None noted that I'm aware of. It's really pretty exciting to think that our discipline has crafted and refined not only the Alliance structure but also GENIP as an overarching organizing body.*
- *I am not sure there is another group like us in education.*
- *Peers – NCSS, State Alliances, regional affiliates of NCSS, College Board. Hard to tell GENIP's equivalent but it might be some off the education think tanks and foundation. Are there other organizational models that we should consider? NSTA seems to be heading in a direction that GENIP might want to monitor carefully. The idea of developing ways of broadening classroom resources for teachers is very appealing. So is being available to trouble shoot for them on instructional and content issues.*
- *We have no peers---GENIP is absolutely essential at creating a structured approach to communication among the 4 key geography organizations.*
- *I'm not aware of an equivalent body.*
- *No one.*
- *Social Science Education Consortium in a somewhat limited way.*
- *I don't know of any other similar collaboration within other disciplines.*

Are there other organizational models that we should consider?

- *Probably but don't know of one.*
- *None noted.*
- *Not that I am aware of---*
- *I think GENIP conducts itself effectively as it is currently structured.*
- *No.*
- *No comment.*
- *I don't think so.*

Where do we have the most difficulty?

- *Follow through.*
- *Getting things done. This is a volunteer organization. It is difficult to ask already busy people to contribute even more than they already do.*
- *Probably in trying to keep up with all that is happening without being hampered by the fatigue factor.*
- *Regular communication.*
- *Identifying new, creative projects to tackle—new approaches to the same old, difficult challenges. I worry that the group may be running out of steam. New blood might help.*
- *No comment.*
- *Communicating with members of our organizations. Should be an easy fix!*

The Future of GENIP

What do you see as the biggest threats to K–12 geography education and to GENIP?

- *Continued low public perception of geography, declining financial base for GENIP.*
- *The ongoing dominance of both history and social studies in the curriculum in K-12 education. The invisibility of geography as a critically important piece of the curriculum that remains (despite all our efforts to bring it to public attention). A concern that AP Human Geography will not ever have enough highly trained teachers to teach it and so it will be difficult to disseminate the course much more widely than it is now. The fact that there is still no separate teaching credential for geography teachers. Even one measly geography class is still not required for high school graduation in the majority of states.*
- *The first threat to geography comes from its position within the social studies, an interdisciplinary domain dominated by history. The struggle for time in the curriculum between history and geography threatens geography's existence. A second threat comes from NCLB. NCLB's emphasis on mathematics, reading, and science has led geography educators to recast our subject matter in the context of these subjects to see any class time for geography. All of this has occurred with little outcry from a public unsure of the value of geography to the general populace. The biggest threat to geography education might be that there are just not enough people who care about it to fight for its existence.*
- *The aggressiveness of the history education community – especially its almost carnal desire to satiate the social studies curriculum with US history. The national trend toward narrowing the curriculum as a result of the accountability provisions in NCLB as they relate to reading, math and science. The challenge to use the Internet well as a teaching/learning tool since, too often, it disperses knowledge because of its breadth and thus there is little focus to what students learn. The failure of classroom teachers and their students to move beyond the Internet as a research source to books, documents, visual, original sources, field experiences, etc.*
- *Lack of a 'full-court' press to make the case for geographic education on the hill. Lack of key congresspersons who will carry the flag for geography. Lack of sustaining the geographic*

alliance network at a national level. Regarding sustaining GENIP—it is a continued commitment by all 4 organizations as to the continued value of GENIP.

- *The continued lack of federal funding in the Elementary and Secondary Education act will make it difficult to accomplish broad-based reform. The fact that geography is presently untested in many states hinders its potential to become more central in the school curriculum.*
- *Loss of momentum, fatigue, shortage of new ideas, drop in funding from NGS, greater focus at NGS on publicity-driven priorities, drop in NCGE membership for demographic reasons and shrinkage of alliances, possible shifting priorities at AGS and AAG.*
- *That geography becomes the discipline with too much focus on technology (especially GIS) that we lose sight of the numerous ways that the discipline enables learners (both young and old) to inquire using other types of scholarly techniques and materials. We don't want to leave the impression that in order to teach geography one must have a computer lab – although we want to indicate to technologically advantaged teachers and students that the technology provides a terrific means to reach the desirable end point and that end point can be reached different ways.*
- *K–12 geography education: The NCLB focus on math, reading, science.*
- *GENIP: Continued long-term institutional support; continued leadership of the caliber provided by Roger and Sarah.*

What do you see as the biggest opportunities for K-12 geography education and for GENIP?

- *Interdisciplinary programs, online activities, national initiatives.*
- *Responding to the needs listed above.*
- *At the same time that geography education is plagued by significant weaknesses and threats, it is also blessed with opportunities. The growth of geospatial technologies and related industries and services provide a tremendous opportunity for geography to create a clear and persuasive image of itself as playing a key role in these areas. Making the connections between technology, geography, and careers should have a positive impact on geography's curricular status. An opportunity related to this lies in spatial thinking, an emerging area of research and interest among geographic information scientists, geographers, cognitive scientists, and psychologists. It could help to re-position geography as a core competency rather than a peripheral add-on to the curriculum.*
Beyond these technologically-related opportunities, the introduction and growth of a course in Human Geography in the prestigious college credit program Advanced Placement (AP), which could be categorized as a strength, provides students in states and school districts in which there is no high school course the opportunity for a high level learning experience at an advanced level of school. Finally, two related initiatives of the National Geographic Society offer geography education tremendous opportunities: the introduction of federal legislation The Teaching Geography is Fundamental Act in summer 2005, and a public engagement campaign entitled My Wonderful World.
- *improving teacher quality; meaningfully integrating geography into the totality of the curriculum*

- *We need to do all we can to create a national agenda in education that sees geography as central or at the core. If we can do that, GENIP can help facilitate implementation strategies for moving geography forward at a national level.*
- *Promoting the study of geography as preparation for a rewarding and interesting career; Using spatial thinking concepts as tools for building connections across the school curriculum.*
- *There are so many high visibility events and issues, both national and international, that could be cited with explanation of how better geographic understanding on part of Americans could help in grasping and dealing with them. These present huge possibilities for promoting the “geographer’s eye.”*
- *At the high school level it is APHG. In the earlier grades, as well as high school, it is the close relationship between geographic analysis and the pressing global issues such as migration, population, environment, global change, economic restructuring, land use, etc.*
- *K-12 geography education: supporting the Senate bill and the NGS public relations campaign; advancing APHG; ensuring continued NAEP Geography Assessments; focusing research and curriculum materials projects on the NRC work on spatial learning.*
- *GENIP: supporting the above.*

What’s the worst that would happen if GENIP ceased to exist?

- *Lose touch with other key geography education players.*
- *The four organizations in geography might duplicate their efforts.*
- *All the organizations would stop talking to each other. NGS would have no connection to geography any more.*
- *Some other mechanism would have to emerge to facilitate communication among GENIP’s four sponsoring organizations. Response to significant issues in geography education would be less prompt, and would run the risk of being either ignored or overlooked. Much of the research that has resulted from funding intern projects at NGS and AAG would likely go undone and be unaddressed.*
- *A more de-centralized focus that could seriously weaken K-12 geography as part of the national agenda.*
- *It would be more difficult to coordinate activity among the geography organizations so that everyone is pulling ahead in one direction.*
- *Duplication and wasteful competition among the four organizations – not limited just to efforts in K-12 geo-ed. Loss of the synergy and creativity generated by discussing issues together. It would be a loss for the whole geography community, not just for K-12 geography education.*
- *The parent organizations would revert to a less coordinated focus on geoed. The advantages of group strength – to the extent that GENIP exercises it – would be largely lost.*
- *Geography education could no longer claim to be speaking with one voice.*

If you could set goals for the next five years, what would they be? How would we know that we

had achieved each goal?

- *Financial sustainability and growth. 30% increase in annual revenues over 5 years.*
- *More widespread geography adoption by schools (through state assessments, high school exit exam and other requirements, AP Human Geography).*
- *I'm unable to answer this since I haven't been at the GENIP table for a number of years.*

Sorry.

- *Develop one or more popular products to support ongoing GENIP activities.*
- *Institutionalize a strong geography presence at NCSS.*
- *Revise the framework for the NAEP tests.*
- *Establish a formal relationship with NCATE and other teacher certifying agencies in order to increase geography's role in the preparation of teachers at all grade levels K-12.*
- *Establish as a target 25,000 AP Human Geography test takers.*
- *Promote including the NAAEP geography in the national testing program currently being considered by USDOE.*
- *Develop position statements on a national curriculum (of which geography will be a part) and a national testing program (also including geography) Each goal is stated in measurable terms. The outcomes are observable.*
- *Organize our activities to have the biggest impact on k-12 and the national media. We need to re-establish our national network of teachers, gain national support for such a network, and see measurable results in learning outcomes (at least on a selected basis).*
- *To build on the AAG Online Career Guide, GENIP should publish and disseminate informative, visually appealing materials focused on careers in geography. Target audience: school guidance counselors, K-12 students, and parents.*
- *Stronger teacher certification and preparation in 10 more states.*
- *Adoption of better geography standards in 10 more states.*
- *Quadrupling of students taking AP tests.*
- *Quadrupling of teachers taking workshops to prepare for teaching AP geography. Since these are quantifiable goals, it would be pretty obvious whether or not they are met.*
- *Work toward ensuring that geography has an important place in the curriculum. (Support funding for standards-based geography education in the schools, for research, and for curriculum/curriculum materials development through communications with the relevant agencies and organizations and by developing guidelines for grass-roots communications.)*
- *Support increased enrollments in APHG.*
- *Ensure continued NAEP Geography Assessments.*
- *Communicate more effectively with the members of our organizations (newsletters, websites).*
- *Develop more collaboration with NCSS.*
- *Keep the Standards alive. Develop a technology-based update to Geography for Life. Progress toward these goals would be easy to measure since all can be quantified by keeping track of the activities and the impacts they have.*

If you could reshape GENIP, what changes would you make and why?

- *Greater financial stability would enable the organization to grow and hire a permanent staff.*
- *Ditto.*
- *Position the project coordinator close to Washington DC.*
- *No immediate need to change or restructure GENIP. The strategic plan on which the Steering Committee is embarking offers the promise of positive change.*
- *More frequent dialogue---to maintain momentum on important initiatives.*
- *Appoint 3-5 individuals to serve on an external review committee for the purpose of providing GENIP with objective feedback on its activities and procedures.*
- *Invite one or two graduate students to serve on the GENIP committee.*
- *Appoint task forces to carry out specific areas of activity (e.g., NAEP, AP Human Geography) and invite individuals outside of GENIP to participate on a volunteer or commissioned basis. A task force should be asked to prepare a short description of how it will carry out its work. Upon approval by GENIP approval, the task force would be expected to complete its work within an agreed time period.*
- *If we could afford it, it might help to add one more representative from each of the four organizations. We need continuity but we also need more ideas, more talent, and more workers.*
- *No comment.*
- *I would add two more meetings a year via teleconference. I think it would maintain better momentum.*

Some Odd Questions about Genip

Should we change the name to Geography instead of Geographic?

- *I like Geographic better.*
- *Yep – good idea.*
- *Isn't it already?*
- *Yes. Very definitely. Geography is more accurate, more descriptive, more appropriate.*
- *Yes.*
- *Isn't the acronym already Geography Education National Implementation Project?*
- *Geography would be more appealing. It sounds more ordinary and less academic.*
- *Yes, but it may not make much difference.*
- *Yes.*

How do you think others see us? Do others even know that we exist?

- *Largely invisible.*
- *See above.*
- *The best way to answer this question is to ask: what would geography education be like today if GENIP never came onto the scene? GENIP over the past two decades has been responsible, persistent, anticipatory, and often eager in promoting geography education K-12. As a result, its sponsoring organizations respect and value its role, support it without any significant reservation, and appoint Steering Committee members who over all have been effective and diligent. Others know we exist when it is important for them to know that we exist (e.g., when they have a need, a question, a problem, etc.) Over the years, there are a number of examples of this. GENIP is not by design a high profile effort. It was never meant to be.*
- *Limited understanding of GENIP; not many even know about us.*
- *I don't think GENIP has a high profile outside of the geography education community.*
- *They are either unaware of GENIP or they are suspicious that it is some small inbred group of insiders working rather secretly, and that is a shame. I wish there were some way to make more people aware of what GENIP is and what it does and has done.*
- *Yes, but we should do more to put GENIP in front of the members of the organizations that comprise GENIP.*
- *Others don't see enough of us and too many people don't know we exist.*

Should we meet more frequently?

- *If we have some particular reason.*
- *No, too expensive. But conference calls in between meetings could prove helpful.*
- *We should try more frequent phone calls in order to make sure our goals are being met.*
- *Meetings should be determined by needs and to address specific agendas. Semi-annual meetings seemed to have worked well. Flexibility is important so the Committee never has to meet because it is supposed to – only because it should/must.*
- *Yes.*
- *I think two face-to-face meetings are sufficient. I think our impact would be greater if we planned out the next five years to focus on specific areas and to allocate more time at our meetings to report on progress and plan future activity for individual projects. Though it is important to communicate with organizations outside of the discipline, much of that activity could be done on behalf of GENIP by the geography organizations or appropriate individuals during the year. Meetings with other organizations should be scheduled for the purpose of supporting existing initiatives; exploratory meetings should be minimized until more time and resources become available to support new work.*
- *Yes.*
- *No, unless a specific project necessitated it.*
- *Yes, but the cost is an issue. See the response to the next question.*

Could we make more effective use of electronic communications such as teleconferences instead of face-to-face meetings?

- *Probably.*
- *Yes, see above.*
- *On occasion, teleconferencing is effective, but face-to-face interaction evokes the most productive results. We learn a lot from each other from tone, inflection, body language, passion (or lack thereof). More good things seem to happen around a green felt table than electronically.*
- *Yes.*
- *Yes. We could add these. They would be a challenge to organize, but if it were done on a schedule set up in advance, just as the meetings are, they could work.*
- *Yes, regular teleconference sessions can motivate and focus people on tasks that are largely individual. Major planning sessions continue to be activated more effectively in face to face sessions.*
- *Not instead of, but in addition to. I think at least two in-person meetings per year are necessary.*