UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY
OU_150866
UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

Presented

With the Compliments of

THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE

OF

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

THE COLLEGE AND TEACHER EDUCATION

COMMISSION ON TEACHER EDUCATION

Appointed by the American Council on Education

E. S. EVENDEN, Teachers College, Columbia University, *Chairman*

RALPH W. TYLER, University of Chicago, *Vice Chairman*

HAROLD BENJAMIN, University of Maryland

MILDRED ENGLISH, Georgia State College for Women

HARRY M. GAGE, Lindenwood College

HELEN HAY HEYL, New York State Education Department

CHARLES W. HUNT, Oneonta State Teachers College (New York)

HAROLD E. JONES, University of California

FRED J. KELLY, United States Office of Education

LEWIS MUMFORD, Stanford University

SHELTON PHELPS, Winthrop College*

W. CARSON RYAN, University of North Carolina

PAYSON SMITH, University of Maine†

ALEXANDER J. STODDARD, Philadelphia Public Schools

FRANK W. THOMAS, Fresno State College (California)

GEORGE F. ZOOK, American Council on Education, *ex officio*

KARL W. BIGELOW, *Director*

* Retired in 1943.
† Chairman from 1938 to 1942.

THE COLLEGE AND TEACHER EDUCATION

By

W. Earl Armstrong, Ernest V. Hollis,
and Helen E. Davis

Prepared for the
Commission on Teacher Education

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION
Washington, D.C.
1944

COPYRIGHT 1944 BY THE AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, D.C., PUBLISHED NOVEMBER 1944

Brief parts of this report may be quoted without special permission provided credit is given. Permission to quote extended passages may be secured through the Commission on Teacher Education, 744 Jackson Place, Washington 6, D.C.

Foreword

In 1939 the Commission on Teacher Education invited a representative sample of American colleges, universities, and school systems to join with it in a cooperative study of teacher education. For the following three years these institutions made special efforts to improve their programs for the preparation of teachers and for the facilitation of their growth in competence on the job. Each center acted according to its own plans, but interchange of ideas was frequent and the Commission provided a variety of services upon request. Many interesting and significant developments ensued.

This book is a report based mainly on what happened in the colleges and universities associated in the cooperative study. Like other reports in the same series it sketches the Commission's work, describes and analyzes specific activities carried on in the affiliated centers, and sets forth the authors' own interpretations and conclusions. It has been organized, in general, in terms of well recognized aspects of programs for the preparation of teachers, although institutional contributions to in-service education have also been treated. But what is particularly striking about the report is its emphasis on the way in which all program aspects proved to be interrelated and on how certain basic ideas and ways of working tended to bring faculty members closer together and give greater unity to institutional programs.

The report has been jointly prepared by W. Earl Armstrong, Ernest V. Hollis, and Helen E. Davis. Both Dr. Armstrong, who was head of the department of education at Mills College before he joined the Commission staff in 1938, and Dr. Hollis, who came from the department of education at the College of the City of New York in 1940, served as field coordinators in the cooperative study. Dr. Davis, who had formerly participated in

surveys of the work of various youth-serving agencies, became associate in charge of the Commission's clearinghouse services in 1940. Dr. Armstrong, in 1943, was appointed dean of the college at Ohio Wesleyan University, and Dr. Hollis, early in 1944, went to the United States Office of Education as principal specialist in higher education.

The book is based fundamentally on what was actually done, during the course of the cooperative study of teacher education, by the colleges and universities that participated therein. It deals with activities in which hundreds of persons—presidents, deans, other administrative officers, professors, students, and, indeed, representatives of school systems and state departments of education—responsibly shared. It has drawn heavily upon reports from affiliated institutions, reports that were usually voluminous and cooperatively prepared. The Commission wishes, consequently, to express its appreciation not only to the authors of the present book, but also to all those others who contributed in many ways to making the preparation of the volume possible.

The authors have, of course, been free to express their own views, and they assume responsibility for all statements made. Passages referring to particular institutions were, however, submitted for review as to accuracy: they may be taken to be correct for the period covered, but the reader will understand that changes occurring since 1942 have not been dealt with. The authors wish to acknowledge the value of suggestions and criticisms from staff colleagues and from two members of the Commission—E. S. Evenden and Charles W. Hunt—who constituted an advisory committee. As in the case of all Commission volumes where the contrary is not explicitly stated, the action of the director in recommending, and of the Commission in authorizing, publication of this report does not necessarily imply endorsement of all that is contained therein.

KARL W. BIGELOW
Director

Contents

PAGE

FOREWORD v

I. THE COOPERATIVE STUDY OF TEACHER EDUCATION 1

The Commission and Its Mandate 1

Launching the Cooperative Study 5

The colleges and universities; the Bennington planning conference; subsequent developments

Plan of This Book 12

II. TOWARD IMPLEMENTING STUDENT PERSONNEL . . 15

Student Personnel in the Cooperative Study . 15

From Centralization at Greeley 20

The setting; records and freshman orientation; the personnel council; the counseling program; by way of summary

From Departmentalization at Tuskegee . . . 31

The setting; the guidance council; improving the social atmosphere; by way of summary

Strong Coordination at Newark 42

The setting; highlights of the personnel program; relations with the work in practice teaching; by way of summary

Initiating a Program at William and Mary . . 50

The first undertakings; the work of the study committees; some of the results; by way of summary

Some General Conclusions 56

III. WORKING ON GENERAL EDUCATION 59

General Education in the Teachers Colleges . 60

The critical difference of opinion; toward positive results

PAGE

Starting from Life Interests at Troy 66

The setting; the initial period of study; toward fusing guidance and general education; the emerging core in bio-social development; by way of summary

The Area Curriculum at Milwaukee . . . 78

The setting and first steps; changes in the fifth area; work in the area on physical science; by way of summary

A Seminar at Columbia University 87

Nature and scope of the project; the course of the discussion; by way of summary

Some General Conclusions 93

IV. Emphasis on the Major Field 96

Repatterning Agricultural Education at Raleigh 99

The nature of the problem; minority tactics and methods of study; aspects of the emerging curriculum; by way of summary

Raising the Issues in Texas 108

The setting; the committee on the natural sciences; toward implementing the proposals; by way of summary

A New Program at Harvard 119

Origin and scope; highlights of the recommendations; by way of summary

Some General Conclusions 126

V. Patterns of Teacher Education 128

The Program at the College of St. Catherine . 129

Overview of the program for teachers; the sophomore and junior courses; arrangements for student teaching; by way of summary

Joint Faculty-Student Work in Texas . . . 137

The setting; the experimental groups X and Y; results of the experiment and problems ahead; by way of summary

PAGE

Curricular Revision at Stanford 146

The setting and first steps; scope and emphasis of the revision; further revision in the light of experience; by way of summary

The Cooperative Program at Columbia . . . 155

The setting; content of the program; the chief problems encountered; by way of summary

Some General Conclusions 164

VI. Recurring Emphases in Teacher Education . . 167

Study Methods and Resources 169

Toward understanding child behavior; toward understanding social process; the role of the arts and music; direct experience as a means of integration; by way of summary

Student Teaching in the Cooperative Study . . 180

Certain administrative problems; improving the campus school; off-campus practice teaching in small towns

College and School in Williamsburg 189

Developments at Matthew Whaley; developments in the department of education; a brief appraisal

An Illustration from Florida 197

The setting in the state program; at Florida State College for Women; the internship off-campus; a brief appraisal

Some General Conclusions 209

VII. Colleges and Schools 212

A Pattern for the M.A. in Ohio 214

The state workshop of 1940; the social studies conference of 1941; subsequent developments at Ohio State; by way of summary

A Summer Workshop in Spokane 222

Workshops in teacher education; the Spokane workshop of 1941; certain later developments

PAGE

Off-Campus Programs in Nebraska 229
The centers for in-service education; by way of illustration; toward community schools; emphasis on child behavior; by way of summary

A Year-round Program in North Carolina . . 241
The setting and first steps; part-time study during the regular year; summer activities; the elementary major at Greensboro; by way of summary

Some General Conclusions 252

VIII. Integration and the Group Approach . . . 256

The Modern Drive toward Integration . . . 257
Resistance among college teachers; planning in the cooperative study

The Group Emphasis at Kalamazoo 266
Organizing for the cooperative study; achievements on the side of content; results of the group process

Teamwork at Ohio State University 276
The setting; the committee on initiation of program; the college policy committee; review and appraisal

Some General Conclusions 286

IX. Reflections and Conclusions 292

Problems of the Group Approach 292
The problem of faculty readiness; the problem of statesmanship

The Elements of Teacher Education . . . 302

The Emerging Responsibility of Collegiate Institutions 307
The role of the subject-matter specialist; the full scope of teacher education

I

The Cooperative Study of Teacher Education

THIS BOOK is about the experience of certain colleges and universities associated for three years in a nationwide project known as the cooperative study of teacher education. It is thus a companion volume to another report in this series dealing with the corresponding experience of selected systems of public schools.[1] The study was an experiment in joint thinking and group action with respect to the preparation and continuous growth in service of teachers—using the term to cover school administrators and supervisors as well as the instructional staff. This enterprise constituted a major part of the field program undertaken by the Commission on Teacher Education, a body created by the American Council on Education. Some description of the scope and orientation of the study is in order to serve as background for the body of the text.[2]

THE COMMISSION AND ITS MANDATE

The American Council began to give marked attention to problems of teacher education in 1936. Various informal discussions and conferences on the subject with representatives of literally all educational interests of the United States culminated, during that year, in the appointment of a special subcommittee of the Council's Problems and Plans Committee to explore the situation and make recommendations for a possible study. The subcommittee's report was reviewed by the parent

[1] Charles E. Prall and C. Leslie Cushman, *Teacher Education in Service* (Washington: American Council on Education, 1944).

[2] See also *Teachers for Our Times, a Statement of Purposes by the Commission on Teacher Education* (Washington: American Council on Education, 1944).

body in February 1937 and a year later was published by the Council under the title, *Major Issues in Teacher Education.* It was as a result of this activity that funds were obtained from the General Education Board with which to create the agency known as the Commission on Teacher Education. Eventually, a group of fifteen educators from widely representative branches of the profession was asked to serve on this body; their names and institutional affiliation will be found on a front page of this volume. The Commission entered upon its work early in 1938 and officially closed its books on August 31, 1944.

The kind of study called for in *Major Issues* was not a fact-finding survey so much as a project in implementation—that is to say, essentially in getting things done or translating theory into ongoing practice. After stressing first that teacher education had been experiencing for some time "reasonably vigorous self-examination from within the profession" and that, furthermore, the initial emphasis had "very properly been upon inventorying facts and analyzing them," the report went on to insist that what was needed at that time was "more experimentation, demonstration, and evaluation, on the basis of hypotheses in which there is reason to have confidence because of previous careful study." Widespread dissatisfaction on the part of educators was noted over the fact that in almost every major division of the field, not only had practice lagged "well behind the best in theory," but training institutions had failed to adjust to the fundamental reconstruction going on inside education itself, in response to "many new developments in American life and culture" and in the light of "a substantially altered theory of education."

The report identified thirteen major issues confronting those responsible for the preparation of teachers and their continued growth in service, and outlined six sample projects that might be undertaken to deal with some of them. The subcommittee's thinking was preponderantly from the standpoint of teacher-educating institutions, though the importance of growth on the job was recognized, and focused conspicuously on two groups or configurations of problems. For instance, five of the "issues" and three of the suggested projects dealt with the gen-

eral subject of preparation, singling out for particular mention the teacher's prevalent lack of understanding of child nature and the educative process, and his largely inadequate grounding in subject matter, practice teaching, and creative activities. Another five "issues" and one of the sample studies were addressed to the area of mutual adjustment or articulation of effort among educational agencies within a given community or region, with special attention to such matters as competition for students, certification requirements, and financial support. The remaining three issues emphasized had to do with clarifying the objectives of teacher education, recruitment and selection of candidates for the profession, and in-service education. The report concluded by insisting that the manner of attack advocated made "participation of many kinds of institution not only necessary but urgent" and calling for the "utmost in ingenious collaboration" in connection with any study authorized.[3]

From the outset, members of the Commission were disposed to take a broad view of the scope appropriate to their program. Basing their deliberations on *Major Issues,* they quickly reached the point of stressing implementation as over against research or controlled experiment, and came to see their task essentially as cooperative demonstration in living situations. However, proceeding on the assumptions that any step or advance is dependent upon the complete understanding and acceptance of all concerned, and that all parts of any program are functionally related, something of a shift in their thinking occurred with respect to the general method to be followed. Instead of accepting the pattern of separate, fairly comprehensive projects tentatively put forward in *Major Issues,* the Commission preferred to concentrate on promoting the integrated attack of whole institutions on their entire programs. In so doing it accepted the possibility, if not probability, of coming out with a variety of tested procedures found useful (or the opposite) in every problem area emphasized, rather than any formal set of standards to be recommended for general adoption. Process—the way things

[3] *Major Issues in Teacher Education* (Washington: American Council on Education, 1938), *passim,* especially pp. 7-9 and 43.

were done—was more or less consciously given precedence over specified content, and any thoroughgoing or definitive treatment of particular interests was, by implication, renounced.

Accordingly, when the Commission made its first public declaration of policy in February 1939,[4] primary emphasis was put on the proposed methods of work. The premises laid down called for acting directly with and through existing agencies, stimulating cooperative attack and experimental activity related to locally recognized problems, encouraging continuous self-evaluation, and avoiding any set pattern or centralized plan. The range and scope of the program were held to be as wide as the field itself, including all problems of educational significance to teachers from the day of first deciding to prepare for the profession until retirement. That is to say, any problem in the field was seen as potentially useful to the Commission's central purpose and, if due care were exercised in the selection of institutions with which to collaborate, wide coverage of the most pressing difficulties was thought to be assured. Those problems of deepest significance to the world of teacher education at large were to be given preference, but otherwise the accent was strongly on local choice. The keynote of the Commission's policy was sounded in the recurring phrase, "to facilitate efforts at self-improvement." The actual content of the program was expected to develop from the grass roots.

In addition to a number of subsidiary activities of various kinds but predominantly of a cooperative nature, the Commission eventually put its main energies into two major projects: the cooperative study of teacher education and a series of all-state programs. The former got under way in late August 1939 and was terminated in June 1942. The state program was opened early in 1940 and ran through the academic year 1942-43. A staff of ten persons besides the director was responsible for heading up the work. Special services were provided in child study, evaluation, publications, teacher personnel, and the conduct of workshops. Headquarters were maintained in Washington and

[4] In *Cooperation in the Improvement of Teacher Education* (Washington: American Council on Education, 1939).

additional offices were made available, respectively, by the University of Chicago (for the division on child development and teacher personnel) and Northwestern University (for the workshop advisory service).

Before addressing ourselves to the section of the program specifically assigned to us in this book, it may be worth pausing to observe that the Commission's experience was all of a piece throughout. Whether at the pre-service or in-service level, in the cooperative study or the all-state projects, the process was everywhere the same: individual growth and institutional integration took place side by side and simultaneously—were part and parcel of one development—as minds were brought together around common objectives increasingly recognized to be important. Incidentally the initially rather subordinate interest in education on the job underwent significant transformation. Concern over the factors conditioning professional growth and awareness of teachers as persons gathered momentum with the progress of the studies. The decision to work directly with public schools as well as collegiate institutions was of the greatest consequence in that it brought the two groups into direct and fruitful contact. But the original notion that the former would address themselves to in-service education while the latter took care of pre-service education turned out to be meaningless. The vitalizing *objective* of cooperative endeavor in the overwhelming majority of cases turned out to be curricular revision, although the students to be served were either "prospective teachers" or "the nation's children" as the case might be. And the immediate and striking *results* of such activity were in-service education everywhere, for college professors and administrators quite as much as for school people. The implications of this statement should become clearer in the succeeding chapters of this report.

Launching the Cooperative Study

After the plan was adopted for the national and statewide studies, great care was taken in the selection of institutions, systems of public schools, and state departments of education

to be invited to associate themselves with the Commission. The criteria used were of two kinds. First of all, there was a general qualitative criterion having to do with a given center's vitality and promise of vigorous pursuit of announced plans, its willingness to try new things, and its commitment to the group approach. Then a set of classificatory criteria was applied to ensure the inclusion of all relevant types of institution and program emphasis, geographical distribution, and the avoidance of extreme or special cases. The final choice included fourteen systems or groups of systems of public schools, both large and small, situated in rural, suburban, small-city, and metropolitan areas in widely separated sections of the country. It also included twenty institutions, or groups of institutions, of higher learning. Since these latter form the subject of this book we shall describe them in greater detail.

The colleges and universities

During the early months of 1939, members of the Commission staff visited a total of ninety-four institutions of higher learning that had signified some interest in the proposed cooperative study. Careful consideration of the documents and plans submitted by these colleges and universities, supplemented by the staff observations, resulted in a first sifting which reduced the number to eighty-six. Since the Commission had decided that, in view of the time and resources at its disposal, the profession would be served best by intensive work with relatively few centers, the final selection was limited to twenty. Even so this figure really allowed for another four institutions since two of the large universities invited each provided for the full cooperation of three virtually autonomous constituent colleges.

The six universities that participated in the study were Columbia University (Barnard, Columbia, and Teachers Colleges), Ohio State University, Stanford University, the University of Nebraska, the University of North Carolina (Chapel Hill, State College of Agriculture and Engineering, and Woman's College), and the University of Texas. There were five

colleges of liberal arts: Claremont Colleges, the College of St. Catherine, the College of William and Mary, Middlebury College, and Oberlin College. Seven of the associated institutions were state teachers colleges: the Alabama State Teachers College at Troy, the Colorado State College of Education at Greeley, Eastern Kentucky State Teachers College at Richmond, the New Jersey State Teachers College at Newark, Southern Illinois State Normal University at Carbondale, Western Michigan College of Education at Kalamazoo, and the Wisconsin State Teachers College at Milwaukee. Finally, there were two Negro colleges, Prairie View State College and Tuskegee Institute. Because of their close relations with public schools in the cooperative study, three additional institutions were drawn into the Commission's immediate sphere of influence: Wayne University through the Detroit Public Schools, Furman University through the Greenville and Parker District systems, and the University of Houston through the schools of that city.

Some of the colleges and universities in this list are privately endowed, others are publicly supported; one operates under Roman Catholic auspices. Some of them are coeducational, others admit only young men or women. The student body before Pearl Harbor varied from 300 or 500, in some cases, to over 10,000 in others. Certain of the institutions specialize in preparing elementary teachers, while others concentrate on the secondary field, on college training, or on the training of rural teachers. In some, teacher education is the sole institutional objective, in others it is the foremost among several interests, and in others the concern of only a specialized minority. Every major region and type of community in the United States, with all the cultural differences they imply, are likewise to be found in the several campus environments. Some institutions operate in relatively crowded areas where competition with other colleges and universities is keen, and some are the only institutions of higher learning in a considerable stretch of territory. In short, no two of the cooperating centers were exactly alike and practically the full range of diversity in American higher education was in some degree represented.

The Bennington planning conference

The first year of the Commission's life was thus given to laying down major strategy and selecting the centers to be asked to take part in the cooperative study of teacher education. During the last two weeks of August 1939, a planning conference of representatives from the institutions and school systems in question was held on the campus of Bennington College. The great diversity of the attendance, combined with its common interest in the education of teachers, proved to be a determining factor in the high level of interstimulation attained on this occasion. The purpose of the meeting was to launch the national study officially and agree on the main outlines for the work of the next three academic years. Two exceptions were made to the general rule of waiting for all leads from the participating centers themselves; the initial contact with the field had indicated such widespread interest in child development and teacher selection and adjustment that plans, including staff appointments, for service in these areas had been made before the conference met.

The delegates at Bennington—some four-fifths of whom were presidents, deans, superintendents, principals, supervisors, heads of departments, or similar administrative officers—were first asked to meet for two working sessions by institutional type. Five groups were organized representing small and large school systems, colleges of liberal arts, teachers colleges, and universities. Each section was asked to canvass the important problems in teacher education as they themselves experienced them. The several compilations were then submitted to the conference as a whole; it is possible to gauge something of the spread and depth of concern felt over each problem by the strength of the vote according to which the most important ones were chosen for further refinement. Twelve discussion groups were then organized around the selected topics, made up in each case from all institutional types represented.

While enthusiasm ran high at Bennington and unmistakable evidence was afforded of the notable stretch given to initial con-

cepts, most of the thinking on this occasion was nonetheless diffuse and liable to impulsive spurts. In large measure this was of course inherent in the situation since the delegates had been asked to ferret out all important problems in a field as comprehensive as teacher education, and since relatively little time was available for the process. It is also true that most of the difficulties presented had been "felt" in everyday and fairly specific practice rather than critically analyzed or generalized. Nearly two-thirds of the 120 items laid before the delegates received votes for further consideration from but a fifth or less of the total conference.

The major trend of interest was on the other hand perfectly clear. In order of roughly combined emphasis from the several institutional groups and the conference vote, attention may be said to have drawn to a focus around the following problem areas: the general and professional preparation of teachers to meet the requirements of a functional philosophy of education, teacher and student personnel with special reference to selection and guidance, coordination of effort largely among the different departments or other administrative divisions within an institution, the need for continuous self-evaluation and clarification of aims, effective methods of studying children, and to some extent around social understanding and community relations. To these emphases the steering committee, when arranging for the topical discussion groups, added the role of the arts in teacher education, which had been put forward only by the large school systems and which had not received more than a few votes from the conference floor.

Comparing the Bennington results with *Major Issues,* it may be said that agreement was more conspicuous than disagreement but that a certain shift was nevertheless quite marked. Both reports emphasized first and foremost the importance of protecting the profession and raising its standards by control at the source of supply; the basic means were thought of in terms of greatly improving the preparation of teachers and of more exacting procedures of selection. Both reports likewise stressed the significance of functional objectives. But the Bennington

conference took a long step toward the greater recognition of teachers as persons, on which we have already commented as characteristic of the study itself, and it failed to match the original subcommittee's outstanding interest in matters of interinstitutional competition and adjustment.[5]

Before concluding this account of the Bennington conference we should point out that, as the deliberations were drawing to a close, Hitler's forces crossed the Polish border. The whole course of the cooperative study was thus run under the deepening shadow of global war. At roughly the midpoint of the project's life the United States entered the conflict as a full belligerent. This circumstance should be borne in mind while reading the narratives we have to present. The pressures exerted by the international situation took various forms, some reinforcing the Commission's purpose by emphasizing the need as well as the value of group methods, and others offering more or less serious obstacles to progress. It is worth noting, however, that in no case could failure to complete any project undertaken be attributed to the war.

Subsequent developments

We should perhaps hasten to emphasize that neither *Major Issues* nor the Bennington conference was ever designed or used as a blueprint for the later studies in the several centers. These were essentially stage-setting devices, serving to open up the field and suggest, but not dictate, the appropriate range for local endeavor; the actual content of the cooperative study was developed by the participating units themselves. The conference performed an additional function in that it demonstrated some of the methods and values to be expected from group deliberation. Furthermore, by bringing together individuals from institutions of all kinds, from all parts of the country, and from all branches of the educational profession, it sounded from the start one of the most far-reaching and characteristic notes in the

[5] See *Bennington Planning Conference for the Cooperative Study of Teacher Education: Reports and Addresses, August 21 to September 1, 1939* (Washington: American Council on Education, 1939).

whole field program. Thus the tone for the study was set by the Commission staff and a working pattern offered for local experiment.

After the Bennington conference, the cooperating institutions and systems of public schools set about organizing for their own particular studies. Local coordinators were selected from the outset and it was not long before central planning or steering committees came to the fore in most cases. These groups worked directly with the Commission's field coordinators and special consultants. The basic unit was a working committee, practically always of interdepartmental membership, to give attention to whatever emphases had been locally chosen for study. The general trend of developments in the course of the three-year period was toward consolidating thinking and probing to greater depths. There was a pronounced tendency for the several centers to narrow the scope of their efforts. As far as their work with the Commission was concerned, most of them did significant things in not more than three or four major areas although study groups had originally been organized to deal with many more of the far-flung interests touched on at Bennington.

It should be noted that this concentration of effort often meant considerably enlarged participation and greater seriousness of purpose in the institutions concerned. For there likewise developed, markedly after the first year, a steadily increasing awareness of the substantial interrelatedness of most basic problems in teacher education. It was found true repeatedly that penetrating study of one not only had the effect of at least throwing light on many, but likewise tended to promote mutual acquaintance and integration of effort within the institution as a whole. This process will be given particular emphasis in the body of this report.

During the first year of the cooperative study of teacher education a good deal of trial and error was not only inevitable but obviously desirable. Most of it may be scored up to essential preparation or plowing the ground. Each problem area studied developed unexpected ramifications, minds frequently failed to

click on the same aspect of the matter in hand, and considerable confusion as well as stimulation resulted from the very multiplicity of the Commission's challenge. This was the prevailing situation when representatives from the associated centers were invited to attend a workshop on teacher education sponsored by the Commission at the University of Chicago, during the summer of 1940. The program was built around the expressed wishes of the participants. Child study was here moved to the position of first emphasis, while second in attendance rank was the general field of teacher growth in service. It was the active interest especially of the school systems that accounted for the predominance of these two study areas. Concern over professional curricula and general education ranked next in order, while roughly equal demand—from some twenty participants in each case—was made for help in evaluation, the arts, and a combination of social understanding and school-community relations.

It was especially after the Chicago workshop that the concentration of effort on which we have already commented came so insistently to the fore. The bulk of the hard work for the cooperative study was done during 1940-41 and the first half of 1941-42. Inasmuch as the methods, emphases, and values discovered in the course of this period constitute the raw material for this book, no further description is called for at this point. By the summer of 1942 final reports had been received from practically all of the cooperating units. Without them the series of volumes by the Commission staff—of which this is one—would not have been possible.

Plan of This Book

The great diversity of the institutions participating in the cooperative study posed something of a problem in reporting. Arrangement of our material according to institutional type was discarded since it did not in any adequate way represent the experience of the associated centers. Although size and complexity did have determining effects on local studies, most of the major concerns in teacher education were shared equally

by all of the colleges and universities in question. A plan strictly according to study areas—student personnel, professional education, and the like—we found open to criticism as violating the essentially organic pattern of the cooperative study and underrating local variables. Since we consider the latter to be of the utmost importance, especially when it comes to implementation or translating abstract theory into ongoing practice, we have chosen to put major emphasis on a series of sketches. In these fairly brief statements we have tried to give enough of the setting and particular conditions to show their influence on the local program, to indicate the general procedure adopted, and to describe and interpret the chief outcomes.

Nevertheless, since the immediate object of study for the working groups on these campuses was some phase of the program in teacher education, we have found it convenient to group the fairly comprehensive sketches or case studies we have to present around these topics. We have chosen to follow a sequence roughly corresponding to a student's progress through college. We begin with the work done toward implementing student personnel, since this activity is charged with supervising a student's entrance and orientation to the campus, as well as undergirding and giving direction to his subsequent program. We then proceed through general education, the major field of specialization, and professional education including practice teaching, to a summary discussion of the essentials in teacher preparation as revealed by the several individual programs advocated. In this connection and at the risk of perhaps unnecessary repetition, we should emphasize that no formal consensus or joint recommendation was ever aimed at or secured. That local thinking nevertheless developed toward very similar final conclusions we believe to be of some significance.

The above considerations are given attention in Chapters II through VI and may be thought of as describing the results of the cooperative study with respect to pre-service education. In Chapter VII we then discuss certain aspects of in-service education undertaken by colleges and school systems working together. Chapter VIII is given to an analysis of progress made

toward organic unity or institutional integration, a matter in the forefront of the Commission's thinking from the beginning and in some ways the most important of its specific objectives. In the brief concluding chapter we have summarized the rest of the report in such a way as to emphasize our personal conclusions and general reflections on the findings.

In our treatment we shall make no attempt to distinguish sharply between activities carried on specifically with the Commission's assistance and those developed concomitantly by the several faculties mainly with their own resources. Our focus will be on what actually happened in these colleges, during their association with the Commission, and the methods used in the process. While we have conceived of our task as being primarily that of reporting, we fully recognize that all descriptive analysis involves some interpretation. But in our sketches we have made an effort to keep the particular institution's own aims in view and to judge progress and success or failure in that light. We have not considered it our province to criticize actual content; readers will differ among themselves—as frankly the authors do—as to the merits of the several programs described or recommendations presented. In the case of those reports which are available in print, we have always supplied full publication details in the footnotes to facilitate individual study. We have, however, definitely considered it our job to draw general conclusions as to procedure and the Commission's purpose in each chapter, to indicate significant points of similarity or contrast throughout, and to present our own major convictions at the end of the book. The chief value for the reader, as we see things, lies in the description of how individual faculties set about improving their programs under highly specific, and for that reason characteristic, working conditions.

II

Toward Implementing Student Personnel

With this chapter we begin our report on the thinking and doing of the twenty collegiate institutions during the period of their association with the cooperative study of teacher education. The story we have to tell has to do with changes that were made on the several campuses with a view to improving what was being offered to prepare and otherwise assist teachers in their profession. Some of these changes are concerned with administrative arrangements, others with curriculum content, and still others with working relations. In every case, though in varying degrees, the process of revision and implementation will illustrate not only some of the difficulties and stumbling blocks encountered, but also the educational implications of cooperative effort in behalf of increasingly shared objectives. Our story is about the stimulating effects of personal interaction, about the fruits of joint enterprise, about the consequences to the curriculum and to campus procedure when concern over meeting student needs in realistic fashion becomes the living focus of attention. We shall proceed then with our first major topic.

Student Personnel in the Cooperative Study

Inasmuch as our theme throughout will be the developmental needs of (for the most part prospective) teachers, it is particularly appropriate to start with the implementation of student personnel. There is of course nothing particularly new about counseling and related services for college students, especially as far as theory and intent are concerned. For there have always

been individual deans, registrars, and professors who have made it their business to help young men and women get the most out of their opportunities on the campus. Where student bodies are small and contacts easy between undergraduates and members of the faculty, informal methods may still offer an adequate solution. With the marked increase in college enrollments since the first world war, however, and the simultaneous diversification and multiplication of program offerings, the need has been widely felt for a more systematic and comprehensive approach to the matter than could ordinarily be relied on to develop from individual friendliness and initiative alone.

Several universities have been leading the way for the last thirty years or more in defining the scope of student personnel and developing its characteristic methods. During the same period many colleges have been paying increasing attention to the selection of students, orientation to college life, counseling in all its phases (academic, personal, and vocational), health services, social arrangements and extracurricular activities, student employment on part time and other financial aid, occupational placement, and follow-up of graduates. Seldom, however, has any institution made any pretence of providing adequately for all aspects of the matter. Even when comprehensive programs have been developed, the several services have usually borne too little relationship to one another. Recognition of this undesirable separateness has led faculties to search for authoritative criteria through which to improve the situation. The prevailing confusion and uncertainty of the whole contemporary culture, with respect to the essentials of good living and the role of organized education in fostering them, has likewise played its part in stimulating thought and experimentation.

The concern of the professional specialist in student personnel—no matter in what phase of the program he may be active—has thus been steadily growing to include all aspects of the individual's personality. What is usually called the personnel point of view may be defined as looking upon each student as a complex organism and attempting to marshal the full resources of the institution to promote his best development. The objec-

tives of the personnel program thus tend to merge with the educational aims of the entire college. The very complexity of the task to be done has, increasingly in recent years, brought the realization that it cannot be taken care of adequately unless all members of the faculty actively cooperate. Such, at any rate, was very decidedly the view of the personnel consultants employed by the Commission.

While no institution in the cooperative study attempted to cover, or even touch on, all of the problems in teacher education which were mutually agreed upon as important, certain of the Bennington emphases described in the preceding chapter called forth very general response. The atmosphere was apparently set to favor their development. Among such widespread interests, student personnel was prominent though not all phases of the subject received the same degree or quality of treatment. The final reports made by these colleges to the Commission indicate that, in at least one of them, each of the following aspects of student personnel was considered: administrative setup, records and record keeping, research, selection and admissions, orientation and counseling, living arrangements and social life, health service, student employment, and placement and follow-up. It will be noted that the first three items relate to matters that make the remaining five possible; they constitute the means whereby the ends of the program are served. All eight together are commonly recognized as properly constituting a well developed program.

We have already said that some aspects of student personnel received less attention than others. For example, relatively little was attempted, in the course of the cooperative study, in the area of placement and follow-up. Nor, despite a few notable exceptions, did the problems of record keeping and research call forth as much initial enthusiasm as did other phases of the work. At the same time, virtually every institution concerned came to acknowledge the importance of using objective data and keeping meaningful records. The most significant work in these areas, within the Commission's experience, antedated the cooperative study and was done in connection with selective

admissions and orientation; much of it has been described in detail in another report in this series.[1] Considerable interest was shown throughout in matters of guidance and developing the full potentialities of individual students.

The main impact of what was done toward implementing student personnel, in the cooperative study, came to expression around administrative procedures and general objectives. The marked emphasis on human relations and their organic interaction, which characterized not only the personnel work but all aspects of the Commission's program, undoubtedly contributed to this result. The implications of this development will be clearer, perhaps, after considering the nature of the difficulties encountered. Three problems turned up with such characteristic persistence, no matter what phase of student personnel had been chosen for consideration, that they serve to bring into relief the most important drives of the cooperative study itself.

First there was the problem of getting the faculty as a whole to share what we have described as the personnel point of view. At the outset, prevailing attitudes on the several campuses ranged all the way from looking at students as disembodied minds to seeing them as unique and developing personalities. Some faculty members dealt with undergraduates as if nothing mattered but their intellectual training; others recognized that mental growth can be significantly influenced by the flourishing or stunting of other aspects of human individuality; and still others were frankly as much interested in promoting social aptitude and general insight, a sense of values, physical health and mental balance, and the like, as in providing intellectual discipline.

Then there was the question of getting the full scope of student personnel understood and recognized. This often meant widening the horizons of certain personnel officers quite as much as convincing skeptical members of the instructional staff. Some individuals tended to think of personnel services

[1] Maurice E. Troyer and C. Robert Pace, *Evaluation in Teacher Education* (Washington: American Council on Education, 1944), Chapters II and III.

primarily as convenient traffic signals or shunting devices for getting students safely and quietly through college according to the requirements for graduation. Others emphasized counseling undergraduates as a means of ensuring the best possible use of available resources in relation to individual differences. Still others thought of personnel procedures and the curriculum as interacting and inseparable parts of the student's education. All three of these conceptions, with some additional variations, were found among the colleges in question—not infrequently, indeed, on the same campus.

The third major problem repeatedly encountered, as these colleges experimented with their programs of student personnel, followed directly from the other two. The division of labor or best distribution of responsibility for each phase of the program was a concern of the first magnitude. As the several personnel offices set about enlisting the services of the regular teaching faculty, it was far from easy to determine who should do what and how he ought to go about it. The most fruitful solution found was to the effect that the bulk of the counseling program should be carried by the faculty while the personnel staff would find its best usefulness in facilitating the process. Efforts were accordingly often concentrated on freeing personnel officers from much of their routine so that their time might be given to assisting members of the faculty and sensitizing them to the larger implications of their work.

The implementation of programs of student personnel was thus shown to be basically a matter of human cooperation. We have undertaken to bring this out in the four contrasting and supplementing sketches presented below, chosen to illustrate the experience of the cooperative study. At the same time we hope to convey an idea of how the Commission characteristically set about its allotted task, to describe its method of playing into ongoing developments and reinforcing whatever local factors were already at work in the desired direction. For example, in the first two of our stories the initial strategy was developed for administrative situations of opposite character; strong centralization in one case and traditional departmentalism in the other.

We shall follow with the description of a personnel program that had already permeated and fused with the entire life of the college. In conclusion we shall indicate how plans were drawn up for a new and integrated program by a large group of faculty members and administrative officers working together.

In each sketch we hope to suggest the distinctive flavor of the program described. To this end we have included the leading historical and environmental factors that conditioned the work done for the cooperative study. We have further sought to show how each project got started, what kept it going, what were the results, and what appears to be the direction of future development. We have not tried to be exhaustive, either in our selection or in the treatment of each case, but rather have aimed at presenting an interesting variety of approach and relative coverage of important problems. Since the circumstances were so different in each instance, comparison among the four colleges described, or between them and institutions elsewhere, should be made with these conditions clearly in mind. But perhaps enough has been said in preparation and it is time to proceed to the sketches themselves.

From Centralization at Greeley

The subject of our first sketch is the Colorado State College of Education at Greeley. The student body is coeducational and, before the current dislocation of enrollments, numbered roughly 1,200. These young men and women came predominantly from rural communities and returned to similar places for their first teaching experience. Normally there are some 100 active members on the administrative and instructional staff. We shall give particular emphasis, in addition to the background, to the work done on personnel records and freshman orientation, the activities of a personnel council, and the program of student guidance.

The setting

Two characteristics of the Greeley campus may be said to have had a hand in shaping everything that has been going on

there, especially during the last ten or fifteen years. In the first place, there has been a steady trend, since the early nineteen-thirties, away from extreme departmentalization toward somewhat highly concentrated administrative control. At one time no less than twenty-four independent academic divisions provided offerings, while seven deans and a variety of associates added their influence to that of the heads of these divisions. Since the fall of 1939 there have been but four administrative departments, as they are called, each headed up by a director immediately responsible to the president. These departments have to do with student personnel, curriculum and instruction, business and finance, and public relations.

The strong administrative position of the personnel office was obviously bound to have its effect on the program. As far as working arrangements are concerned, it facilitated a specific application of the general trend toward coordination within the institution. Before 1939 some two dozen different personnel functions were being performed with varying degrees of efficiency, with little or no exchange of information, and geographically scattered all over the campus. After the reorganization, all services and responsibilities affecting the welfare of students were housed together in the new department, in one section of the administration building. These units included the work of the registrar, the dean of women, the student health office, the student employment office, the housing office for students, and the personnel research staff. In all matters relating to social activities, the manager of the student-union building and the elected president of the student organization were called into consultation. Associated with this group were also the faculty and student advisers to be discussed a little later. This concentration was completed during the opening months of the cooperative study.

The second major conditioning factor at Greeley was the orientation toward experimental innovation that had been gathering momentum for at least a decade. The faculty is alert and accustomed to trying new things, albeit more often on an individual basis than through concerted group action. One

fairly general recent activity, on the other hand, has been the development through committees of a new set of educational objectives for the entire college. The original impulse in this direction came from the North Central Association in 1937 and was accelerated especially during the first two years of the cooperative study. Undergraduates as well as faculty members were drawn into the deliberations. In the course of this project, individual professors examined their courses with a view to appraising their contribution to the objectives in question. As a result, even in the early stages of debate and formulation, the faculty became increasingly aware of individual student needs and receptive to the work of the personnel staff. This activity likewise served to demonstrate that student personnel, curriculum building, and evaluation are not separable functions, but that each depends upon the others and reinforces them.

A natural concomitant, perhaps, of the experimental mindset has been the growing diversification of the program and the extension of the service area of the college. In recent years, and notably during the period of the cooperative study, there has been marked interest in general education during the first two years of college and in developing additional professional curricula—although not to the extent of impairing the institution's primary function of preparing teachers. This change in scope had immediate consequences for student personnel inasmuch as the problems of counseling and orientation were greatly increased and complicated. Many students have since been attracted to Greeley who either had not made up their minds as to their lifework, or who definitely did not want to teach and could not qualify for the preparation. A new responsibility was thus placed on all advisers of students.

As a result of these varied developments the theory of student personnel on the Greeley campus has been undergoing significant growth. This has been true within the department as well as among members of the teaching faculty. In contrast to the former preoccupation with particular and immediate problems, often connected with observing rules and satisfying the requirements for graduation (a viewpoint to be expected from

the piecemeal exercise of personnel functions), there is emerging a conception to the effect that students should be treated as individual personalities and helped both to understand themselves as such and to make the best educational use of the college's resources. Undergraduates and the teaching faculty alike are coming to play a much more active part in the process than used to be the case. The driving force of this development is of course kept alive and directed by the department of student personnel.

Records and freshman orientation

As the cooperative study got under way, what may be called the normal confused excitement of administrative rearrangement began to wear off. By the time a consultant in personnel was asked for early in 1940, the staff of the department had reached the stage of wanting to simplify the existing records. As referral of undergraduates from one personnel office to another became easier and thus more frequent, the need for exchanging information likewise became increasingly apparent. Comparison and informal comment then revealed the fact that many records overlapped and suggested the possible value of a single records office as part of the new physical concentration. The director of personnel, the registrar, and the personnel research staff took responsibility for developing an appropriate plan and, as their first step, discussed with each branch of the service the information it needed to have. The findings were then used by the group as criteria for appraising every individual record form. A number of specific instruments were, as a consequence, modified or eliminated. The function to be performed by the record in guiding students and placing them professionally came to take precedence, in this connection, over administrative convenience or usefulness in research.

That the process of coordination was distinctly fostered by this undertaking, and staff thinking directed toward the essentials, may be illustrated by the effect on the orientation program for freshmen. Study of the records led first to a critical examination of the comprehensive battery of standardized tests admin-

istered to students on entrance. Certain information was being collected by this means which threw relatively little light on the personal and vocational needs of the undergraduates, while some essential facts were missing. Furthermore, it now appeared that the testing program, combined as it was with large group meetings and tours of the campus during freshman week, was so heavy that a considerable burden was being put on freshmen just when they were trying hardest to adjust to a confusing new environment. Some members of the staff criticized this rushing of students from place to place and meeting to meeting as likely to result in psychological intoxication rather than appreciation of what the college had to offer. Past experience with the receptions and similar social functions of freshman week had convinced other members of the group that most entering students were bewildered rather than made to feel at home by such affairs.

Beginning in 1941-42, accordingly, experiments were tried in making the whole orientation process more gradual. The diagnostic tests were spread over a period of months. Hitherto the results had been used in large measure only by the research staff. The personnel faculty now began to think the data might play an educational role for the students and serve to enlist their cooperation in appraising their individual needs and planning their programs. Spacing the tests, with a certain amount of flexibility allowed in deference to varying abilities, made it possible for freshmen to assimilate some of the first results and consequently sense the relevance of the information to be secured from the next batch. This in itself, since attitudes and receptivity are of critical importance in all psychological testing, had the effect of increasing the value of the data.

At the same time, entering students were brought together increasingly in small groups and as individuals to talk with those college officials with whom they would later be associated in their work. Also, emphasis was placed on getting each freshman sufficiently acquainted with a few people during the first week to gain some feeling of assurance. The group organization was eventually applied also to the orientation course for fresh-

men, given by five personnel officers concomitantly with the staggered program of testing. During the period of the cooperative study, as a matter of fact, the freshman class was still brought together as a whole, once or twice a week during the fall quarter, to consider such topics as the curriculum and traditions of Greeley, efficient study habits, and the opportunities and responsibilities of the teaching profession. But the staff was not satisfied with this arrangement.

After considerable experimentation with content and method, from one year to another, a course was tried out in the fall of 1942 which has met with fairly general approval. Some attention was given to getting acquainted with the college and study skills were not entirely left out—although the personnel staff no longer believed that all students can learn effectively by identical methods. The center of attention, however, was a thorough diagnosis by each freshman of his own abilities and interests. The standardized tests, now spaced throughout the fall quarter, were correlated with the class procedure. During the first month or so, students met five times a week, in groups ranging from twenty to thirty-five, for general discussion. After this period they were regrouped according to the major patterns of weakness and aptitude revealed by the first tests—and thus established in large measure by the students themselves. Thereafter, a freshman met only twice a week according to the original classification and the remaining three periods with his "problems" group. If no outstanding deficiency became apparent in a given student's preparation, he spent his three hours in following up special interests.

The personnel council

After the administrative reorganization of 1939-40, the personnel staff—covering the offices already enumerated and consequently of considerable size—at first proceeded on the assumption that it would handle all matters affecting student welfare quite directly. During the better part of the first two years of the cooperative study it did provide most of the personnel services at the college, and supervised the rest—notably the work

of student and faculty advisers. Toward the end of 1940-41, however, the group began to feel the need of more help from the instructional staff. On the initiative of the director, a personnel council of the faculty was organized to share some of the department's responsibilities.

This council was set up likewise in response to a need felt by the faculty advisers. As the latter worked with students on selecting curricula they became, throughout this period, increasingly critical of the restrictions on choice and of the established requirements for graduation. The student had relatively little to say once he had made the basic decision as to which curriculum to follow. Although many professors were trying to allow for individual differences in the conduct of their courses, the opinion became widespread that the inflexibility of the existing prescriptions and sequence requirements could not be defended in view of what was known about human personality. Furthermore, as a result of the reconsideration of educational objectives simultaneously under way and already mentioned, it was felt that so rigid an arrangement deprived students of the educational experience to be gained from making choices.

In other words, both faculty advisers and the personnel staff—each group proceeding in its own way—reached the point of emphasizing participation in educational planning by the undergraduates themselves. But the interest of students could be aroused only if their particular needs, as they themselves could analyze them under guidance, were honored in the curriculum. It came to be widely thought on the campus that the college would have to begin with each freshman precisely where the high school left off—and that this would not always be the same point. For example, a student well prepared in science or music, for argument's sake, might be excused from freshman work in his field of special strength. Another, or possibly the same, student might be weak in say English speech or writing, and should consequently be asked to spend extra time on his deficiency. As the college regulations were eased to permit this sort of adjustment, the question at once arose as to who should make the necessary decisions. The personnel council was the first answer to this question.

The council, under the leadership of the personnel director, was made up of fourteen individuals—two representing each of the seven subject-matter divisions of the department of curriculum and instruction. Of this number only two were division chairmen while the others were either full, associate, or assistant professors. The object of this selection was to spread the opportunity for learning something of personnel procedure and to protect the chairmen as much as possible from administrative routine. While thinking was not too precise at the outset as to what the council should do, the major purpose was to establish active relations between the personnel office and the rest of the faculty. As things worked out, the council's first occupation was that of passing judgment on requests to vary a student's program from the pattern announced in the catalog. From the beginning, however, members of the council acted with full authority as individuals as well as in their corporate capacity. For example, when a student and his faculty adviser agreed on a certain change in program, the matter was frequently taken to some member of the council who represented the appropriate subject-matter division; regardless of what may have been the original theory of the council, this individual's decision was given and taken as final.

The faculty advisers soon began to question the wisdom of this arrangement. They saw little reason for having a council if individual members could act independently. Furthermore, they wondered why the judgment of a council member should necessarily be any better than that of the adviser who already knew the student. Actually the new council was not too well received and it became apparent that, if it was to serve the personnel director's purpose of sharing the work of his department with the instructional staff, a new function would have to be assigned to it. Attempts were subsequently made to turn it into something of a board of strategy with reference to certain aspects of personnel.

The council did some effective work in helping the personnel staff to rearrange the testing program originally crowded into freshman week. It was even more successful in planning and directing a series of discussions of the case-study type for ad-

visers, and making arrangements for advisers to work closely with the personnel staff in charge of the orientation course for freshmen. It is in activities of this sort as a matter of fact, as a liaison or mediating body, that the personnel director and the council itself are coming to see future developments. That is to say, the aim is not so much to tell the faculty advisers how to do their work, as to provide them with stimulating contacts and experiences, by means of which their conception of the job to be done is enlarged. It can, indeed, be reasonably expected that the personnel staff and the council will withdraw to some extent from exercising certain personnel functions directly, and that they will increasingly devote their energies to assisting the regular faculty in taking over the main burden of counseling students.

The counseling program

A word is accordingly in order about the system of student guidance. Approximately one-third of the teaching faculty were serving as advisers at the time of the cooperative study. The individuals concerned had been chosen by the dean of women from preliminary lists submitted by the seven chairmen of subject-matter divisions. Freshmen were assigned to their advisers by the dean of women and the executive secretary on the basis of data secured before registration. The adviser thus appointed from the division of the student's major academic interest was ready to receive him on arrival. The number of students assigned to any one adviser naturally varied from one field to another and according to the relative speed with which adjustments in the requirements were made. The range at the conclusion of the Commission's field work was from four to twenty-six.

In 1941, when the general curricular shift took place throughout the institution which substantially modified the work of the first two years of college, the policy was adopted of keeping students with the same faculty advisers until they graduated. Exceptions were allowed of course when the student changed his academic major. The arrangement made for continuity and was

also a natural result of the concern with educational objectives already noted: the long advisory relationship favored that appreciation of individual need which the faculty had come to regard as important. The way in which this has been working out in practice may be illustrated by two significant developments.

Early in the history of student counseling at Greeley a distinction had been made between curricular and personal problems. The former were considered the province of faculty advisers while the latter were entrusted to selected students of junior and senior standing. These students worked with the dean of women in what were called personnel seminars. While the main business of the faculty advisers, up to the time of the cooperative study, had been to see that freshmen chose their courses according to the catalog requirements, the student advisers were introducing these same young men and women to the social arrangements and extracurricular activities. There was nothing in the setup to bring the faculty and student advisers together in order to exchange information that might be valuable to both parties.

The personnel staff had never liked this arrangement and eventually criticized it on two counts. In the first place, the student advisers—who were for the most part preparing to teach—were likely to get a distorted picture of the counseling job they would be called upon to do after graduation; and in the second place, the faculty had no adequate access to information about a student's personality other than his intellectual development. It was to bring out the inadequacy of this one-sided approach that the personnel council was asked to arrange the discussion meetings already mentioned. They were attended by the thirty-odd faculty advisers, the fifteen student advisers, and all members of the personnel staff. On each occasion the case of a particular freshman was presented in detail, the interaction of the several aspects of his personality analyzed, his chances for professional success after college weighed, his problems indicated, and a general program suggested for the best use of his time and energies while on the campus.

In this way many faculty members had the complex nature of personality development made vivid to them. They saw the point of knowing a good deal more about each student than could conveniently be assembled under the old system of changing advisees every one or two years. They also saw the value of working with the student advisers. Several of them asked to have the appropriate student advisers assigned to them as assistants with special responsibility for collecting certain data. Indeed, this matter of gathering relevant information took on increasing importance and led to the second program development referred to here.

As the faculty advisers began looking around for data that would throw light on a student's total personality, they first turned to the written records that had been accumulated in the personnel office. Often they were dissatisfied with what they found; much was very general in nature and there wasn't enough of it. The questions that occurred to them about their advisee's problems, reflecting their own expanding insight, could not be satisfied. At this juncture the Commission's specialist in personnel called attention to the anecdotal form of record keeping. The faculty advisers liked the idea and they asked fellow professors, directors of residence halls, and the people in charge of extracurricular activities to prepare anecdotal statements at the end of each quarter, on students with whom they had had contacts.

Since no model or anything in the way of preparation had been given, the first results were rather unavoidably disappointing. Instead of the insightful descriptions and objective analyses they hoped for, the advisers usually got simple and not very illuminating statements to the effect that so-and-so was an "excellent student" and somebody else's "attitude was poor." Accordingly, in 1941-42, the practice was abandoned as a general procedure and a more limited plan adopted which is still in operation. Each faculty adviser now collects anecdotal statements from as many individuals as he thinks have the necessary opportunity and skill for making them on each of his advisees. On the basis of these reports and his own knowledge, he prepares a

general summary on each student for the central files every quarter. These statements are available, of course, for all personnel purposes but they are not always included in the folder used in connection with placement.

By way of summary

From the preceding pages it should be clear that the student personnel staff at the Colorado State College of Education at Greeley has taken advantage of its favored administrative position, first to consolidate and integrate its own functioning and then to extend its influence and move toward engaging the sympathetic understanding and cooperation of the faculty advisers. In the last analysis, and if the present movement is continued, the test of the program's success will be the degree to which the regular teaching faculty is able to take over most of the counseling work with students.

We have tried to indicate how the efforts of the personnel staff were reinforced by concomitant developments on the campus, especially by the group project on educational objectives of the college. Notable beginnings have clearly been made toward developing a common mind and purpose on the campus, in which the idea of serving student needs is central. But there is obviously still a great way to go, both in the larger development and in the program of student personnel. None would accede to this statement more readily than the personnel staff itself; there is accordingly every reason to anticipate further progress in the future.

From Departmentalization at Tuskegee

The subject of our next sketch, Tuskegee Institute in Alabama, is a more complex organization than the teachers college just decribed. There are seven administrative divisions on the undergraduate level, known as schools and departments, concerned respectively with agriculture, commercial dietetics, education, home economics, mechanical industries, the training of nurses, and physical education. Tuskegee is a coeducational institution for Negroes with a student body, during the period

of the cooperative study, of about 1,400; nearly two-thirds of these young people were men. The college's reputation and strategic location in the population center for southern Negroes are reflected in the fact that more than thirty states of the union and four foreign countries were represented among the undergraduates every year; the largest delegation—some 30 percent—came from Alabama. The combined administrative and instructional staff at the institute consists of 184 individuals.

In the school of education, which accounted for a good tenth of the enrollment, the ratio between the sexes was reversed and women students were in the majority by nearly two to one. The extent to which the institute is concerned with the preparation of teachers cannot, however, be gauged merely by the activities of this school. Among the six other administrative divisions, the department of physical education is likewise a teacher-educating unit and the others train both teachers and technicians. A study of the occupational distribution of Tuskegee graduates, 1935-40, indicated that some 60 percent were known to be in educational work.

The setting

The general situation at Tuskegee at the beginning of the cooperative study was the familiar one, in educational circles, of a vanguard minority of forward-looking educators trying to enlist the interest and cooperation of a largely traditionalist and departmentalized majority. The several administrative divisions had more in common and could have been more useful to one another than was generally realized. There was a good deal of overlap and some exchange of faculty service among them. The prevailing atmosphere was, however, one of considerable exclusiveness and teaching practice was "still the impregnable citadel of each instructor's fancy."[2] There was no agreement and little mutual knowledge with respect to educational theory or goals. But the situation was certainly yeasty. Especially in general education and student counseling, but also in admin-

[2] Final report of Tuskegee Institute to the Commission on Teacher Education, p. 4.

istrative procedure, school-community relations, and the professional education of teachers, the impact of modern ideas and emphases was beginning to make itself felt.

Of great advantage to the vanguard was the fact that it included some of the most influential individuals on the campus. Conditions were indeed ready for the sort of reinforcement and undergirding which the Commission had chosen as its peculiar form of endeavor. The fact that the institution, though complex, was sufficiently small and closely knit by its rural location to make the problem of integration at least compassable, was another favorable circumstance of importance. In the words of Tuskegee's final report, "the salient feature of the improvement program was the fact that it was a whole venture" centered around a series of all-institute conferences. The value of group methods had been suggested to the leaders of the institute first by the Bennington conference that launched the cooperative study, and a few months later by a joint meeting with the staff of Prairie View State College in Texas, the second Negro college associated with the Commission's program.

Inasmuch as the all-institute conferences at Tuskegee played so important a role, a brief description is in order at this point. An adaptation of the Bennington technique was used early in the academic years of 1940-41, 1941-42, and 1942-43 as a means of promoting joint thinking throughout the institution. Consultant service was provided by the Commission. The first such conference was held September 2-3, 1940 with the objects of initiating the intensive study of important problems for the cooperative study and soliciting widespread participation by the staff of the entire college. The main business was carried on in six discussion groups, each made up of some fourteen to twenty-two members drawn from all administrative divisions. These groups were organized, after a canvass of faculty interest, around the topics of promoting interdepartmental cooperation, improving the educational programs, fostering more satisfactory staff relations, improving the local business arrangements, promoting wholesome social life for students, and adapting the program of student employment to the needs of all concerned.

According to the report of this conference, the discussion was frank and animated, and a greater number of persons were in attendance on the second day than the first. Many problems that "loomed large in the minds of some before the discussions progressed" turned out to be a simple matter of "not understanding the procedure" already in existence. Furthermore, there was "clear evidence" that the "needs of individual students were the paramount interest" of those participating. The summarizing committee was of the opinion that the discussion indicated a "marked growth of general interest and willingness" to take what the consultant sent by the Commission called a "peep over the neighbor's fence to see what he is doing."

The six discussion groups presented specific recommendations at the close of the conference, which were then referred by the local coordinator for the cooperative study and his associates to appropriate groups in the college for action. Progress reports and further elucidation by group discussion were the features of subsequent all-institute conferences of much the same character. The general effect of this procedure has been to bring student needs substantially to the fore, to promote institutional unity, and to shift major concern a bit from preoccupation with academic achievement to an increasing acceptance of human personality as the proper focus of education.

The departmentalism characteristic of Tuskegee as a whole was, naturally enough, reflected in the program of student personnel. It was not, and is not now, an integrated administrative unit comparable to the Greeley setup. Service to students was being rendered more or less independently by the personnel office, the administrative dean, the deans of men and women, the heads of the several schools and departments, the chaplain, the records office, and an official responsible for student employment locally called the secretary of labor. But student personnel is part and parcel of the new spirit developing on the campus. Two of the discussion topics at the first all-institute conference, having to do with social life and employment for students, had a definite bearing on this subject while four of the six discussion leaders may be classed as personnel officers: the director of

records and research, the secretary of labor, the chaplain, and the personnel director. The following year, eight of the seventeen reports presented for discussion dealt directly with some aspect of student personnel, while in the fall of 1942 the number was eight out of twenty-one. What we have called the personnel viewpoint was reflected, besides, in the prominence given to student needs in most of the reports on curricular innovations. The marked interest shown throughout in interpersonal relations on the faculty and in liberalizing administrative practice similarly testify to the pervasiveness of the unfolding spirit.

We do not wish to imply, of course, that Tuskegee solved all or most of its problems during its association with the cooperative study. Change in academic circles is at best a stubbornly slow process. But we can claim that substantial progress was made and that developments are still continuing. We propose to illustrate this by describing in some detail the experiments and difficulties of two personnel groups: the unit organized in 1941 as a guidance council and the officers concerned with extracurricular activities and social life.

The guidance council

When the personnel office was set up at Tuskegee in 1930, it was vested with no administrative authority. Responsibility for carrying out the various personnel functions was, and still is, distributed by the administrative dean. Thus, vocational guidance was allocated to the heads of schools and departments and the director of placement; academic counseling was likewise assigned to the departmental heads with certain phases of it reserved for the dean, the registrar, and the personnel director; and guidance on personal problems was allocated to the personnel deans (*i.e.,* of men and women), the chaplain, the medical director, and the personnel director. The job of the faculty was seen as simply that of teaching students; that of the administrative and personnel staff of managing them. It can thus be said in summary that at the time when serious consideration was given to improving the work in student personnel, the Tuskegee

faculty as a whole and the personnel staff in particular were highly departmentalized in their thinking, no very clear or generally accepted concept of student personnel prevailed, no particular connection was seen between instruction and guidance, and very little awareness was in evidence of the role students themselves might play in their own development.

In large measure as a result of the stimulation provided by the first all-institute conference, the need was felt at Tuskegee for some integration of the personnel services. The assistance of a specialist was provided by the Commission and in April 1941 a guidance council was organized. It was made up of the heads of all academic schools and departments and a second representative from each of the four largest ones, the administrative dean, the two personnel deans, the chaplain, the secretary of labor, the personnel director, the registrar, and the financial officer. The president served *ex officio* and other members of the faculty were to be called in from time to time as consultants. The administrative dean acted as chairman and, in his statement at the first meeting, outlined the council's functions as follows: to plan the guidance program, to make the initial contacts with students and refer them to the proper individuals for advice, to follow up the program and make it effective, to call attention to promising practices elsewhere, and to see that each member of the council did enough guidance to keep in touch with its practical problems.

The first venture of the council was disappointing from the standpoint of group integration. It addressed itself to the problem of improving the personnel records and thereby aroused widespread apprehension of administrative interference or the introduction of some form of rigid central control. The council found it necessary to allay suspicion by routing all materials, including the students' folders, to advisers through the departmental heads. The data to be used were collected and recorded under the supervision of the personnel director, but after that the folders were handled by each of the seven executives. The matter was thus amicably settled although not

without strengthening some of the prevailing resistance to an integrated program.

At the same time, the guidance council made some tentative plans for a system of advising students and selected three individuals to give special attention to certain aspects of this matter at workshops during the summer of 1941. Interest in student personnel had been sufficiently developed at Tuskegee by this time to warrant making this field one of the three major emphases for the second all-institute conference. On this occasion in the fall of 1941, attention was definitely shifted from records to counseling. What the workshop participants had to contribute was important in this connection. All members of the faculty who thought they might like to serve as advisers to students were asked to volunteer. By November roughly a third of the faculty had come forward and 450 freshmen had been assigned; the number of advisees in each case ranged from two to fifteen.

It was at first agreed that these faculty advisers would give counsel only on matters pertaining to study habits and extracurricular activities. They had no authority whatever on questions relating to the curriculum; this phase was still the prerogative of the departmental heads and the administrative dean. The adviser might try to help students understand what was to be expected of the several courses in the catalog but he could not approve enrollment or any deviation from the established requirements. Nor was he expected to help students get part-time employment or other financial aid.

The guidance council made some effort to prepare the advisers for their work. On three occasions it arranged for meetings of these members of the faculty by schools with specialists in personnel provided by the Commission on Teacher Education. In each instance, case histories were brought to the meeting to serve as a basis for discussion. The object was not so much to work out solutions for the particular cases as to present ideas on dealing with students in general. The council sponsored three additional conferences at which such matters as records

and interviewing were taken up. As it turned out, these undertakings provided only limited background for most of the faculty advisers. On the other hand, it may be doubted if any amount of preliminary discussion could have prevented so inexperienced a group from making certain initial blunders.

Those responsible were accordingly only moderately pleased with the results of the first year's efforts to use regular faculty members as advisers. The problem which most impressed the group was that of getting students to take advantage of the opportunities offered them. While practically all advisers had had one interview with each freshman assigned to them, only half reported themselves as having talked with their advisees at all frequently. The records of the interviews sent to the personnel office differed greatly in quality and most of them were not very meaningful. Some of the advisers appeared to be quite at sea as to what was expected of them. But, as a result of this experience, the guidance council learned a great deal. Its members reached the point of being willing to curtail some of their own prerogatives because their joint analysis of the situation had brought the realization that the advisers were not in a position to touch the students' lives sufficiently. They needed something real to talk about so that, in the nature of things, students would seek them out. Accordingly the policy was gradually introduced of giving the advisers more scope; they were authorized to approve registration for courses and were to be consulted on the eligibility of students for scholarships and assignments to work opportunities. Since around 90 percent of the undergraduates were in need of some financial assistance to get through college, this last was no small consideration.

To strengthen the conferences between advisers and students, the guidance council renewed its educational efforts. It designated five particularly able individuals to serve as resource persons, one for each of the four larger schools and the fifth for the remaining members of the staff. There were in the former case guidance committees for each already in existence, though not very actively so. Beginning in the fall of 1942 and when possible

working through these committees, the resource people conducted a series of intensive conferences with the advisers for each unit. By so doing the guidance council virtually acknowledged what was already implied in its action to increase the advisers' scope, namely, that most of the student counseling would have to be done by the faculty rather than directly by itself or the personnel staff. Adopting this viewpoint meant, as already noted, giving up some of the powers of departmental heads and admitting the faculty to more meaningful partnership. Since, as will be recalled, the departmental heads were members of the council, this action was self-imposed.

Improving the social atmosphere

While the guidance council was thus concentrating on advising students, certain related personnel activities were going on more or less independently. The deans of men and women were hard at work trying to improve social standards in the dormitories, and a faculty-student council on campus life was functioning to raise the general tone throughout the institution. The two developments were closely related and will be briefly described.

The problem of wholesome life in the dormitories was more important on this campus than was true of most institutions in the cooperative study. One of the major obstacles to improvement lay in the social difference and consequent lack of understanding between the undergraduates and the faculty. Most of the students came from rural communities where standards of living were low and recreational opportunities few. They were used to being handled in an authoritarian way by the dominant culture, their own parents, and the local church. Responsible self-reliance, cooperative give and take, and fair treatment had not been characteristic features of their experience. Faculty members on the other hand, though belonging to the same racial minority, were as a group well educated and used to high social standards. Most of them were also ambitious for the students and, through them, for the race. It is not to be wondered at, accordingly, that sometimes they made undergraduates feel

inferior and at other times tried to impose their ideals somewhat arbitrarily.

With the growing interest in the differing needs of human personality fostered by the all-institute conferences, the whole matter of extracurricular activities and student behavior received increasing attention. The first conference recommended that faculty members be asked to live in several of the student dormitories; these individuals were, however, cautioned against undue familiarity with the undergraduates and were charged with maintaining the rules of the institution. The faculty was divided on the issue of how far to go in imposing standards of behavior. An important minority, since it included most of the administrative leaders, wanted to emphasize assisting students to work out codes of their own to meet the demands of their daily experience.

As a matter of fact, promising beginnings were made which were neither dominated by the faculty nor completely left to the students. In the course of the last two years of the cooperative study, freedom of action was increasingly given to student committees on certain aspects of dormitory management, decorating the dance hall, social functions, and the like. The details of this student participation may best be seen through the activities of the council on campus life, referred to above.

This council was organized in 1940 to replace an earlier student organization. The step was taken after considerable discussion between faculty and undergraduate leaders; it was mutually agreed that the previous form of student government had failed. At the same time, it was recognized on both sides that if the faculty took over completely the blow to student morale would be serious. So a joint arrangement was worked out. The new council on campus life was made up of eight undergraduates elected by their fellows, and seven faculty members appointed by the president. The two personnel deans and the chaplain were always among the latter. The chairman was usually a staff member and the vice chairman a student; the leadership of subcommittees was divided between the two groups. The council elected its officers itself.

The activities in which the council engaged provide the best description of it functions. It published a handbook for students and a biweekly newspaper; it sponsored such events as dances, hikes, retreats, and intramural athletic contests; and it disbursed student funds. During 1942-43 it undertook to draw up a group charter relating to club initiations, selection of club members, promotion of social activities, the election of student officers, and orientation of freshmen to campus life. Administrative officers give it credit for having improved the conduct of student elections, and for encouraging the removal of the traditional restrictions against dancing between faculty members and undergraduates on social occasions.

By way of summary

It should be clear from the above sketch that real progress was made at Tuskegee, during its association with the Commission, on getting the program of student personnel to function. We have indicated that the most important propelling factor in the situation was the group integration fostered by the annual all-institute conferences. We have suggested how the meeting of minds and exchange of views, on these and other occasions, tended to bring student needs into the forefront of attention. The work done specifically by the personnel people in this connection crossfertilized continuously with similar undertakings for the cooperative study in curricular improvement and staff relationships. In all of this activity structural innovations appear to have been less important than the changes that have occurred in joint action. The process of developing a group mind on this campus is well under way and there is every reason to expect it is to continue with vigor.

Although the personnel staff at Tuskegee was in nothing like the same advantageous administrative position as the corresponding group at Greeley, it is nevertheless interesting to note essentially the same two-way development in both cases. As the drive toward integration gathered momentum from personal interaction, the staff responsible for student personnel in both places began not only to coordinate its own activities

but also to share its work with increasing numbers of faculty members and students. Centralization of administrative direction and decentralization of (in this case) the guidance function are thus seen to be mutually reinforcing and complementary aspects of one organic process.

Strong Coordination at Newark

Our third sketch will be concerned with the New Jersey State Teachers College at Newark. Of the 530 students there in the fall before Pearl Harbor, 42 percent were taking the general elementary curriculum, 16 percent were in kindergarten-primary work, and 10 percent each in the curricula preparing teachers, respectively, of the industrial and fine arts; the remaining 22 percent were enrolled in a program of general education from which they hoped to transfer to one of the professional curricula as vacancies occurred. Women outnumbered men in the ratio of four to one. As many as 90 percent of these undergraduates lived at home, some of them commuting every day from distances up to sixty-five miles. The college is located in the state's center of population and transportation was, at that time, both varied and convenient. About a third of the students came from towns of less than 10,000 inhabitants, another third from the suburban centers of northern New Jersey, and others from larger cities like Newark, Jersey City, and Elizabeth. Most ethnic strains of the local population were represented among them. A faculty of some forty members was in charge.

The setting

The institution opened as a state normal school in 1913 and until September 1929 offered only two-year programs. At that date each curriculum was extended by state regulation to three years, and in 1934 to four years. To the original offering of preparation for elementary and kindergarten-primary teachers, there was added the curriculum in industrial arts in 1924 and in fine arts in 1932. The institution was made a state teachers college early in 1937.

Recognition of the fact that personality plays an important

part in the classroom, accentuated by the interest of the president and faculty in individual differences, led to an early emphasis on matters of student personnel. A definite and comprehensive program was put into operation beginning in the early nineteen-thirties. The six publicly supported teachers colleges of New Jersey stand in unusually close relation to each other; there is a joint program of selective admission to all of them, cooperatively carried out, which is designed to secure only the best applicants for teacher education. A precaution against the development of too large a surplus of qualified teachers is the state restriction on the number of freshmen entering any one curriculum to not more than 150 percent of the demand for the preceding spring. The allotment of students to the several institutions that offer the curriculum in question (in elementary, secondary, or special work as the case may be) is made by the state department of education according to a system of quotas. Wartime pressures have not significantly affected the functioning of this arrangement.

In 1939 a new curriculum in general education, covering the first two years in college, was devised to take care of the excess of acceptable applicants over the established quotas. Each teachers college is free to work out the details. As offered at Newark the program consists of broadly cultural subjects and a limited number of electives. The theory is that, as vacancies occur in the professional curricula at any of the state institutions for the preparation of teachers, replacements can be made from this reserve. It was also hoped that transfer might be possible after the sophomore year to other types of vocational training available in New Jersey institutions. The program has not been in existence long enough, and the conditions since Pearl Harbor have not been sufficiently typical, to make possible any judgment as to the success of this development. It will however readily be seen that the presence of this reserve group on the campus, at Newark amounting to a good fifth of the student body during the cooperative study, has added to the problems of the personnel staff. That there are likewise knotty implications for the curriculum, which in turn have a bearing on the

counseling of students, is a discovery it did not take the faculty long to make.

The nature and extent of the work undertaken at this college in connection with the Commission's cooperative study of teacher education was conditioned by the death of its president. He had been nationally known as a leader in student personnel. The staff decided to use the period and contacts of the national study primarily to consolidate gains and perfect the existing program instead of branching out in new directions. The program to be described was accordingly not the result of experimentation specifically for the Commission. Its unusual character is however well worth the reader's attention. We propose to describe the salient features of the personnel activities as a whole and then to illustrate the integration of this service with the rest of the educational program by the case of student teaching.

Highlights of the personnel program

The distinctive feature of the personnel setup at Newark is its intimate coordination with the entire functioning of the institution. Furthermore, despite emphasis on appropriate administrative arrangements, the integration is achieved primarily through mutual acquaintance and personal contacts. In large measure owing to the insight of the administrative dean, the schedule and other aspects of routine are kept subordinate to the human factor. The smallness and compactness of the institution are additional considerations that have been made to work in this direction.

In their own words, there is then "no dichotomy of aim or effort as between instruction and personnel activity." Virtually everybody on the faculty is a regular adviser to students:

> In the program at Newark, it can be truly said that each staff member is concerned with both personnel work and instruction. Far from reducing emphasis on scholarship and established skills, personnel work with students enables the college to minister to the aim of scholarship by relating instruction to the personal problems of human beings.[3]

[3] The Personnel Cabinet, *Student Personnel Services in the New Jersey State Teachers College at Newark* (Newark: State Teachers College, 1939), p. 18.

The personnel services are technically coordinated by a cabinet made up of the following twelve individuals: the college president, the administrative dean, the dean of men, the registrar, the physician, the consulting psychiatrist, the mental hygienist, the health counselor, the head of the department of education (also in charge of student teaching and placement), the director of research, the speech specialist, and the educational secretary. This personnel cabinet meets once a month to "consider procedure, propose policy, evaluate practice, and especially to strengthen or redirect emphasis." The scope of the program covers recruitment and admissions (by statewide procedure), orientation, general counseling, extracurricular activities and student teaching, physical and mental health, student employment and other financial assistance, special service such as speech correction and the like, placement, and follow-up.

Records of two sorts are accumulated on each student and kept in special folders to be used as needed by any member of the faculty. In the first place there are dated descriptions or anecdotes written by the counselors and at times by the president, the deans, the instructors, or any of the service specialists. These contain notes on interviews, case data, and specific decisions or actions taken. Interpretation is seldom included and always labeled as such if it is. Study of similar records elsewhere, promoted by the Commission's program, induced a demand at Newark for greater detail in these anecdotes, including if possible direct quotations of the students' words. Records of the second kind are numerical and include course marks, interview ratings, point-hour ratios, percentile ranks, and the scores from standardized tests. The bulk of these cumulative folders on each student is kept readily accessible to advisers and all personnel officers, in central files in the dean's office.

Considerable effort is made to cultivate the active participation of undergraduates in the combined process of guidance and education. Significant changes in procedure have frequently resulted from the suggestions and questions of students, as for example in the following case:

Some years ago . . . a number of upperclassmen of ability and

sound judgment became anxious concerning the contents of their personnel folders. They wanted to know "what went into the folders about us." As a result, the counselors now interpret the contents of the folder with any student requesting the same. The unintentional factor of secrecy being dissipated, the majority of the students are reassured. . . .[4]

This contact with student thinking is facilitated by the arrangements for counseling. In accordance with the prevailing emphasis on mutual acquaintance, approximately six freshmen are assigned on entrance to the counselor with whom they will remain as long as they are in college. This means that each faculty member normally has about twenty-four advisees at any one time, made up of six undergraduates from each of the four classes. These counseling groups, as they are called, have a certain collective identity; they meet together regularly for discussion and occasionally for social activities. In this way they tend to supply some of the functions of dormitory life on other campuses. The "sole purpose" of the whole counseling procedure is to help each student "develop to the full extent of his capabilities" and "become self-directive" in solving his problems.[5]

One of the projects undertaken at Newark with the assistance of the Commission was a fairly systematic appraisal of the personnel program. A prominent feature of this evaluation was a detailed questionnaire filled out by 454 undergraduates and 100 alumni. According to the final report from Newark, the main value of this undertaking lay in the way it brought student and faculty thinking even closer together, and made explicit to all concerned the potentialities of the personnel services. The tabulations brought out the fact, for instance, that students actually got help on many problems which had not been at all prominent in their minds when they went for advice. The difficulties of which undergraduates were most conscious (88 to 75 percent reporting them) had to do with transfer from

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 19.

[5] Final report of the Newark State Teachers College to the Commission on Teacher Education, p. 8.

the general curriculum, failure in courses, changes in their majors, and understanding the aims and program of the college. Furthermore, students apparently got as much help in the aggregate from other members of the faculty as from their regular advisers.

These and related findings had the effect of pointing out to the advisers that their work could be improved. The actual array of undergraduate concerns convinced some of them that they needed to know more than they did about their advisees. Several in fact asked the dean to help them interpret the data available in the personnel folders. The enumeration of existing personnel services had the similar effect of showing the students what was at their disposal; in fact many of them "volunteered the information that the very act of filling out the questionnaire had made them more conscious of the many ways in which counselors" could assist them.[6] The findings have served since as the basis for much discussion at faculty conferences, meetings of the personnel cabinet, and in the counseling groups.

Relations with the work in practice teaching

The interaction of personnel procedures and the rest of the program may be illustrated briefly by an account of their relationship to student teaching. A word is in order at the outset about this latter program, consisting of what are known locally as the junior and senior practicums. As conducted since the academic year of 1937-38, this setup provides students with a gradual induction under guidance into the profession of teaching. To this end, the cooperation has been secured of the elementary schools in six neighboring communities—all within thirteen miles of the college.

Students choose the center in which they wish to observe and take part, usually on the basis of geography since they have to commute from their homes. Thus the junior class comes to be divided into six practicum groups of some fifteen or twenty students each, with three or four faculty members assigned as supervisors. These groups visit the center of their choice every

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 21.

two weeks for a full day from September to April, and then stay on full time during the spring quarter. While this observation and steadily increasing participation in the life of the school is going on, the undergraduate is discussing relevant educational problems and theories in concomitant classes given by the faculty members who are also acting as their supervisors. This junior experience is followed by an eight-week period of practice teaching in the senior year, which however is not restricted to the same six centers. Seniors select the school system in which they will teach, subject to the approval of the director of student teaching at the college and of the local superintendent of schools. Each student is visited several times by a specific member of the faculty in the capacity of supervisor. Progress reports are added to the personnel files.

The junior practicum is a demonstration of the personnel point of view at Newark. The long assignment by groups to the same center cultivates friendly interaction and stimulation among students, between students and their faculty supervisors, between the college and the cooperating elementary schools, and to some extent between the undergraduates and parents or other members of the community. The question of improving the curriculum so as to increase the effectiveness and educational value of community contacts, in this connection, is one to which the college is giving marked attention. Frank discussion takes place naturally and frequently among students, supervisors, and training teachers during the entire period.

The personnel folder serves an important function with regard to student teaching. In addition to the record on academic standing, psychological and aptitude tests, entrance examinations, and the like, it contains by this time such items as the health report, data on special interests and talents, and notes on student activities, employment experience, or any special problems the undergraduate may have such as home responsibility, financial stress, or difficulties with speech, and the like. Information of this kind not only gives the supervisor a head start on getting acquainted, but also makes possible that particular guidance which the student needs most. It also permits assignment

to the school or classroom teacher that may be most helpful under the circumstances. On the other hand, the personnel cabinet does not favor using the data too much to "fit personalities to each other." They consider that "too much of such emphasis is not necessary, perhaps undesirable" in situations where relationships are sufficiently cordial to make mutual adjustment easy.[7]

Since the practicum supervisors are members of the college faculty and consequently almost always advisers to students also, it sometimes happens that the undergraduate is supervised by his regular counselor. Usually this is not the case. But in the nature of things, the supervisor exercises many guidance functions—especially during the junior year—and this is considered highly desirable at Newark. The fact that the supervisors are used to work of this kind and are familiar with the records system is of course significant in this connection. Supervisors and counselors work very closely together, discuss a given undergraduate's development on the basis of what each knows, and their reports are available to each other. No special routine or administrative machinery is found necessary to facilitate such interaction.

In conclusion it is worth emphasizing that the close contacts with a single practicum center, during the junior year, give the undergraduate an opportunity to see the school as a whole and in its entire functioning. The special activities, hobby clubs, music and dramatics, and recreational programs for the children, as well as meetings of the parent-teacher association, the school faculty, and the like, may be used both to promote the undergraduate's personal growth and to give him a comprehensive, integrated idea of what the profession of teaching has to offer. The practicum is accordingly to be regarded as a constituent element in the personnel program of orientation.

By way of summary

In the above sketch we have sought to describe a situation in which the integration of student personnel with the rest of

[7] The Personnel Cabinet, *op. cit.*, p. 34.

the program has proceeded to an advanced stage. Faculty participation in personnel procedures is unusually great. While the relatively small size of the institution is an important consideration in this connection, it is well to emphasize that this factor does not by any means act automatically in the desired direction. The conscious policy of trusting to mutual acquaintance, and fostering the latter by the quantity and quality of face-to-face contacts provided, deserves a large measure of the credit. The no less important corollary of subordinating schedules and formal routine to human interaction—as illustrated by the informality permitting students to seek help from faculty members other than their advisers, the absence of formalized procedure governing contacts between advisers and practicum supervisors, the unwillingness to trust too much to matching personalities in assigning students to training teachers, and the like—should be underlined. That even in this highly fused program an impetus toward closer group thinking was received from an explicit analysis of student needs, is clear from the reaction by all concerned to the findings of the evaluation questionnaire.

Initiating a Program at William and Mary

The subject of our final sketch in this chapter is the College of William and Mary in Virginia. The institution is a college of liberal arts that has had an interest in educating teachers for the state's public schools since the days of Thomas Jefferson. The present enlarged and progressive program in this field dates from the nineteen-twenties and has been accompanied by a constantly extending service to local schools, particularly in the tidewater counties. At the time of the cooperative study there were some 1,300 undergraduates enrolled annually, among whom young women slightly outnumbered the men. Some 150 individuals made up the administrative and instructional staff.

The first undertakings

What distinguishes the William and Mary story is the fact that it deals with an effort to move rapidly and systematically

from relatively meager beginnings to the establishment of an integrated program of student personnel for the entire institution. Since the procedure was a group project and furthermore enlisted the services of many members of the teaching faculty, it is particularly relevant to the present discussion. The impulses that led to this development reflected certain aspects of the college's history that should be explained. Until some thirty years ago, graduates of William and Mary (all men at the time, women not having been admitted before 1918) predominantly entered the professions. Since then the tendency has been on the increase for graduates to find their life work in other occupations as well. During the nineteen-twenties the curriculum was considerably modified, as a matter of fact, to include specific vocational preparation. After the middle nineteen-thirties, however, the emphasis was reversed again in favor of the liberal arts tradition. While this was done with the full approval of most of the faculty and the governing board, it did cause some decline in student enrollment and thus arouse concern.

Despite some uneasiness over what was happening, the faculty believed strongly in their curriculum. They not only considered it superior but also maintained that it offered the training needed for many vocations. As they sized things up, the difficulty was that students couldn't see the possibilities. The remedy they advocated was a personnel program designed to do two things: first, make clear to undergraduates and prospective students how they could use the existing curriculum for vocational preparation; and second, help young men and women make the most of themselves and their opportunities while in college.

The first step in the direction advocated was the appointment by the president of a faculty committee to draw up a brochure setting forth the college's educational aims and describing its curriculum. The resulting folder (1940) stressed the idea of liberal education as the "foundation on which careers in public life, the professions, and business are built." A series of departmental meetings of the faculty to discuss the leaflet led to the demand for a more elaborate pamphlet outlining in greater detail how the available courses might be used toward a variety

of vocational goals. Each department then prepared a list of possible vocations for which its majors could qualify without sacrificing the regular requirements, and indicated the appropriate sequence of courses. In science, for example, suggestions were offered for majors interested in careers in sixteen fields, including such diverse areas as aquatic biology, psychiatric aid, and preprofessional work in medicine, dentistry, pharmacy, forestry, and engineering. When the several departmental lists were assembled and published as a bulletin, *College and Career* (1941), curriculum patterns were presented for sixty-six vocations, more than a third of which were in teaching and educational administration.

These two publications were written on the assumption that the existing course offerings could be left fairly much as they were. While there is some evidence to suggest that preoccupation of this sort with the practical needs of students had its stimulating effect on course content and campus relations, the main result was the analysis in writing of the vocational possibilities inherent in a program of liberal arts. The first task called for by the faculty had thus substantially been met. The second and more important job, that of helping students to profit from the available resources, called for a more complex procedure.

The work of the study committees

It is true that the integrated program we are describing did not have to start exactly from scratch. There were in existence before 1940 an admissions office, deans of men and women, a health service, and a placement bureau. But there was very little in the way of comprehensive counseling of students and no concerted action among the service units enumerated. After the publication of the two bulletins, sentiment on the campus was ready for intensive work on a well articulated program. In January 1941 the president accordingly appointed a special committee on student personnel. Four subcommittees were organized at once to develop proposals respectively on guidance,

social direction and organizational (*i.e.*, extracurricular) activities, placement, and the health service.

Two important considerations controlled the work of this special committee and its study groups. First, it was agreed that the work should be done by the instructional and administrative staffs together, with positions of leadership carried by members of the teaching faculty. Accordingly, the chairmen of the four subcommittees were a professor of English, an associate professor of history, the dean of the department of jurisprudence, and an assistant professor of biology. These chairmen were appointed by the special committee but each was free to select his colleagues himself. The several groups were all made up of administrators, and members of the instructional staff. Eventually more than half the faculty, carefully chosen from among campus leaders, served on the study groups. While the finished work of the subcommittees was never submitted to the faculty as a whole, the method of selection and operation did much to enlist widespread interest and confidence in the results.

The second principle on which the personnel study was based was reliance whenever possible on specific information. The consultant sent by the Commission to assist in outlining the work to be done by the subcommittees, built on the faculty's conviction in this direction and pointed out the sort of data that were most likely to be useful. It was then agreed that facts should be gathered on student needs and how, if at all, they were being attended to on the campus, in each of the four areas chosen for investigation. During the next fifteen months a great deal of work was accomplished. The subcommittee on guidance interviewed some forty undergraduates, made contacts with house mothers in dormitories as well as the sorority and fraternity houses, and wrote for data and comment to personnel specialists elsewhere. The second subcommittee made a study of fraternities and sororities on the basis of statistical information from the personnel deans and interviews with about seventy-five undergraduates. The placement subcommittee made an analysis of the employment of graduates through

the college in vocations other than teaching (the facts for which were already on hand), and compared the results with what was known about the placement services of a number of other colleges. The health subcommittee made a fairly elaborate comparison of what was done for the physical and mental welfare of students at William and Mary with what was available in this field elsewhere.

By the time the Commission's field program was formally terminated in June 1942, three of the subcommittees had completed the tasks assigned to them and had handed in detailed reports with recommendations. The remaining subcommittee, on social direction and organizational activities, had finished its analysis of conditions in the sorority and fraternity houses (rather a knotty problem on this campus, especially in its financial aspects) and also its study of the honor system. It still had on its books, for consideration during 1942-43, a study of other campus groups and the dormitories.

Some of the results

The subcommittee on guidance was the first to complete its work, in June 1941, after four months of deliberation. It was then transformed by the president into a standing committee of the faculty charged with permanent supervision of the new counseling system. While the original intent of the faculty, it will be recalled, leaned strongly in the direction of academic and vocational guidance, after the study program the prevailing concept was enlarged to include counseling in all of its aspects. The administrative action was in line with the group's own recommendation that the college increase its facilities for advising students and assign them to the care of a special committee. Its second recomendation, that these services be "administered by an instructor qualified to give psychological tests, to do clinical counseling, and to supervise the work of faculty counselors,"[8] was likewise accepted by the administration and acted upon immediately.

[8] Final report of the College of William and Mary to the Commission on Teacher Education, p. 202.

Early in 1941-42, the new guidance committee invited sixteen members of the faculty to act as advisers to students. During October and November the recently appointed head counselor gave them a brief course of training. Subsequently another seven members of the faculty were asked to participate and their orientation began. When the committee took stock of its progress in April 1942, it found that approximately 20 percent of the undergraduates had voluntarily taken advantage of the counseling service. Interestingly enough, there was a strikingly even distribution to be noted as among all four classes, among levels of scholastic aptitude and academic attainment, and as between men and women.

As the other subcommittees and the original special committee have completed their exploratory work, they have similarly been transformed into standing committees of the faculty. In this way it is hoped that all personnel services will be greatly strengthened and enlarged, and significant coordination among them worked out. While a few specific recommendations have had to be deferred because of wartime conditions, in some cases perhaps permanently, the administration has on the whole been very receptive to the suggestions made through this procedure.

By way of summary

A striking aspect of the story of William and Mary is the fact that interest in a comprehensive, integrated program of student personnel was stimulated by what may be called, perhaps, the negative impact of an important student need. Vocational concerns are of paramount significance to modern young people and cannot be ignored by institutions that depend for their functioning on student enrollments. Without in any way questioning the validity of the liberal arts approach to vocational preparation, the faculty at William and Mary deliberately set themselves to selling their program to undergraduates and prospective students. Once the decision was reached to work to this end through student personnel, the procedure adopted was that of reliance on group methods and sound information. The

teaching faculty was prominent in developments at every stage; from the outset these individuals were seen as the natural agents for most of the guidance program.

Some General Conclusions

We have in this chapter described the efforts made by four colleges in the cooperative study of teacher education toward improving their services in student personnel. We have shown that the institutions concerned were at very different stages of development with regard to the personnel viewpoint, that the setting was markedly different in each case, but that all were advancing or consolidating positions on the road toward essentially the same goal. We have likewise tried to indicate how the Commission set about reinforcing and assisting whatever local forces were working toward group consciousness and integration.

It will be noted that in each case the process of revision was aided significantly by some campus development other than those set in motion by the personnel office. The study of objectives at Greeley, the all-institute conferences at Tuskegee, and the decline in enrollments at William and Mary are illustrations. While this readiness of the faculty provided the personnel staff their opportunity, the interest and expanding insight of the instructional staff were kept alive only by responsible participation. The multiplicity and interaction of student needs were made explicit in the process of discussion and of active service. A special application of this emphasis on readiness and function may be seen in the attitudes noted toward records. It was as faculty advisers came to see the implications of their job that they began looking for data and criticizing the existing personnel folders. At the same time, some of the difficulties of writing objective and meaningful anecdotes about students came to be appreciated.

Our underlining of student needs as the focus of attention has been continuous. In fact, we may claim that only as this subject took hold of the imagination of personnel staff and

teaching faculty alike, did progress toward an adequate program get conclusively under way. It was all but inevitable, furthermore, that students themselves should be increasingly drawn into positions of active sharing. This development was indeed an outstanding characteristic of all work done in student personnel in the cooperative study, not just in the cases presented. The opinion of undergraduates was taken seriously and widely cultivated, especially in connection with orientation programs and counseling. Self-analysis and student participation in guiding their own fullest development came to be regarded, in many institutions, as an essential part of the educational procedure.

Further preoccupation with student needs among all associated institutions is reflected in another activity not specifically mentioned though often implied in the foregoing sketches. In addition to concentrating on how to help students make effective use of existing resources, there was a marked tendency to work on the resources themselves and to bring these into line with known student needs. In a sense the whole development at William and Mary provides an illustration. Sometimes this effort led to the establishment of new facilities for developing or refining such skills as had been found lacking in the students' preliminary equipment; speech clinics, writing laboratories, and drama workshops are examples of this approach. In other instances, the regular course offerings were adapted so as to contribute to some extent to a student's full development—social, emotional, physical as well as purely intellectual. More will be said on this head in the next four chapters.

In the course of our narratives we have tried to indicate how experience in the cooperative study nearly always represented the convergence and crossfertilization of several concomitant projects. The close interaction between guidance and professional education was described in the case of Newark. The preoccupation with educational objectives at Greeley was likewise emphasized, as were the curricular innovations at Tuskegee. This is but one of many demonstrations we shall make in the course of this volume of the intimate connection discovered

among virtually all of the emphases that were mutually agreed upon at Bennington as important. And student needs will continue to be our theme song. So far relatively little has been said about the actual nature of these needs; we shall attempt to bring out the implications we have in mind in our discussion of the work done toward improving the curriculum.

III

Working on General Education

IT WILL BE recalled from Chapter I that an essential aspect of the cooperative study of teacher education was its emphasis on local initiative and working at the grass roots. Areas were chosen for intensive consideration and experiment on the basis of what each of the associated colleges and systems of public schools itself felt to be important in its particular setting. Very little attention was given to logically complete or exhaustive outlines of study. As a result, special interest attaches to the actual choice of problems and to the particular slant through which these were approached. Student personnel was by significant odds the subject of widest concern to the institutions of higher learning, and practice teaching ranked next. Interest in evaluative activities was similarly widespread, particularly in connection with matters of professional education. All of these colleges, furthermore—and in mounting degree with the progress of the cooperative study—were outstandingly interested in problems of articulation or correlation among the several parts of the total curricula they were developing for the preparation of teachers.

The subject of general education was treated in somewhat specialized fashion. As a topic of study it was a marked concern of the state teachers colleges and Negro institutions, but did not appear as a major project very often in the universities and colleges of liberal arts. On the other hand, as will appear in later chapters, much of the content included by the university and liberal arts people in the revisions they made in their professional curricula for teachers was handled by the other group under what they called general education. This was notably the case in connection with courses on child behavior or community

understanding. As a matter of fact, the preferences shown by institutions of different types for the manner of handling the less technical aspects of teacher education had more to do with external circumstance, local convenience, or historical accident than with questions of fundamental philosophy. Since, however, such relatively extraneous matters do condition the path of development open to institutions as well as to individuals, something more than writing convenience will have been served by first discussing each group more or less separately. We shall not be in a position to synthesize and appraise the total work done on the curriculum for teachers until considerably later in this book.

General Education in the Teachers Colleges

Since we have reserved for other chapters, our comments on the two Negro colleges in the cooperative study, our primary concern here will be with the publicly supported teachers colleges. A word is in order about the conditioning factors that account in large measure for the interest displayed by these latter in developing programs of general education for the freshman and sophomore years.

The teachers colleges were, as a group, at a stage of development that made this area a normal starting place for curricular revision. They had grown up largely apart from the main liberal arts tradition and were under some pressure from their own and regional accrediting associations to strengthen their academic offerings. At the same time, they felt some natural hesitation about taking over uncritically patterns which they had reason to believe the liberal arts people were themselves beginning to question. Some of them furthermore, especially in those parts of the country where institutions of higher learning are relatively few and not close together, were being driven by local demands and their own ambitions to become colleges of a general character; they were admitting increasing numbers of students interested in occupations other than teaching. The situation at Newark already described, whereby a large group of students appeared on the campus who might have to continue

their education after two years with a variety of vocations in mind, had practically the same effect in this college. The desirability in such circumstances of offering a basic curriculum suitable for all undergraduates, no matter what their occupational ambitions, is at once apparent.

A great deal of serious work was done by these teachers colleges in connection with the basic or general curriculum. The literature was widely examined, faculty members were sent to summer workshops to concentrate on some phase of the subject, and trips were arranged to other institutions for observation and analysis of what was being tried out. Studies were made locally of the backgrounds of students and data from the entrance examinations were used as a basis for planning. Fully as much time and energy was spent by study groups on general education as on any other area, in the institutions concerned. Some very worthwhile achievements are to be reported. But there was after the three-year period far less to show for all this effort, in terms of faculty agreement and actual experiment, than turned out to be true of any other subject chosen for study in the Commission's experience. The methods that usually worked so well—in these same institutions—frequently ended as far as general education was concerned in bewildered frustration.

The critical difference of opinion

The nature of this unexpected outcome suggests that the main problem was inherent in the subject rather than in the methods used or the abilities of the people in question. Further analysis will serve to strengthen this hypothesis. For to begin with, the initial problem of developing a common mind about any specific project in general education was actually so difficult as to prove insurmountable in half of these teachers colleges. In one case the group method of free and frank discussion seems to have resulted primarily in sharpening differences of opinion and making explicit a situation that had only partially been known to exist before. While the experience was thus in many ways disappointing to the faculties concerned, there is much to

be learned from any process that throws light on the essence of a problem. It is for this reason that we have wished to discuss the matter in this chapter.

Four significantly different viewpoints on general education came to expression in the deliberations of these teachers colleges. It should be added that all of them were based on an acceptance of student needs as the guide to curriculum planning. In the first place, there were individuals—usually in the subject-matter departments—who interpreted the needs of undergraduates in terms of revealed gaps in their preparation. They were often shocked and aroused by the poor showing of the students who came to them with respect to such basic skills as reading ability, speaking and writing English, arithmetic, and the like. Since state regulations usually prevented them from drawing up very far-reaching standards of selective admission, such persons gave much of their attention to remedial programs, the tightening of academic standards, and strictness in requirements for graduation.

Then there were other individuals, many of them likewise subject-matter specialists, who started by trying to define the extent and content of human knowledge which they thought it essential for all citizens to possess in common. They were looking to general education to suggest the unifying elements—facts, principles, values—needed in a world confused by excessive specialization. Such persons recognized the impossibility of organizing the great variety and range of modern scientific and humanistic knowledge, in any adequate or representative manner, through the pattern of traditional courses. They saw the task before them as that of selecting three or four broad areas as indispensable and working out for each comprehensive survey courses, or course syntheses, to cover the minimum essentials. Their bent was thus in line with those integrating drives of modern scholarship which have, in protest against the fragmentation of human intellectual achievement, produced ecologists in biology, cultural anthropologists in the social sciences, and organismic schools in psychology.

A third category of persons were primarily concerned with what they called the life interests of their students. Their approach was similar to that of the synthesizers just described except that they derived their organizing principles from needs relating to home and family life, earning a living, the requirements of citizenship, and the like, rather than broad fields of human knowledge like the humanities or the physical sciences. These individuals gave attention to careful study of the social backgrounds of the undergraduates and to identifying the dominant problem areas of their normal existence.

The fourth and last group of faculty members to be mentioned in this connection was not very large in the teachers colleges of the cooperative study. They looked to the requirements of the teaching profession as encountered in actual experience to define student needs, and went at outlining both general and professional education with this practical application in mind. More will be said about this approach in our next chapter, in connection with the work of certain universities.

The viewpoints here briefly described will be familiar to practically every reader. They are found throughout the educational world and reflect the essential rudderlessness of much of present-day existence. While they are not necessarily incompatible and often did combine or crossfertilize in the course of the discussions to be reported, they are clearly sufficiently diverse to make initial agreement about experimentation difficult. What had not been appreciated in some of these teachers colleges at the beginning of the cooperative study, furthermore, was the extent to which this diversity was represented among colleagues living and working close together on the same campus. Besides, it was the common agreement to the effect that general education was important that brought matters so much to a head. And the fact that all working groups for the cooperative study were deliberately planned to be as widely represented as possible was another factor making for both frustration and clarification. That much of the resulting discussion ended without extensive change in practice is accordingly not too sur-

prising; that it often led to serious preoccupation with educational objectives for the college as a whole proves that it was by no means wasted.

Toward positive results

The Western Michigan College of Education at Kalamazoo was one of the institutions that experienced trouble over general education. Since this college was, however, one that went very far in experimenting with group methods on a basis to include the entire faculty, we shall keep our detailed discussion of its work for Chapter VIII. But the final report sent from this center to the Commission includes a collection of individual statements prepared by members of the faculty, some of which are of interest at this point. The statements were drawn up as part of the stocktaking at this college, at the close of the Commission's field work.

According to this particular document, prior to 1939 members of the Kalamazoo faculty "were so thoroughly departmentalized that many of them had only a modicum of information about recent developments in fields not their own."[1] To have induced group thinking on a large scale on this campus is consequently cause for congratulation, despite the lack of agreement revealed in the field of general education. That even this experience of disagreeing could have valuable by-products, furthermore, will be clear from the following quotations:

> In varying degrees I think it may be said truthfully that I came, through this study, more fully . . . to appreciate the confusion and conflict of ideas and ideals relative to . . . general education among a typical faculty group, but at the same time to understand the meaning and implications of general education in my own thinking; to understand the basic importance of trying to conceive our general educational objectives in terms of the needs of students and of society. . . . Not the least of the values I received was the experience of persuading men and women with sincere and sharply conflicting views to talk things out in a spirit of give and take. . . .
>
> The study did much to make me a more intelligent member of

[1] Final report of Western Michigan College of Education to the Commission on Teacher Education, p. 2.

our faculty [by giving me] an appreciation of the great divergence of philosophy and methods of work among different departments and of our need to arbitrate many difficulties in viewpoint . . . an appreciation of our weaknesses as well as of our strong points, and a desire to have needed changes made.

. . . I have seen that one can disagree and yet not be disagreeable. My ideas and my subject have been subjected to the third degree and yet I believe in them. I have been compelled to think out the role of my subject in the scheme of education in a teachers college of the future, and to define and modify procedures. My educational philosophy has been broadened and liberalized. . . .[2]

Other members of the faculty, both in this college and elsewhere, mentioned the personal help and inspiration they had received from workshop experiences and visits to other institutions. Others have felt stimulated to undertake individual study projects or to try out some new method or approach in the classroom. Perhaps the conclusion most warranted by all the facts, as they have reached the Commission's files, is that the first necessary steps have been taken, on several campuses, toward plowing the ground in preparation for experimentation to come. The need has actually been voiced in some of the final reports for initiating procedures looking to the thorough overhauling of educational objectives. It is to be hoped that the pressures of wartime and postwar adjustment will reinforce the growth that has been started rather than divert its progress. No local factor is likely to be more critical in deciding this issue than the vision of the leadership these colleges enjoy.

Despite the confusion so widely found and even accentuated by the cooperative study, as far as general education in the first two years of college is concerned, we have some positive experiments to describe that should be of considerable interest against the background of the preceding discussion. They were made in situations where one or another of the viewpoints above presented was sufficiently in the ascendant to permit joint action. Incidentally, any thinking person will at once grant that even among representatives of each of the several outlooks, there is

[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 26, 30-31, and 44.

ample opportunity for stimulating differences of opinion about specific content or emphasis.

Our first sketch will deal with an attempt to combine the counseling of students with general education conceived in terms of their life interest. We shall then present the story of a modest experiment with comprehensive survey courses in general education. Our concluding sketch in this chapter will describe a graduate seminar in education, which was organized to explore the possibilities of preparing, at colleges of liberal arts, teachers of the general studies (or "core" curriculum) in secondary schools of the experimental type. As in the preceding chapter, we shall attempt to include in each instance enough of the local background to convey the particular flavor of the experiment described.

Starting from Life Interests at Troy

The subject of our first sketch in this series is the Alabama State Teachers College at Troy. The institution prepares young men and women for the elementary and secondary schools of the state's southeastern counties, with special emphasis on rural communities. During the first years of the cooperative study the student body varied around 300, the women outnumbering men in the ratio of nearly two to one, and there were twenty-eight individuals on the administrative and teaching staff. We propose to give special attention, in our account, to the initial analysis of student needs, the attempt to fuse procedures of guidance and instruction, and the freshman core or integrated course in bio-social development.

The setting

The urge toward curricular revision on the basis of social realities, as expressed at Troy, is part of a statewide movement that dates from the reorganization of the state department of education in 1935. At that time responsibility for elementary, secondary, health, and physical education, libraries, and the like was concentrated in one division, and it was this organizational unit that sponsored the curriculum program for the next

five years. Despite the prevailing conservative culture of this section of the deep South, the program was distinctly experimental and functional in its orientation from the outset. The readiness of public opinion for such an approach is locally attributed to an "overwhelming appreciation of the failure of the schools to bear their responsibilities" during the chaotic decade after the first world war and the subsequent economic depression. Certain "crucial needs and deficiencies" in the program had been made apparent and "self-examination became the order of the day" in educational circles.[3]

The immediate impact of the program initiated by the state department of education was felt in the public schools. Approximately 17,000 teachers[4] took part in the workshops, conferences, and study projects of the enterprise. They represented nearly seventy county systems and more than forty city systems. The main objectives of the undertaking were to promote the study of curricular problems by the teachers themselves, to adjust the school curriculum to the needs of the region, to orient practice and the choice of materials to recent social trends, and to emphasize flexible courses and accompanying guidance procedures. But the institutions that prepared teachers obviously had a stake in what was happening and could not remain outside the development. From the start all of the seven publicly supported institutions of higher learning were indeed actively associated with it, along with certain private colleges and specialized institutions of various kinds.

In 1937, after the state project had been functioning for two years, its first director resigned to accept the presidency of the Troy institution. Upon his initiative, the intensive work of the movement was extended to the four state teachers colleges, including Troy, that prepare for the white school systems. These

[3] Final report of the Troy State Teachers College to the Commission on Teacher Education, p. 7. For a full account of this program see C. B. Smith, "Final Report on Initiation and Promotion of the State Curriculum Development Program for Alabama, 1935-1940," an unpublished dissertation for the Ed.D. degree in the files of Teachers College, Columbia University, 1940.

[4] As in all reports of the Commission on Teacher Education, the word "teacher" is used to include supervisors, principals, and other administrators as well as classroom teachers.

centers worked as a study unit within the larger project. They had as their joint consultant on full time, for eighteen months, a professor of education who had been connected with New College, a former subsidiary of Teachers College, Columbia University. The Commission on Teacher Education provided special consultant service during the same period. As a result, agreement was reached by the four colleges with respect to a pattern to govern general education, during the freshman and sophomore years, though the actual implementation of the program was to be developed separately by each faculty as a group.

But before presenting the adaptation worked out at Troy it is necessary to go back a little and begin with the analysis made at this institution of the social backgrounds, interests, and attitudes of its undergraduates. The work done by the four teachers colleges together and within each institution by itself proceeded concomitantly.

The initial period of study

The faculty at Troy started with the assumption that their curriculum in general education should minister to all of the most important life needs of the undergraduates. They also accepted as a working principle that this curriculum should be not only integrated but actually fused with the program in student personnel—the chief point of contact and interaction being the counseling procedure. Such an undertaking called for great clarity and agreement about the critical needs to be served. The task of making the initial analysis proved to be no easy one and a period of eighteen months was given to it before experiments were started. This outcome was, however, generally anticipated by the faculty itself; from the start the necessity had been visualized for "an orientation period of study" which might last "approximately two years," a "curriculum-repatterning period" of experimentation and adjustment, and a "permanent period of steady . . . reconstruction of the educational program as a unified whole."[6]

Early in October 1937, the entire faculty was organized into

[6] Final report to the Commission, p. 16.

six working committees to study respectively the group and individual needs of students, a sample community in the service area, basic educational philosophy, campus life, trends in college and teacher education, and the implications for Troy of the statewide program. There was also a steering committee, a committee to interpret the data of the first two study groups, and another committee to formulate a program of action on the basis of all findings. As things worked out during the next two academic years, the assignments of the several groups on philosophy and interpretation merged and were taken over by the steering committee. The industry of the study groups, or faculty seminars as they were called, may be gauged to some extent by the fact that a reserved section for the faculty was set up by request in the library, and that more than $1,000 was spent on books for the project in general education.

The working committee on group and individual needs of the students (defined to include interests, abilities, and general background) turned in the most comprehensive of the reports prepared by the faculty and completed by the fall of 1939. The study procedure included personal interviews with undergraduates and former students, questionnaires to former students, and an examination of the educational literature. Among the significant recommendations offered were emphases on providing for the cultural and social enrichment of the students' background, keeping the costs of education within reach of their limited financial resources, directing attention to the study of home communities, providing students liberally with opportunities for sharing responsibility and leadership, orienting instruction to the known capacities and development of the undergraduates and making broad use of the problem approach, focusing the offerings of individual departments on student needs "to the limit of practical possibilities," and continuously studying such needs with their relevance to the educational program in mind.

It was agreed that the heart of the program in general education should be a series of integrated core courses that disregarded departmental lines. The procedure as well as the content was

to be addressed to the needs uncovered by the faculty seminars. Student participation in campus life was extended at this time to include work on faculty committees and a share in reconstructing the curriculum. The scope and purpose of the proposed new program may be stated briefly as developing "sound scholarship and a cultural background" with respect to personal problems in the following five areas of living: individual and social development, home and family life, recreation and creative self-expression, adjustment to and control of the physical environment, and the fundamental aspects (including values) of socio-economic and civic affairs.

More specifically, the curricular pattern for general education agreed upon by 1940 and revised a year later called for a total of 48 quarter hours during each of the first two years of college. Major emphasis in the freshman year was put on the bio-social development of the individual (21 quarter hours) to include work in human biology, health and physical education, psychology, and problems of modern society. There was another such fused or core course on the arts in individual development, a service course in English, and an elective subject (each 9 quarter hours). For the sophomore year there was a core on man and his natural environment (9 quarter hours), two additional core courses (12 quarter hours each), respectively, on socio-economic problems of the region and nation and on the arts in contemporary society, a service course in applied mathematics (3 quarter hours), and electives in physical education and the student's special interest (3 and 9 quarter hours, respectively).

During 1939-40, the faculty authorized a remarkable project, the purpose of which was to do some exploratory work before more general experimentation with the new curriculum was undertaken. Two instructors and thirty-two freshmen were released for two quarters from the usual class requirements except for three one-hour courses in physical education, music, and art. They were given a mandate to work out on the spot a program in general education based on the interests and needs of this particular group of students. This venture proved to be a valuable orienting experience for all concerned, including the facul-

ty as a whole, but it also led to the conviction that more in the way of guidelines would have to be provided than had at first been thought necessary.

During the summer of 1940, four members of the faculty accordingly gave considerable time to blocking out the content for the proposed core courses and to developing a tentative syllabus to guide instruction. They revised and refined their proposals at a workshop on teacher education conducted by the Commission at the University of Chicago. On their return to the campus, a three-day conference before the opening of the fall quarter was used for presenting their work to the entire freshman staff for discussion. The deans of men and women were responsible for a significant part of the core requirements as authorized for trial; it was agreed that "standards attained by a student in campus living" were to be important in evaluating his work in the appropriate comprehensive courses. With this summer's work and the fall conference, the anticipated period of orientation may be regarded as concluded. The second phase of curriculum reconstruction, that of experimentation and adjustment, was inaugurated with the academic year of 1940-41.

Toward fusing guidance and general education

During the first year of experimentation, the faculty agreed to restrict its new activities to the proposed work for freshmen, leaving the second year's program until the students had become sophomores. It will be recalled that the Troy faculty started with the assumption that student personnel was as important as course content, especially as far as general education was concerned. The decision to base the curriculum continuously on student needs, furthermore, implied that undergraduates should learn to become articulate about these needs. Counseling procedures and the active participation of students in directing course developments were thus accepted as essential aspects of the program. The reader will be reminded, in this connection, of the situation described in Chapter II for the New Jersey State Teachers College at Newark.

While the drive toward integrating curricular and guidance

activities was certainly marked among the institutions associated with the Commission, as already noted, few went as far as Troy in this regard. The academic problems which students discussed with their faculty advisers, in most cases, had to do with the piling up of work at peak times, adjusting to new methods of instruction, making the best use of the library, improving study habits, or learning how to get over shyness in class and developing facility in expressing themselves. Such problems are in a sense created by the curriculum rather than objects for its immediate attention. The hypothetical case of a student failing in chemistry may serve to bring out the difference we wish to emphasize. Most faculty advisers to whom such a student turns are not themselves teachers of chemistry. They try to help him understand the ways of his particular chemistry professor, perhaps, find new sources of information, or see the relationship between what he is being taught and his future life work. If the adviser is enterprising and familiar with the personnel point of view, he may look into the student's background and his total experience on the campus. He may take no end of pains to arrange the student's social life so as to permit greater ease of concentration on chemistry. But he will not be able to modify the content of the course to play directly into the student's fundamental interests—assuming that those are known and recognized.

It was with this last object in mind that the Troy faculty decided to try out a plan whereby a certain team of faculty members would carry full responsibility for the guidance and instruction of a particular group of students. The freshman class of 1940-41 numbered more than 100 and was organized into three sections, of not more than forty each, on the basis of interests and background. Teams of from two to five faculty members with different fields of specialization were assigned to each, with one of their number serving as chairman. The sections met with their faculty teams for two hours, five days a week for each core; this schedule required two-thirds of the chairman's time and half the time of his supporting colleagues. A good deal of the actual course work was done by small groups

or individual students, and this obviously entailed much conferring on methods of study, use of the library and other resources, and analysis of the problem selected for treatment. Detailed acquaintance with the concerns and interests of the students guided the faculty in their choice of materials, both for personal guidance and for presentation to the sections as a whole.

During the opening week of college some thirty upperclassmen assisted the faculty with the orientation of the several freshman groups. They were particularly useful in helping the freshmen get acquainted and feel at home. At the same period tests of intelligence, personal adjustment, and scholastic achievement were given and physical examinations administered. The test results were scored under guidance by the student concerned and were then used as the basis for planning the freshman curriculum, in each section, through group and individual conference.

With the opening of the second experimental year, 1941-42, a substantial reduction occurred in the freshman class which meant a loss of certain members of the faculty. There were not enough of the latter left to continue the sectional arrangement of the first year. Besides, the experiment had convinced the faculty that neither the students nor they themselves were quite ready for so complete a break with past experience in the classroom as they had attempted. They agreed that still more was needed in the way of an outline of subject matter to ensure a certain coverage, that fewer decisions needed to be made on a group basis, and that most students required more specific help than they had been given in selecting topics and finding suitable materials for study. The freshmen concurred in this view and felt that they had not been prepared for the independent "research" required of them; they had been baffled by the task of relating lectures and assigned readings to the problems they had selected as their special interests; above all—and this was the crucial factor—they were uneasy about how they were going to be rated for the work done and about the subject matter for which they were going to be held responsible.

It was accordingly decided to try out in the second year a broad arrangement of subject matter within each core, and to rotate students in groups of fifteen or so from one faculty team or individual specialist to another. This was done particularly for the freshman core in bio-social development and during the third quarter of the year. The new plan meant that to some extent the spotlight was taken off the particular student and focused on subject matter. Counselors had fewer contacts with freshmen than had been true the first year; while each had all of his advisees in class at some period, he no longer had them for two hours every working day. In talking over developments after the second experiment, the faculty generally agreed that the procedures for the two years might well have been reversed. Some of them thought they might have been ready in 1941-42 for what they had tried to do in combining teaching and counseling in 1940-41, if they had used a year first for reorganizing and correlating subject matter. Their ideas about student needs were, moreover, being redirected to some extent by experience. But to make the whole development clear we shall have to repeat the story of these two years with emphasis on the instructional side. We shall do this in the next section, using one of the core courses for illustration.

The emerging core in bio-social development

As already noted, the freshman core in bio-social development is the most extensive single phase of the program emerging at Troy in general education. The preliminary analysis of student concerns had revealed so many outstanding problems in personal and social adjustment that the faculty decided to begin the bio-social core, in 1940-41, with units in this area of each section's own choosing. Difficulty was, however, encountered over the use of the problem approach; in the words of a faculty bulletin,[6] "students and instructors were learning a new instructional technique" and did not find it easy to reduce the chosen problems to "manageable size." The experience of one section

[6] *The Freshman Program in General Education for 1940-41,* Bulletin XXVIII (Troy: Alabama State Teachers College, 1941), pp. 55-56.

was roughly typical of the rest. The chairman suggested that "a study of individual differences" in relation to personal-social development might be useful. This suggestion was adopted and the section subdivided into four groups to study the following topics: individual differences due to age and sex; individual differences due to family inheritance; individual differences and their relation to personality; and individual differences due to race, geography, and nationality.

Students chose problems according to their interests and each instructor worked in the area closest to his field of specialization. Thus the biologist on the team gave major attention to the first two subgroups, the psychologist to the third, and the social scientist to the fourth. There was, however, "an exchange of services when problems cut across subject fields as they necessarily did." Each subgroup elected a chairman and analyzed its topic so that individual students might "investigate one particular aspect" of it. These subgroups worked on the unit for about four weeks; general meetings of the entire section were held occasionally for "help on concepts, general principles, and techniques needed by the whole group."

Work in the other sections and for other units followed much the same pattern. The nature of the general meetings may be illustrated from the report of another section as it worked on personal-social adjustment.[7] They were designed to meet the "many common problems and needs" that kept constantly cropping up. In this particular section the general meetings were used in the following ways. The English department offered help on taking notes, drawing up outlines and bibliographies, developing and presenting materials, and the like. A geographer was asked to conduct class periods on "the physical environment and its effect on individuals and their relationships." The social scientist on the faculty team presented, on different occasions, "an interpretation of the culture," "cultural patterns as they influence our developing personality," and "the social environment as it influences our relationships with others." The biologist discussed genetics, "how human variations occur,"

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 70.

and "the physiological development as it affects personality." Joint reports from the subgroups were made to the section as a whole where they were discussed and appraised "by the faculty and class together." Films were sometimes presented and discussed at such general meetings. One double period was given to "our common objectives" and the items on which the students' "growth would be checked."

We have already indicated in the preceding section how the personnel program was associated with general education at every stage of the work. We have also noted that there was some dissatisfaction with the first year's experiment despite genuine pleasure over the substantial fusion achieved with regard to instruction, guidance, and campus living. The reduction in staff and students in 1941-42 served to bring matters to a head and the dissatisfactions were faced up to squarely. Staff members acknowledged that it had not been easy to draw on their specialties adequately in the cooperative attack on the problems selected by the students. Furthermore, they began to doubt the wisdom of relying quite so heavily on student initiative:

> Students were inclined to consider their task finished and the subject exhausted, when sharing had been completed. This reluctance to penetrate more deeply into fields and failure to pursue new leads growing out of initial studies . . . raises serious questions concerning [the] motivating power of expressed interests for those long accustomed to taking fixed assignments.[8]

It was accordingly agreed that certain modifications would be necessary another year. As already noted the experimenters with the new program came to recognize that the staff would have to exercise stronger leadership in organizing units of instruction and also in determining student needs. Results since 1941, as the period of exploration has been merging into the final stage of permanent acceptance, have confirmed the wisdom of changing in this way toward greater emphasis on faculty direction. Perhaps another difficulty worth mentioning in this connection, which has likewise yielded progressively with the passage of time, has been the initially substantial problem of securing ap-

[8] *Ibid.*, p. 40.

propriate study materials and background reading for the unconventional type of instruction adopted.

One more phase of the subject of student needs should be mentioned in concluding this sketch. During the first experimental year, 1940-41, the faculty worked on a statement of major factors of teaching competence, designed to direct the selection of curricular materials for prospective teachers and the evaluation of student progress. Under the leadership of the local coordinator for the cooperative study at Troy, this task was carried through by the end of the year to the adoption of a list of forty items, expressed in terms of specific behavior and organized in nine basic categories. This statement was found to be broad enough for the guidance of general as well as professional education, and concrete enough for use in daily planning and appraisal.

Armed with this instrument the bio-social staff, reduced in 1941-42 to six individuals, made plans to start the new freshman program with a unit on "problems of modern living." The life scientists emphasized the biological determinants of living, with a view to the implications for teachers, while the social scientists took up consumer and labor problems as they are conditioned by our contemporary social order. One period a week was given to current world affairs including place geography. The students rotated from one set of instructors to another and counseling was done in terms of the factors of competence identified as desirable in teachers. Staff and student appraisals of growth toward achievement consequently became more specific and were also more systematically recorded. The critical suggestions of the previous year were and are being met in this way, without entailing any loss of the essential experimental drive of the program.

By way of summary

The story of Troy's innovations in general education is instructive in several respects. First, it highlights the importance of reaching some substantial agreement on the outcomes aimed at before experiment is undertaken. On this basis procedures

can be appraised in the course of trying them out, and the implications of educational assumptions can be tested, clarified, and enriched by experience. The Troy faculty was furthermore unusually farsighted in allowing for long periods of initial study and experimentation, as well as for continuous check once the main lines of the new curriculum had become clear. The existence of the statewide program and the intimately small size of the staff are factors that, in this case, clearly were important in bringing about the essential degree of group commitment.

Again, the Troy experience demonstrates how slow and complex a job it is to translate new theory into classroom practice, and how much patient skill is required to lead immature students to the point of responsible sharing in their own educational development. The setting of this particular program is arresting because it shows a conservative and economically underprivileged culture beginning to experiment with very modern educational methods. Both factors were reflected in the minds and viewpoints of the freshman classes—and to some extent even the faculty. Finally, the story suggests that student needs are exceedingly complex and that all of the approaches to them expressed in the course of the cooperative study have a real bearing. While the Troy group clearly started with life interests as their dominant conception, they combined this from the outset with emphasis on revealed gaps in preparation—as witness the service courses in English and applied mathematics—and were not slow in recognizing the importance both of the demands of integrated subject matter and of the requirements of teaching as a profession.

The Area Curriculum at Milwaukee

We turn now to a somewhat different approach to general education as developed experimentally at the Wisconsin State Teachers College in Milwaukee. Before the current disruption of enrollments the student body varied well over 1,200 and roughly two-thirds of the group were young women. The undergraduates came, for the most part, from homes that were not very well to do and their parents were often immigrants of the

first or second generation, representing many national strains. About three-fourths of the students had their homes in metropolitan Milwaukee. Most of the graduates became teachers and entered upon the profession in rural districts or small towns within a radius of 100 miles of the city. The administrative and instructional staff numbered approximately 100 persons.

The setting and first steps

The Milwaukee institution is one of the state teachers colleges that is in process of taking over certain general functions on an increasing scale. Before the opening of the cooperative study a plan had been initiated to improve the offerings of the academic departments. It called for a reorganization of the four-year curriculum according to two administrative divisions called junior and senior colleges. The junior college is devoted to general education by way of background for intensive professional training in the senior college, but is also open to young people who have no wish to prepare for teaching. Considerable care is taken over the admission of students to the senior college after the first two years, with a view to restricting the opportunity to those who are likely to meet the institution's professional standards as teachers.

Beginning in 1938-39 and on the basis of several years' study, a new program in general education was tried out at Milwaukee as an alternative to the comprehensive courses already offered. This "area curriculum," as it was called, consisted originally of five broad fields or major areas, all of which were required of students choosing this program. Registration for the sequence was at first restricted to 70 members of the entering freshman class of some 400. The areas in question were physical science, biological science, social science, the humanities, and a fifth called "social and aesthetic experience." Students were expected to take these integrated courses during their freshman and sophomore years, meet the requirements in English composition and foreign languages, and devote the rest of their time to major and minor subjects of their choice.

Responsibility for the content and methods for the several

areas was given to five practically autonomous committees appointed by the president. Little effort was made to coordinate the work of these bodies. In fact, as first tried out, the area courses were simply local adaptations of the introductory surveys in vogue at the University of Chicago. The four or five faculty members assigned to each area agreed among themselves on the sequence and time allotments for the different topics to be taken up. Each lectured on his own specialty while his colleagues listened, and each led a quiz section throughout the year. The weekly schedule called for about two hours of lecture, one hour of quiz and discussion in small groups, and one hour of illustration or demonstration; there was no laboratory work and relatively little outside reading. Student achievement, as measured by a comprehensive examination prepared by the area staff, was about the same as that found in the regular classes. Because of strong opposition from the rest of the faculty, the experimental group became discouraged. Their morale was further lowered by the state university's refusal to give transfer students full academic credit for work done in the area courses.

Except for the faith of the president the experiment might have been given up at the end of the first year. It was at this point that Milwaukee State Teachers College became associated with the Commission's cooperative study of teacher education. After the Bennington conference, described in Chapter I, the president appointed a series of special study committees. He singled out for emphasis the new project in general education along with student personnel, child development, social understanding, and the arts in education. Parenthetically we may say that these study committees caused a minor disturbance of the administration. As they got under way it became evident that their assignments overlapped, not only among the study groups but also between these and some of the regular standing committees. While this crosscutting slowed up progress and illustrated the danger of overorganization, by demonstrating the interrelatedness of many emphases it resulted eventually in greatly simplified and soundly coordinated arrangements for revising the curriculum.

As far as general education is concerned, the period and resources of the cooperative study were used at Milwaukee for improving the area curriculum. This project was greatly aided by a thoroughgoing evaluation of the entire program which, after the first year, became an outstanding feature of this college's participation. The wider preoccupation throughout the institution with experimental ideas and educational objectives did much to restore confidence and promote interest in the project in general education. Stimulation was likewise received from contacts at workshops, general meetings called by the Commission, and visits to other institutions. As a result, the area curriculum was notably advanced and experienced a very interesting evolution. We propose to show this in our discussion particularly of changes in the fifth area and of the work done in the physical sciences.

Changes in the fifth area

Most of the problems and uncertainties connected with the new curriculum turned up in what was at the outset the fifth major area, on social and aesthetic experience. This requirement always differed from the others in that it was spread over the entire residence in college rather than confined to a period of thirty-six weeks during either the freshman or sophomore year. Furthermore, hours and credit were arranged individually for each student while the other areas regularly carried four units of credit apiece. Work was offered in art, music, journalism, speech, dancing, study clubs, choruses, social organizations, and athletics. The aim was to see whether or not anything was to be gained educationally by relating the student's social and aesthetic development to his whole course in college. According to the final report sent to the Commission, it was found after careful study that the materials comprised within the area were too diverse for any significant correlation. Without giving up the fundamental objective, the plan for the fifth area as such was consequently abandoned.

Several experiments were then undertaken to provide for the content visualized for the fifth area in other parts of the cur-

riculum. For instance, attempts were and are being made to correlate the courses in music and art appreciation with what is offered in the humanities. Formerly some six or eight lectures and demonstrations on these subjects were included in the program of the humanities area. In addition, students took the regular courses in aesthetics at such time during their freshman or sophomore years as they chose. In 1941-42 the lectures on art and music were dropped from the humanities calendar; students enrolled for the area curriculum were required to take the appreciation courses concurrently with their work in the humanities, in sections specially set up for them. Both students and instructors report that the interchange of information and experience derived from the relatively parallel treatments provides the opportunity for intelligent coordination. Members of the humanities staff describe themselves as pleased with the progress made and as trying to plan their schedules to allow for even closer crossreference in the future.

Another example may be seen in the attempts made through the comprehensive course in social science to accomplish some of the other objectives of the original fifth area. The staff responsible for the social studies block were the first to branch out toward significant firsthand experiences and community contacts with which to enrich classroom procedure. They also conspicuously encouraged group methods among students and between students and faculty members for certain phases of the educational work. Voluntary student committees were sponsored to meet with some members of the area staff. These bodies elected their own chairmen and developed their programs largely from the interests and initiative of the members. Thus in 1941-42, a planning committee concerned itself chiefly with the conduct of the course—with questions of how often examinations were to be given, how the time should be divided between lectures and discussion, and the like. A bulletin-board committee took responsibility for clipping items from newspapers, magazines, and other sources to keep pertinent information of current interest before the class. An excursion committee planned trips to industrial plants, housing develop-

ments, courts and other government offices, business centers, meetings of labor unions, and the like, and tried to relate these to what was being discussed in class.

One particular project is worthy of special mention. The class made a study of housing conditions and employment status in the Negro section of Milwaukee. The study was carried out on the request and with the collaboration of the Urban League which later made use of the findings. After planning the survey and making a house-to-house canvass, a student committee met with league officials to interpret the data and draw up a plan of action. Through undertakings of this sort responsibility was placed progressively on student committees for a share in the program. In turn, the procedure increased faculty sensitivity to the importance of selecting curriculum content in terms of the backgrounds, abilities, and interests of the students rather than exclusively, or even primarily, in terms of its importance as part of a well rounded survey of the area.

Work in the area on physical science

Space will permit treatment of only one more development, though it should be said that much the same general evolution occurred in all aspects of the area curriculum. A detailed account of what happened in the physical sciences, by the chairman of the faculty group of four in charge, was included in the final report to the Commission and will be drawn on heavily for this summary.[9] As expressed in this statement, the original purpose of the area curriculum was to provide that culture which "everyone regardless of his profession should have," including "historical perspective," ability to "speak and write effectively," an understanding of his "social heritage," and knowledge of the "physical and biological world about him." One of the reasons given for the relative failure of the existing program at Milwaukee to "supply this cultural training" was the fact that "subject matter was not integrated." Hence the design of the area curriculum.

[9] Final report of the Milwaukee State Teachers College to the Commission on Teacher Education, pp. 58-64.

In planning the area course in physical science ("presuming to integrate the fields of physics, chemistry, mathematics, geology, and astronomy") the object was to teach students "how to read scientific literature . . . written for laymen," to understand "mathematical and graphical methods of conveying information," and to "develop the power of critical judgment" in "arriving at generalizations." The four faculty members allotted the time at their disposal, "giving so many hours to each subject-matter field," selected the "titles of approximately ninety lectures," and organized these "in a logical sequence." Each individual lectured, assigned readings, and prepared tests in his special field. "An attempt to integrate" was made by dividing the class into four discussion sections and assigning an instructor to each for the entire year. Together, the staff prepared a comprehensive test to end up with, and this was the "only criterion" used in "estimating achievement and giving a grade."

During the second year certain changes were made, first "in an attempt to remedy faults we could see," and second "because our philosophy changed." A text was adopted to "help the student organize his knowledge" and "serve to relate the various fields." While "not at all sure" that this was "entirely to the good," the group felt it "imperative to have some book or syllabus for the student to follow." They further decided to draw on "frequent tests, reports, judgment of the discussion leader, and anything else we considered significant" in appraising the students' achievement. This not only "resulted in more study" on the part of undergraduates but likewise made the staff "observe and help the individual student more than formerly." They also advised students expecting to transfer to other institutions not to take the area curriculum.

Finally, they made a "rather fundamental change in the direction of greater participation" of the students in all class activities. This was done for two reasons: in "answer to the problem of providing for the student who deviated from the average" and in order to get "more purpose and direction" for the work. They also began to wonder whether there was "any

real difference between cultural and professional subjects"; by making the course "more immediately significant" to the participants they hoped not only for "greater learning" but also that the student might be able to "fit the information and knowledge into the pattern of his life and purposes." They concluded that "perhaps this is what is meant by integration."

The staff put this matter before the students with the result that committees were organized very like those already described in connection with the social sciences. By the end of the year 1941-42 the class was devoting one day a week to committee work, another to reports by the students, two days to lecture-demonstrations and discussion, and the remaining day to work in small study groups. Tests on general information were, however, retained and the faculty "suspect that the change in procedure has not materially detracted" from realization of the "so-called cultural objectives" as originally conceived.

By way of summary

The Milwaukee story is particularly interesting in comparison and contrast with the preceding sketch on developments at Troy. The final concepts and arrangements made for general education are strikingly similar although the two faculty groups started from different angles. As the Milwaukee experimenters got progressively into their task, the original objective of presenting a comprehensive background which all citizens should have in common was both modified and vitalized, though in no sense overridden, by concern for the known interests and abilities of particular students. The focus of true integration of subject matter came to be seen in the life purposes and professional ambitions of individual students. Incidentally, the differing attempts at the two institutions to include the undergraduates' social and personal growth in the educational scheme of things is another point of illuminating similarity and contrast.

The experiment at Milwaukee further illustrates both the difficulties and the advantages of having to work as a relatively small vanguard minority against the opposition or indifference

of colleagues. The president points out that maintaining a "radical curriculum as a parallel plan to the traditional" arrangement certainly "places the former at a distinct disadvantage" and is hard on the students concerned.[10] But on the other hand, it is doubtful if this particular experiment would have been made if the full approval of a majority of the staff had been a prerequisite. It is noteworthy that the experimenters came very near giving up even as things were, and that an atmosphere of at least sympathetically suspended judgment was necessary before the project could grow sustaining roots. It would be interesting to know, by the way, how many individuals who were originally suspicious of the area curriculum had themselves had doubts about the efficacy of Milwaukee's regular program but had simply not been attracted by the proposed innovation. Such a situation would not be unusual in educational circles.

We may conclude with some gratifying evidence of progress made. For their own satisfaction as well as to answer certain colleagues, the area staff checked their work in the spring of 1940, after the first two experimental years. They administered the Cooperative General Culture Test of the American Council on Education to the 41 students who had completed the first full sequence of the area curriculum and to a like number who had finished the freshman and sophomore years on the regular basis. The two groups were matched with respect to age, intelligence quotient, rank in high school class on graduation, and personality rating; high school credit for work done in science, mathematics, and fine arts was almost identical in both cases. The average scores on the test were at the 78th percentile for the experimental group and the 65th for the control. Furthermore, the area students consistently outranked the regular students on all subsections of this test: social studies, 66 to 62; literature, 74 to 60; fine arts, 80 to 74; science, 82 to 54; and mathematics, 64 to 54. The test was repeated with the next sophomore class and the outcomes were similarly favorable to the area curriculum.

[10] *Ibid.*, p. 6.

A Seminar at Columbia University

Our concluding sketch in this chapter will deal with a different type of project, unique in the Commission's experience. The seminar we shall describe was not an institutional enterprise addressed to some specific and local plan of action, but rather an exploratory study group sponsored by three colleges on a university campus. We include it here for the light it throws on the nature of the task with which classroom teachers are confronted as they try to provide general education for children; the life interests of pupils are presented as the essential ingredient in the "requirements of the job" which we have shown to be so important in the general preparation of prospective teachers. The project grew out of a larger joint program of pre-service education for teachers undertaken by Barnard, Columbia, and Teachers Colleges of Columbia University of which we shall have more to say in Chapter V. Barnard and Columbia Colleges are undergraduate institutions of liberal arts, respectively, for women and men, which before the wartime disruption of enrollments together accounted for nearly 85 percent of the university's undergraduates. Teachers College is a professional school which, at the same period, enrolled approximately half of the graduate students. Together the three colleges were responsible for nearly 60 percent of the entire student body of the federated university during the regular year.

Nature and scope of the project

One of the important consequences of the association of these three university colleges on a program of teacher preparation was the joint decision to explore rather systematically how liberal arts institutions might best prepare teachers for the experimental approach to general education in secondary schools of the newer type. To this end a special seminar was set up for 1941-42, sponsored by the three colleges in association with the Commission and given at Teachers College. It was listed as Education 500CS, carried eight to sixteen points of

credit, and was described as "teacher education for new-type secondary schools." With the aid of the General Education Board, fellowships for this seminar were granted to four individuals each from colleges of liberal arts and public secondary schools. Care was taken to ensure representation by geographical area and type of institution; colleges and school systems were included both from within and outside the national cooperative study. Several advanced graduate students likewise attended the seminar. The group met once or twice a week throughout the year under the leadership primarily of two professors from Teachers College and one professor each from Columbia College and Barnard. Other faculty members attended fairly often to keep in touch with the project or to render special service.

Inasmuch as the major project for the cooperative study at this university was focused on broad fields in the preparation of teachers, the decision was reached in the seminar to restrict attention to what is called the problems approach or core curriculum, without extended debate on the relative merits of programs of other types. Group methods of work were stressed from the beginning and among the chief aims immediately recognized was the preparation of a joint report. Committees were at once appointed to carry major responsibility for each of four proposed chapters. Additional committees came into being as needed to care for other sections of the report, such as a descriptive introduction, or to act in an editorial capacity. Each member of the seminar eventually served on two or more committees and no committee was appointed without representation from the liberal arts and public school groups.

In a very real and literal sense the report was written by all eight fellows acting together. The basic plan and division of labor were first agreed upon in general session. Each subgroup then usually assigned sections of its chapter to its particular members. The results were gone over together and completely rewritten before they were taken to the seminar as a whole. The frank and thoroughgoing analysis by the larger group always meant at least one more draft of the chapter and frequently

more than one. Inasmuch as all eight fellows were to sign the completed document, each had to be satisfied by all of the others.

The two main questions that guided the seminar were, "What is the modern secondary school like?" and, "What preparation does a teacher need in order to function in one?" While, as already noted, emphasis was placed on the core curriculum in this connection, the fellows themselves believed that their chief conclusions would hold for modern secondary teachers working in other fields as well. The sources of information on which the group mainly relied included the personal experience of the several fellows and the educational literature. Some visitation of experimental schools was also possible. One member of the group conducted, as his doctoral thesis, a questionnaire study of twenty schools that had a direct bearing on the problems before the seminar. Visiting specialists, largely from Teachers College, likewise contributed to the deliberations from time to time.

The course of the discussion

While, in the words of the foreword to the final document,[11] the significance of this project "lies not so much in the conclusions reached" as in the fact that "a serious beginning" was made in "exploring the possibilities" of cooperation among representatives of different sections of the educational world, the course of the general argument should be of interest. The fellows themselves described their project as an "experiment in understanding." They started work by trying to analyze together what the modern school is like; this proved to be a "longer and more arduous task than was anticipated" because of the "great differences in the educational philosophies" represented. The study made by one member of the group, already referred to, was a major help in this connection, as were the "personal reports" of the school people and the "descriptions of

[11] "New Teachers for the New School," a report of the cooperative study group conducted by Barnard College, Columbia College, and Teachers College at Columbia University, New York, 1942 (mimeographed).

college plans" contributed by the liberal arts members. While the atmosphere "became stormy" when such matters as "the instrumental conception of subject matter" or the "organismic theory of learning" were under discussion, the process of becoming "better acquainted with the problems of the other group" promoted enough mutual tolerance to serve as the basis for "a new synthesis."

The most important factor "peculiar to our time," as far as improving the public high schools is concerned, was thought to be "the universality of secondary school attendance"; this meant providing "suitable learning experiences" for the "highly heterogeneous group" covered by the term "all the children of all the people." Since not more than 10 percent usually go on to college, what education is desirable for the other 90 percent? A "further complication" of the problem was found in "the unusual social, political, and economic stress of the period," not to mention the "predicament of a society whose technology has outrun its social understandings as well as its traditional economic institutions."

Seven characteristics of modern schools, as they attempt to cope with the situation, were identified as follows. First, they were seen to accept the proposition that "education should have an intimate relation to the improvement of living." Then, they make use of that subject matter which is "appropriate to the needs of modern youth" and stress the importance of pupil participation in defining those needs. In the third place, modern education is "inclusive" in its scope and, fourth, puts "emphasis upon cooperative planning of school activities." Fifth, the new-type schools believe that "learning involves the whole self or personality" and, sixth, that "many media of communication and expression"—such as visual aids, firsthand experience, creative work in the arts—can be used to promote it. Finally, these schools place increasing emphasis on "evaluation as part and parcel of instruction" quite in addition to its use in checking the school's efficiency or pupil attainment.

These seven characteristics next became the foundation on which "the teacher in the new school" was discussed. In order

to function in the situation described, it was thought that modern teachers needed "some knowledge of all fields" in the curriculum and "careful, exact scholarship in one specialized area," but also had to have a "broad and comprehensive" outlook on life. The group saw important implications here not only for teacher education but also for the selection of candidates for service. It was at this stage of the work that the questionnaire study and visits to schools were particularly helpful. The remaining two chapters of the report, dealing with the college and respectively in-service and pre-service education, embody the essential outcome of the year's discussion. This result, interestingly enough, was no very specific proposal for either aspect of professional preparation but rather a challenge to colleges of liberal arts to acquaint themselves with the emerging situation in the schools.

As the seminar proceeded with its deliberations, the fellows became more and more convinced of the importance of continued service to teachers on the job as a function of colleges and universities. At first, the subject was not very prominent in their thinking and it was agreed that a chapter about it might follow the main report, "if included at all." The fellow who made the questionnaire study was, however, asked to insert on his instruments questions about activities for education in service. When the results were presented to the group, it was decided not only to emphasize the chapter on in-service education but to have it precede the chapter on pre-service education. This "reversal was based on the conviction" that by developing work at the in-service level, "especially in new-type schools," institutions of higher learning stood to gain "much valuable light" on the proper content and "desired character of pre-service education."

The chief proposal finally made in the last chapter was a plan whereby the entire faculty of a college could set about revising its offering in teacher education gradually by means of study groups. The seminar advocated beginning with a critical examination of educational goals on the basis of information secured from "pre-service students, graduates of the

institution, public school administrators, and citizens of the community" in which graduates were at work, as well as "representatives of the college who have taken part in teacher preparation and have visited graduates on the job." They went on to emphasize the great importance of "scientific appraisal" of all experiments undertaken, the desirability of freeing certain individuals from some of their regular teaching load for work of this kind, and the usefulness in this connection of consultant service from outside. The report concluded with some suggestions for the preparation of teachers, in which the several areas of general, specialized, and professional education were to be "unified in one inclusive approach."

By way of summary

The note struck by this cooperative seminar supplements both of our preceding accounts in that it underlines the importance of specific job requirements in gauging "student needs" as a basis for teacher preparation. In effect the needs approach was pushed back to the pupils whom the prospective teachers may expect to have in class. The conclusion that the first step required of colleges and universities, if they intend to gear their preparatory work for teachers to current realities, is to revise their educational goals in the light of testimony from the field, is especially interesting in view of the rather widespread experience of the cooperative study. It is in the area of general education that the need for dependable, realistic standards and purposes appears to make itself felt most critically.

On their own testimony, the fellows found the study group an exceptionally stimulating but definitely exacting experience. Some very real learning is agreed to have taken place. Mental horizons were perceptibly stretched and awareness of each other's problems, for that matter of each other's professional way of life, notably fostered. There occurred in the course of the year's work a remarkable meeting of minds and, along with mutual appreciation and respect, also a sharper realization of certain real and persisting differences of opinion. The whole project was a convincing demonstration of the learning possi-

bilities inherent in the group approach as well as, to use their own phrase, something of an "experiment in understanding."

Some General Conclusions

The experience of the state teachers colleges in the cooperative study with general education programs designed for the first two years, provides a special illustration of what we described in Chapter I as a leading characteristic of the Commission's program as a whole. Briefly this may be expressed as the strategic importance of concentrating effort at a given, rather specific place as distinguished from starting with an all-out attack in every direction. There was a marked tendency at the outset for the colleges and public schools associated in the enterprise to set up committees and study groups to handle practically all of the emphases discussed at Bennington. There was a very high mortality rate among such committees. In general, success did not conspicuously attend the study procedures until a few topics were discovered that struck fire locally—these were usually quite particular applications or variations of the necessarily broad and inclusive ideas presented at Bennington. But the interesting thing about subsequent developments was the way in which such concentration on fairly limited objectives led rather quickly, over and over again, to wider implications until, almost before they knew it, local study groups found themselves including more and more of the total program initially visualized.

This pattern may be discerned in connection with the projects in general education discussed in this chapter. The scope and content of general education, designed for the most part as a basis for many vocations besides teaching, proved to be no easy matter to decide. Opinions differed sharply and the process of talking things over sometimes underlined the disagreement. This was likewise the experience of the Columbia seminar, it will be recalled. But when a serious attempt was made to begin with any one conception of student needs, it was not long before all of the others began to be drawn in. Gaps in preparation, the minimum essentials of subject matter broadly conceived, the

life interests of students, and the practical requirements of the job were all found to be indispensable ingredients in the long run. And the correlation or crossfertilization of these several considerations was found to take place in the course of actual experiment much more genuinely than through the inevitably artificial compromise of theoretical debate.

In other words, the Commission's experience seems to indicate that *where* you begin is not nearly as important as *that* you begin. This is not to say, of course, that careful study and preliminary thought can be omitted. On the contrary, we mentioned the long period of intensive preparation at Troy as one of the assets of that situation. But we do offer the suggestion to larger staffs, where substantial agreement is still lacking, that it may be worthwhile to select one or another approach for trial and suspend judgment until it has demonstrated in experience its capacity or failure to satisfy the considerations they may have in mind. It is not inconceivable that two or even more patterns might be developed on the same campus, provided resources permit and the student body responds in sufficient numbers. However that may be, the point we are driving at here is that experimentation in areas that involve human relations can seldom be productive in an atmosphere of mutual suspicion or indifference. The fertilizing effects of the state program in Troy or the evaluation study at Milwaukee can hardly be exaggerated in this connection; nor should we underestimate the value of the personal sympathy of the presidents in the two colleges concerned.

A word is in order about committee structure in this connection. We Americans have quite a tendency to overorganize and get entangled in the "machinery" devised to promote action. The Commission's experience demonstrates not only the futility of trying to cover too much ground at the outset, but also that almost every area chosen for study was unnaturally subdivided into specialized fragments. We noted in passing that nearly half the committees or faculty seminars, appointed at Troy for the initial period of study, proved to be unnecessary and artificial. No harm was done on this occasion because of the intimacy of

staff relations; every faculty member was serving on two or more committees anyway so that the merging and sloughing off could take place without the slightest inconvenience. But the situation becomes more complicated as soon as numbers are increased. The overlapping functions of the Milwaukee committees should be recalled here, and especially the circumstance that the mandates of some of the new special committees crossed with those of regularly constituted standing committees of the faculty. We shall have more to say about organization for group work in other chapters of this report.

Perhaps we should say in conclusion that the trend noted at Troy and Milwaukee to see in the individual student the focus of true integration of subject matter does not necessarily solve the problem of building through general education a heritage for all citizens to have in common. The "individual student" at both institutions was first and foremost a prospective teacher. The experience of all state teachers colleges confronted with serving the needs of students with vocational aspirations of many kinds should have considerable light to throw on this matter as the years go on. Possibly there is no very serious difference between teachers and other professions in this regard. Possibly the individual student can, with adequate guidance, make more than one appropriate "integration" from the same course. In any case, this whole matter seems to be another of those questions that are best served now by concentration on relatively limited objectives. As long as the experimental mood is active and productively channeled there appears to be no occasion for worry.

IV

Emphasis on the Major Field

While the dominant organization in the colleges and universities associated with the Commission followed the widespread pattern of lower and upper divisions, many of them were not under the same pressures to abide by this sequence as were the state teachers colleges just discussed. Some quite freely challenged it and rejected as educationally untenable the implied basic distinction between general and professional training. Their faculties frequently took the position that all subject matter should be related to ultimate vocational purpose, broadly conceived, and that a three- or four-year pattern might well be developed for each major occupation in which general education, the field of concentration, and professional education were integrated from the beginning. They did not usually favor a single rigid scheme for each profession, certainly not as far as teaching is concerned, but advocated reaching agreement on essentials and then allowing considerable leeway to work out the details in terms of each student's individual needs and interests as well as of the requirements of his chosen teaching field.

In such a framework the scope and sequence, if not the content, of general education become different from those described in the preceding chapter. Attention is still focused on the nontechnical aspects of professional preparation but the method may have as much to do with the way certain technical courses are taught and with extracurricular experiences as with subject matter specifically thought of as belonging to general education. In other words, this approach assumes that it is vocational purpose more than any other factor, that determines whether a given course content shall contribute more to general or professional competence. The implication, indeed, is that

the attempt to confine general or professional training to a particular two years in college is to pretend a control over human reaction to experience that instructors really do not have.

Advocates of such long-term curricular integrations tend to reject the distinction between general and specialized education on both psychological and administrative grounds. They maintain that most students have made some vocational decisions before they come to college and that this powerful drive should not be neglected or dissipated by being ignored for two years. On the other hand, they hold that the converse is equally true and that certain major themes of that general education which is based on life interests—such as core courses on family life and community understanding—are psychologically best suited to the years immediately before adult responsibilities are assumed. The chief administrative reasons given for not wanting a lower division include the tendencies of such arrangements to multiply administrative officers, divide departmental or divisional responsibility unnaturally, and reinforce the habit of senior instructors to gravitate away from work with freshmen and sophomores.

The decision to select all curricular subjects for their contribution to occupational competence, these educators insist, does not mean abandoning general or liberal education for narrow vocationalism. In fact, their foremost aim is to assure balanced preparation for teachers who must eventually function as generalists more than specialists. They recommend the flexible pattern individually determined under guidance as the middle way between the extremes of narrow specialization and of unlimited freedom of choice. The latter can permit students to acquire a smattering in many areas without teaching competence in a single field. Where anticipated life interests are common to all students, these educators would provide undifferentiated programs; where these differ they would offer individualized treatment. For instance, future teachers of English need a shorter and more generalized acquaintance with science than do prospective teachers of physiology or biology; and stu-

dents who expect to teach general science need to have applications and emphases made for them in, say, biochemistry that may differ significantly from those required by future specialists in health education.

The institutions that pondered and experimented along these lines in the cooperative study were privately controlled colleges of liberal arts and university schools of education or arts and sciences. Despite some exceptions, their offerings in teacher education were designed primarily to prepare for the high schools while the major (though by no means exclusive) concern of most state teachers colleges and the Negro institutions was at the elementary level. Although, as we have said, the former group of institutions was not under so much pressure as the latter to develop programs in general education that would suit students with differing vocational interests, the university schools were in most respects not as free as the teachers colleges to control their experiments. Nor were they usually as free as other professional groups on the same campus.

To be more specific, in most professional schools—those of engineering and medicine, for example—a single faculty group has responsible control over a majority of the courses needed for the degree; in teacher education, in contrast, professors of education are similarly in control of around 20 of the 120 semester hours in the average curriculum. The other 100 hours fall about equally in the jurisdiction of professors in the field of concentration and general education. The problem before some of the institutions associated with the Commission was thus a matter of enlisting the sympathetic understanding and active cooperation of their colleagues in other administrative units on the campus.

Work undertaken for the cooperative study from the standpoint of this integrated approach falls in two categories. Certain institutions concentrated on complete programs of teacher education and others focused primarily on the field of specialization, though of course not to the exclusion of the other factors. It is with the latter that we shall be concerned in this chapter. We have two interesting accounts to present of develop-

ments within the cooperative study, and we shall supplement these with the description of a similar enterprise carried out at Harvard University with the Commission's financial assistance. All three projects were conducted in much more complex environments than those that have figured in the preceding sketches.

Repatterning Agricultural Education at Raleigh

The subject of this sketch, the State College of Agriculture and Engineering at Raleigh, is one of three coordinate units that together constitute the consolidated University of North Carolina. The other two are the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and the Woman's College at Greensboro. The three institutions function under one board of trustees and one president, but the affairs of each are managed by its own administrative dean. On the Raleigh campus there are normally some 2,300 resident students, practically all of them men, which represents about 28 percent of the total student body at the consolidated university. The Raleigh administrative and instructional staff numbered at the time of the cooperative study nearly 240 individuals.

The nature of the problem

The State College is organized in four administrative units as follows: the school of engineering which in normal times attracts more than half of the enrollment, the school of agriculture and forestry which accounts for one-fourth, the school of textiles with rather more than 10 percent of the students, and the division of teacher education with rather less than 10 percent. Among the young men registered in the last, some 80 percent plan to teach agriculture in high school.

The entire consolidated university follows the pattern of lower and upper divisions. At Raleigh the first two years are controlled by an administrative unit called the basic division; as suggested by the title, the courses designed for freshmen and sophomores are not primarily focused on the individual's general culture but are considered in the main as preparatory for,

or basic to, the later courses of technical specialization. This is particularly the case in the several departments of science. Since more than 75 percent of the upperclassmen are preparing for engineering, agriculture, or forestry, the bulk of the entire curriculum is oriented to their particular requirements. As a result prospective teachers on this campus have to spend the first two years of their college program taking courses that bear only indirectly or to a limited degree on their interests, and in the designing of which the division of teacher education had no share. The situation is not materially different in the advanced courses, as far as the field of concentration is concerned.

Prior to 1939, the division of teacher education had accepted the subject-matter courses it found ready made and arranged them as well as it could into such curricula as it required. We have already noted that by far the most important—because most extensively used—of these patterns had to do with preparing teachers of agriculture. The atomistic nature of the results is best conveyed by reproducing this particular curriculum in its entirety. We do this accordingly herewith. When the scattered units, which together add up to the 230 quarter hours of credit needed for graduation, are grouped according to divisional and departmental responsibility, the picture in numerical order is as follows: natural sciences 53 hours, agriculture 49, education 35, electives 31, English 18, social sciences 18, military science 12, mathematics 8, and physical education 6 hours.

CURRICULUM FOR TEACHERS OF AGRICULTURE

FRESHMAN YEAR

	1st Term *(hours)*	2nd Term *(hours)*	3rd Term *(hours)*
English Composition	3	3	3
Economic History	3	3	3
Inorganic Chemistry	4	4	4
General Botany		4	
General Zoology	4		
Algebra and Trigonometry		4	4
Physical Geology			4
Military Science	2	2	2
Physical Education	1	1	1
	17	21	21

SOPHOMORE YEAR

	1st Term	2nd Term	3rd Term
General Economics	3	3	
Agricultural Economics			3
Physics for Agriculture Students	5		
Animal Physiology or Plant Physiology			5
Economic Zoology		4	
General Botany	4		
Organic Chemistry		4	
Farm Equipment		3	
Soils			4
Animal Nutrition		3	
General Poultry	3		
Principles of Forestry	3		
General Horticulture			3
General Field Crops			3
Military Science	2	2	2
Sport Activities	1	1	1
	21	20	21

JUNIOR YEAR

English, elective	3		3
Rural Sociology		3	
Diseases of Field Crops	3		
Economic Entomology			4
Educational Psychology	3	3	
Visual Aids			3
Teaching Farm Shop Work	3	3	
Farm Management			3
Farm Accounting			3
Soil Fertility	3		
Fertilizers		3	
Electives	6	8	3
	21	20	19

SENIOR YEAR

English, elective			3
Animal Hygiene and Sanitation			3
Agricultural Marketing	3		
Materials and Methods of Teaching		5	
Methods of Teaching Agriculture	5		
Secondary Education			3
Principles of Teaching	3		
Observation and Directed Teaching		5	
Evening Classes and Directed Teaching		5	
Electives	4	3	7
	15	18	16

According to this setup, students intending to teach vocational agriculture are introduced in their freshman year to rather difficult courses in botany, chemistry, geology, and zoology; they take no agriculture and no education at all. During the rest of their time at college their science work includes further courses that are better suited to the requirements of future chemical or mechanical engineers, plant pathologists, veterinarians, and experts in marketing or soil erosion, than to the needs of individuals who are going to have to function, for the most part, as one-man schools of agriculture in rural communities. It is difficult for such students, in the time at their disposal, to acquire that comprehensive grasp and range of skills which they will eventually be called on to use. Important omissions in the subject matter, as the division of teacher education sees it, have been bacteriology and genetics. Optional courses in these subjects were recently added as a result of the cooperative study.

The period of association with the Commission was devoted to revising the curriculum for teachers of agriculture with the help of instructors in the larger schools. The entire consolidated university took part as a unit in the cooperative study, as we shall describe in Chapter VII, but individual projects within the several institutions were sponsored at the same time. We shall devote the rest of this sketch to an account of the study procedures used at Raleigh and the highlights of the emerging new curriculum.

Minority tactics and methods of study

The qualities of statesmanship are sometimes generated by the position of being somewhat at a disadvantage. It was obviously in this situation that the division on teacher education found itself when it began its work for the Commission's program. Although the plan selected for intensive work was concerned specifically with problems of preparing teachers in vocational agriculture, the entire college was invited to participate in the setup. A steering committee representing the institution as a whole was put in charge and the detailed work was

done by three subcommittees, respectively on general education, science and agriculture, and professional training. The heads of the appropriate subject-matter departments sat on these subcommittees with members of the division of teacher education. The Commission provided consultative services, made it possible for two individuals to attend summer workshops, and helped the chairman of the division to visit, among other institutions, five midwestern universities that had paid special attention to agricultural education.

The steering committee worked as a unit for a long period of exploration and discussion before subdividing for work on specifics in 1941-42. It had been hoped that educationists and subject-matter specialists would be able to do extensive traveling together, to see at firsthand what teachers of agriculture were expected to do on the job. The war emergency caught the group before this program had little more than got under way, but some illuminating visits were actually made to neighboring high schools. Since, moreover, quite a large group of secondary teachers of agriculture happened to visit the campus from time to time, and assembled for district conferences in the summer, it was possible to add to the contacts made through the field trips. Individual subcommittees or departmental faculties undertook specialized investigations of their own, as they set about actual revision, which we shall have occasion to mention a little later.

The general plan agreed upon called for gradual adaptation and revision on the basis of considered appraisal of the adequacy of current courses to the vocational purpose in mind. These appraisals were not elaborate or technical evaluations but rather represented staff judgment after discussion within each major department affected. Certain subject-matter departments, especially those in which relatively large numbers of prospective teachers of agriculture enrolled, were asked to work out possible ways of consolidating some courses, modifying the content of others, and reshuffling these or additional courses with respect to sequence, prerequisites, and credits. The idea was to plan special courses or sections for the students in question. While

the usual departmental preoccupation with the importance of particular subject matter made itself felt a good deal, in the course of this procedure, there is no doubt that widespread appreciation of the predicament in which the division of teacher education found itself was also stimulated. As a matter of fact, cooperation has been substantial and is still continuing.

Besides, even though a particular faculty group may not always have succeeded in getting the specific change it advocated, it nevertheless sometimes made its essential point just the same. We may illustrate by what happened to the basic division's request for a new deal in general education. The staff members concerned pointed to the meager cultural backgrounds of most of the Raleigh freshmen and claimed that more failures among agricultural teachers could be attributed to what they called "cow college culture" than to technical or professional incompetence. While they did not get the additional quarter hours they asked for in the total curriculum, nor yet the opportunity to orient such courses as were nominally under their control more emphatically in the liberal arts direction, they did stimulate a new way of looking at general education in the minds both of themselves and their colleagues. Professional and subject-matter courses were discussed increasingly with the personal and social needs of students in mind. The cultural and nonvocational outcomes of instruction were emphasized in connection with marketing, farm cooperatives, and the conservation of farm resources. The contribution to aesthetic enjoyment of courses in landscape gardening and floriculture came in for similar treatment. Courses in the basic division were revised to bring out the average citizen's responsibility for seeing that American education is geared to the country's real needs. Through shifts in viewpoint and emphasis of this sort, a sizable reform in general education was made and a leavening process well started on its way.

Aspects of the emerging curriculum

The most important part of the curricular revision to date has to do with the content of course offerings in science and

agriculture. As was to have been anticipated from the nature of most of their work, the strong departments in these areas were more than a little resistant to radical changes. For all that, as we have already stressed, some very real and far-reaching cooperation was forthcoming. For instance, the soils department consolidated two of its courses (totaling seven credit hours) into a single offering for prospective teachers carrying five hours' credit. As a prerequisite, to which the division on teacher education readily assented, students must take a three-hour course in fertilizers. Before the cooperative study opened, as a matter of fact, the department of horticulture had developed a specially adapted course in fruit growing which was immediately very popular. The department of poultry now offers a sequence of this type—a three-hour course in general poultry followed by a four-hour course in poultry production—both specifically focused on the needs of future teachers.

Such adjustments resulted from the recognition by the subcommittee on science and agriculture of the need at once for more, and more varied, subject matter in the curriculum for agricultural teachers. A study is under way looking toward combining certain science courses with agriculture in ways to bring out the application of science to farm practice. Another current project, within the department of animal husbandry, illustrates how hard it is sometimes to make the changes asked for. This department offers some 85 hours' worth of specialized courses on swine, sheep, beef cattle, dairy cattle, mules and horses, stock judging, farm meat, common animal diseases, dairying, and the like. Prospective teachers have only 10 hours that they can afford to give to animal husbandry. There is a specialist on each animal type; hence no committee has as yet been able to agree on the minimum information and skills that teachers of agriculture should have. Nor does any one of them feel qualified to teach such a generalized course once it is designed. Furthermore, after they had seen the work in animal husbandry that teachers actually had to handle, these faculty members felt sure that the ordinary survey course would not meet the situation. But they are still working on the problem.

We shall conclude with an account of how a new course sequence in chemistry is being developed for the emerging curriculum in agricultural education. In general, the science professors started with the view that freshmen and sophomores needed to be grounded in essential scientific concepts if the later application to agriculture and to teaching the subject was to have any meaning. They maintained specifically that this included certain terminology and nomenclature which the educationists in turn tended to think of as "nonfunctional" and hence capable of being omitted. Again, while approving the new courses in bacteriology and genetics, the scientists did not wish to see these subjects included in the 53 credit hours available for science, and asked for certain prerequisites in botany and zoology. When the preponderant share in the curriculum already allotted to science was called to their attention, they were inclined to think reductions might better be made in the 35 hours assigned to education.

But certain professors among the scientists have taken considerable pains to develop courses appropriate for prospective teachers. Chemistry has been one of the real stumbling blocks to the latter and the department of chemistry has been a leader in making adaptations. Two instructors, responsible respectively for general and organic chemistry, proceeded with the approval of the department's chairman to revise these offerings. They followed two lines of investigation simultaneously: (1) they asked the instructors of all advanced courses for which chemistry is a prerequisite to indicate the specific aspects of the subject needed for success in their courses; and (2) they consulted teachers of vocational agriculture at work in the high schools as to what chemistry they used, immediately or as background, in performing their regular duties. On the basis of this information and their own considerable knowledge of student backgrounds, the chemistry professors have been selecting content and determining instructional procedures for a coordinated sequence of courses to replace the existing requirements in chemistry for prospective teachers of agriculture. The suggested changes do not, in the opinion of those responsible, represent

any relaxation of standards with respect to either subject matter or laboratory method.

By way of summary

In the foregoing account we have tried to indicate how the position of being in a minority generated, in the division of teacher education at Raleigh, a statesmanlike approach to curriculum revision that may, in the long run, demonstrate substantial advantages over any plan that might have been established from a theoretically constituted blueprint. It is not easy for any multiple-purpose institution, or for any of its major departments, to adjust its procedures to the special needs of a relatively small group of students registered in a separate division. At Raleigh the first step toward meeting their problem by the minority group was that of securing a measure of understanding and active interest from strategically situated staff members whose courses were essential to the program under scrutiny. In other words, they began where they could—and it took a full year of steady effort to establish enough favorable opinion to get revision started. Nor was it plain sailing even at this stage, as we have tried to make clear, in spite of some very heartening beginnings.

The great asset of the Raleigh method lies in the continuous nature of the educational and cooperative process that has been set going, and that brings people together who ordinarily are inclined to go their separate ways. Further studies and adaptations of the sort described are distinctly contemplated, especially once the war emergency will have let up and more equipment and personnel become available for experimentation. While our treatment here has been necessarily incomplete, we should perhaps mention in closing that the emerging program includes graduate as well as undergraduate work for teachers of agriculture in its scope. Finally, it should be clear from our whole description—notably from the example of the basic division—that the vitalizing effects of the give and take on this campus are by no means confined to the immediate changes, contemplated or already made, in the curriculum for teacher education.

Raising the Issues in Texas

We turn now to a somewhat similar project undertaken on a larger scale and in a still more complex environment. In Austin, on the main campus of the University of Texas, the subject of this sketch, are located eight colleges and schools which together enrolled some 11,000 students before Pearl Harbor. We shall here be concerned with two of these: the College of Arts and Sciences, by a wide margin the largest administrative unit with well over 6,000 students and a staff of more than 300, and the School of Education which had some 250 undergraduates registered for degrees and a staff of less than thirty. The two institutions together accounted thus for some 60 percent of the total student body. While there were three men to every two women at the College of Arts and Sciences, women were decidedly in the majority (nearly 80 percent) at the School of Education.

The setting

Since the end of the first world war, the responsibility of state universities for the education of teachers has undergone some important changes. Up to that time, teachers had been prepared for the high schools largely in the liberal arts tradition under conditions controlled, in most parts of the country except New England, by the arts colleges of state universities. This direction was exercised through certain members of the staff, known as high school inspectors, who authorized the accrediting of high schools and hence were important factors in setting the curriculum and professional qualifications for teachers. In response to the social forces that gradually concentrated responsibility for accrediting in statewide and regional bodies, the universities came to surrender their prerogatives as inspectors of the high schools after 1918 to state departments of education.

At about the same time, many of the departments of education in the arts colleges at state universities became independent schools with similar administrative status to that of the parent institutions. It happened at the University of Texas in 1917.

This development may be attributed to the mounting interest of the time in all phases of higher and secondary education, including the steadily growing demand from educators for graduate work. Many arts faculties objected strenuously to the turn events were taking and saw themselves being left with little more say about the total education of teachers than they had long since come to have for the preparation of lawyers, doctors, and engineers. They continued to give prospective teachers the bulk—some three-fourths—of their course work, but the number and sequence of credit hours in subject matter, the essential pattern of the curriculum, and the like, were being determined more and more by professors of education, officials in state departments of education, powerful accrediting associations, and educators in the public schools. Educationists were, on the other hand, discovering that control over the external arrangements did not suffice to shape the quality of instruction to their ideals or to the needs of teachers. Neither group could afford to do without the informed and wholehearted cooperation of the other but circumstances were driving them further apart. Both groups tended to be somewhat on the defensive.[1]

The pressure of rapidly increasing business reinforced that more or less natural preoccupation with immediate and individual concerns on the campus, which has come to be known as departmentalism. With the multiplication of staffs, buildings, and students, intercommunication became increasingly more difficult and consequently less frequent. Since 1918 very few subject-matter professors have had occasion, furthermore, to see or hear what was happening to the high schools of the country. Besides, many of them became absorbed in graduate work based on much more narrowly conceived majors and minors than had formerly been typical of the liberal arts. Educationists, in their turn, for a time rivalled the subject-matter people in subdividing their expanding field into fragmentary specializations. More recently, certain promising countertrends have set in among both groups of educators and have demon-

[1] A school of education sometimes can solve this problem by developing its own staff in arts and sciences; relatively few have been in a position to do so.

strated some capacity to gain momentum; for all that, it has not been, and will not be, easy to bring about widespread redirection of energies for some time, as the Commission's experience abundantly testifies.

To return to the situation specifically in Texas, there had been until 1930 a greater demand for high school teachers than could be supplied so that the university was under little outside pressure to adjust its requirements for the B.A. or B.S. degrees to conditions in the field. After that date, however, and until the present disruption due to the war, the situation was reversed and the supply of teachers exceeded the demand. In certain fields, for instance the physical sciences, school administrators began turning for instructors to graduates of the seven teachers colleges somewhat in preference to those of the university. With fifty colleges of all kinds preparing teachers for the Texas high schools, the university could not afford to disregard its competitive position. The School of Education accordingly took note and, during the nineteen-thirties, started to look critically at its offerings. The cooperative study of teacher education offered an opportunity to strengthen this tendency and also to begin work on revising the subject-matter side of the curriculum. This last obviously meant soliciting the cooperation of the College of Arts and Sciences, which was readily granted.

The president of the university and the deans of the two schools in question constituted the planning body for the work to be done for the cooperative study. The merits of a general attack versus intensive study in separate committees were discussed and the latter plan was chosen. On the recommendations of the deans, after the individuals concerned had been consulted, the president appointed such committees to work on appropriate curricula for high school teachers in the natural and social sciences. A year later, again mainly on the initiative of the deans, three additional committees were appointed for English, foreign languages, and mathematics. Each of the five study groups was made up of the two deans, a professor of secondary education, and from five to seven subject-matter specialists. These bodies were authorized to suggest in each case

the degree they considered suitable for the curriculum recommended. Of their own accord, the committees decided, however, to lay their proposals before the general faculty of the College of Arts and Sciences instead. This was for two reasons: they believed—though not unanimously—that their curricula should lead to the B.A. degree, and they hoped that such a degree would serve to bring the College of Arts and Sciences and the School of Education closer together than would be the case if the degree were a B.S. in education. If the decision should, however, finally go against granting the B.A., the expectation is that the suggested program will be offered to the School of Education.

But this is getting ahead of our story. We propose to illustrate the development of the entire undertaking by describing in detail what happened in connection with one of the first study groups to be appointed.

The committee on the natural sciences

The personnel of the study committee on the natural sciences, in addition to the two deans and a professor of secondary education, consisted of five specialists in the fields of botany, chemistry, geology, physics, and zoology. These individuals did not consider it their task to design a curriculum to supplant completely the one already in existence, but rather hoped to develop what they considered a superior parallel plan to be offered concurrently. Early in their deliberations they discovered both the existing movement elsewhere toward five-year curricula for secondary teachers, and also the limitations on what could be accomplished in only four years. But they decided to go ahead with a four-year program nevertheless, mainly because this standard prevails in Texas for the permanent certificate to teach in the high schools, and because a five-year program would have raised the question of rewarding it with the M.A. degree—a matter that concerned the Graduate School.

The committee spent most of the academic year of 1939-40 adding to its knowledge of actual conditions in the high schools. This meant studying trends in enrollments, the changing re-

sponsibilities and scope of secondary education in Texas, newer instructional practice developed in response to recent findings on adolescence, and especially the whole matter of having to adapt to the abilities, backgrounds, and life interests of a very heterogeneous group of boys and girls. Further study brought out the fact that nearly half of the 1,800 active science teachers of Texas were in high schools with less than 150 pupils. They had to teach from one to four subjects besides science. A further complication so far as preparation is concerned was seen in the fact that, for those carrying one other course, the extra field ranged over fifteen areas of subject matter; for those responsible for two other courses, there were no less than sixty-three combinations of subject matter. A typical program was found to include general science, biology, chemistry, physics, and mathematics or history.

The committee also examined courses of study and textbooks used in the high schools of Texas and elsewhere. Several members visited science departments in the field and learned at first-hand of their problems. With the assistance of the Commission, an all-day conference was arranged at which fifteen science teachers, supervisors, and administrators from nearby high schools discussed the situation with the entire committee, the emphasis being on the degree to which their college training had actually been a help on the job. As a result of everything seen and discovered, members of the study group were deeply impressed. The needs of most high school youngsters were seen to be entirely different from those of the comparatively few preparing for college. The program in teacher education consequently appeared to be due for real overhauling. In response to the committee's request for expert advice at this point, the Commission made it possible for them to have the services of two consultants, respectively from Columbia University and the University of Chicago.

According to the official minutes, there was at one time some disposition in the committee to favor rather unconventional work in science for pupils who had no expectation or intention of continuing their studies after high school. This would have

meant preparing teachers to disregard the usual subject-matter divisions within the natural sciences, and to handle their material under such topics as "the human life cycle," "conserving the soil and other natural resources," "relations between plants and animals," "the weather," or "geophysical backgrounds of living organisms." Serious thought was given to the possibility of offering, in the freshman year, a series of broad but integrated and life-related courses in the physical, biological, and earth sciences by way of introduction to this method. But the plans were given up after some debate, partly because the courses would have had to be developed with other members of the faculty to whom the whole approach would be unfamiliar and thus probably unsympathetic. An equally impelling consideration was the committee's eventual agreement that psychologically it was sounder for beginning students to learn the specific disciplines as such and then to take up a certain amount of integration and crossreference for teaching purposes in a senior seminar.

During the second year of the study, 1940-41, the committee finally drew up its proposed curriculum. Its outstanding feature was emphasis on greater range and less concentration in the subject-matter requirements than was characteristic of the prevailing pattern of majors and minors. The existing specific courses in botany, chemistry, geology, and physics were no longer considered ideally suited to the preparation of teachers, since they had been designed as units in a sequence for technical vocations other than teaching or as a basis for graduate specialization. However, the committee did not think it wise to undertake revision at this juncture, preferring to regard the task as part of a long-term program to be directed by a possible liaison professor in the natural sciences, for whose appointment and functions the committee had definite plans. The curriculum finally proposed was made up of existing courses rearranged in a new pattern.

The suggested program was based on the prevailing 126 semester hours. It assigned 18 of these to education including student teaching, 36 to required courses in English (12), social

studies (12), mathematics (6), and the fine arts (6), and reserved 17 to 21 semester hours for electives. Most of these requirements were not only already in the curricula for prospective teachers, but were sanctioned by state regulations for certification; the only new item was the course in fine arts. Three-hour courses in principles of economics and the study of society were strongly recommended as electives, and students majoring in physics or chemistry were advised to elect six hours in calculus. The remaining 51 to 55 semester hours were to be in the natural sciences, distributed as follows:

Courses	*Semester hours*
Beginning	27 or 31
Popular astronomy (3), principles of biology (6), general chemistry (6-8), general physics (6-8), descriptive and historical geology (6)	
Sophomore	12
Human physiology (3), elementary bacteriology (3), sophomore work in the student's choice other than biology (6)	
Junior or senior (major)	6
Natural science seminar (3 hours may be counted as education)	6
	51 or 55

The sophomore program in this arrangement, consisting of a specified sequence in the biological sciences and the same amount of work in another science of the student's choice, was designed to round out the preparation of biology majors in the physical or earth sciences, and to lay the foundations for the area of specialization in the case of students who did not wish to concentrate on biology. The whole pattern is in striking contrast to the existing arrangements for majors and minors at the university, which call for 36 semester hours in science that may be all in one field.

It will be seen that the committee's recommendation assures an acquaintance with five sciences, a fuller knowledge of two of them, and an additional year's work in one of these. It provides for concentration in one science to the extent of 18 to 20 semester hours. While this was not a primary concern, the

committee pointed out that if any of the elective time were given to the major subject a student would be able to meet the usual requirements for admission to graduate work. But as a matter of fact, many graduate schools are encouraging the breadth of undergraduate preparation in science contemplated in this program.

Toward implementing the proposals

The study group on the social sciences spent the academic years of 1939-40 and 1940-41 in activities very similar to those we have just described. By the fall of 1941 both committees were ready to report and we have already noted their decision to lay their findings before the faculty of the College of Arts and Sciences. Since the two committees ran into much the same sort of opposition, it will be easier to continue our account with the experience primarily of the committee on the natural sciences.

We have shown that the proposal made by this study group differed from the existing pattern in that it called for a considerably wider coverage and less intensive specialization. This seemed to many of their colleagues more than could be justified by a prudent regard for standards of scholarship. But while this point was not by any means disposed of in the ensuing spirited debate, it was not the main focus of the faculty's concern. As we have noted, the committee did not, for the most part could not, change the existing requirements in English, education, social science, and mathematics, but it had made two innovations that were locally considered very radical. The first was the six-hour requirement in the fine arts—choice being offered in drama, literature, music, and the graphic or plastic arts—by means of which the committee sought to balance and enrich the background of science teachers. The second was the seminar on teaching the natural sciences, the object of which was to promote that synthesis which the committee had come to think of as essential to the occupational needs of prospective teachers in the high schools.

In order to provide for these two courses and the desired

breadth of training in science, furthermore, the committee had been led to omit the traditional requirement of 12 semester hours in a foreign language. The B.A. degree has never been granted at the University of Texas without this feature. It is not surprising, therefore, that many faculty members regarded the proposal as a serious attack on the liberal arts. Their initial opposition was both marked and violent. But the specialists on the committee—themselves primarily scientists and not educationists—had been convinced of their recommendations by what they had actually seen in the field; as scholars they were accustomed to reaching conclusions on the basis of their findings. Their colleagues, on the other hand, had not had the committee's two years of firsthand study and deliberation.

As a matter of fact, there is nothing actually unprecedented about the suggestions made by the study committee. Many institutions of higher learning have already adopted, and others are contemplating, very similar programs. A national organization, the Cooperative Committee on Science Teaching, published in October 1942 recommendations based on the same line of reasoning and calling for comparable breadth of preparation. In response to a preliminary inquiry circulated by this organization, 31 out of 99 institutions reported offering programs for the education of science teachers in the country's public high schools which deviated in much the same way from the traditional pattern of intensive majors and related minors. These institutions comprised 17 out of the 33 universities responding, 8 out of 21 teachers colleges, and 6 out of 45 colleges of liberal arts.

The Texas committee on the natural sciences had a further suggestion to offer. As we mentioned a while back, they concluded that the task of revising specific courses belonged in a continuous, long-term program under the direction of a specialist in science education. They saw this individual as likewise officially advising prospective teachers of science, conducting the important synthesizing seminar, and directing the student teaching of science majors. He was also to be responsible for bringing university and high school people closer together so that they

might come to agree on the essentials of a permanent program for the education of science teachers. The idea of a liaison or dual professorship of this kind was not altogether new at the University of Texas, but its scope had not previously been visualized on so broad a scale as here recommended.[2]

The two study committees on the natural and social sciences frequently exchanged views and information, in the course of their preliminary work, and they formulated virtually the same or comparable final recommendations. The social scientists asked for a liaison professor in their field, for instance, likewise put in a requirement in the fine arts, and similarly encountered difficulty with the general faculty over their proposal to omit the requirement of mathematics in their integrated curriculum. No faculty action was taken after these two committees reported in 1941 because three similar committees—on English, mathematics, and foreign languages—were still at work on their proposals. It was considered desirable to wait until all five curricula could be discussed together. Meanwhile the president's consent to the proposed new professorships has been secured. This was the situation at the time the Commission closed its field program and wartime pressures have since added their complications to the problem. But the matter is still of active concern, especially to the two deans, and there is reason to look forward to constructive developments in the future.

By way of summary

The significance of our story about Texas lies in what happened to the thinking of a group of subject-matter specialists once they had the opportunity of seeing at firsthand what was going on in contemporary high schools. As their own dean put it, "for the first time in twenty-five years . . . the College of Arts and Sciences has been confronted with the problems of the secondary schools."[3] The lengths to which the study groups felt

[2] The committee's thinking in this regard was influenced by the dual professorship at Syracuse University. See *A Functional Program of Teacher Education, as Developed at Syracuse University* (Washington: American Council on Education, 1941), Chapter III.

[3] Final report of the University of Texas to the Commission on Teacher Education, p. 97.

it necessary to go in adjusting to a totally different situation from that with which they had been familiar are as striking as they are encouraging. Furthermore, the arts dean went on to stress that the two university schools that joined forces in the project described "are irretrievably bound together from now on in the professional problem of training" teachers for the public high schools.[4] The education dean, while admitting that the results to date "are not entirely satisfactory," considered that "it is probably less important to come rapidly to formal conclusions than it is to move continuously and thoughtfully in the direction of improvements."[5]

It is tempting to argue that the initial opposition from the arts faculty would have been less had it been consulted from the start. The reader will remember that the original planning was done by the president and the two deans acting as a self-constituted committee of three. This had happened more or less under the pressure of events and because the Commission's invitation had arrived at a time when most members of the faculty were away from the campus, toward the end of commencement week. The study plans were presented at first only to those individuals who were being asked to serve, and not to the entire faculties of either the College of Arts and Sciences or the School of Education until the first reports were ready. But, on second thought, it may well be doubted if wider consultation at the outset would have made any serious difference. Approval would doubtless have been given to the proposed arrangements but could have been only perfunctory at that stage. Besides, it is noteworthy that this was not the issue raised in the debate. The shock to most faculty members resulted from the utterly new viewpoint presented and the disturbance of an accepted tradition. The prestige and security of certain departments seemed to be somewhat irresponsibly called in question. On the other hand, the study committees might have managed better if they had introduced their proposals with the explanation belatedly offered in the course of questioning, that the ob-

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 99.
[5] *Ibid.*, pp. 116-17.

ject of presenting their programs to the arts faculty as appropriate for the B.A. degree was to ensure greater participation in teacher education for this group.

Perhaps the most significant fact about the study groups is that they proceeded on the basis of two important assumptions: first, they worked on the theory that it was up to the university to prepare teachers for the high schools as they really are; and second, they further assumed that a committee representing the area of concentration should determine the content and amount of cultural subject matter—or general education—the student should have. They derived their suggestions in this field also from what they saw in actual practice. Through the recommendation for a dual professor, not to mention the composition of the study groups, the distinction between professional and technical education was likewise blurred over. In other words, the Texas committees evolved a view of teacher preparation in which general culture, fields of concentration, and professional education were blended into one organic process because geared to the recognized needs of the high school.

The facts that five study groups have been functioning in this way for more than three years, and that their personnel has been drawn from such representative fields as natural science, social science, English, mathematics, and foreign language, suggest that a process has been started on this campus that will not be easily halted. On the analogy of experience elsewhere, moreover, it is not too much to say that violent reaction can be—and often is—the first step in assimilating a new idea. Beneath the disagreement we have described, there is substantial evidence to justify the expectation that the university will meet the postwar world with at least four revised curricula in teacher education, and with a faculty whose basic understanding of the secondary schools has been materially enriched.

A New Program at Harvard

Our final sketch in this chapter will deal briefly with a project to which, as already noted, the Commission gave financial assistance but which was not part of the cooperative study of teacher

education. It was the work of a joint committee appointed by the president of Harvard University and representing both Harvard College and the Graduate School of Education. The university consists of the undergraduate college for men and twelve graduate and professional schools. Radcliffe College is the affiliated institution for women, with both graduate and undergraduate students. At the time of the study, Harvard College with some 3,500 students and the Graduate School of Education with 200, together accounted for nearly 45 percent of the total enrollment.

Origin and scope

Dissatisfaction during the early nineteen-thirties with its own programs leading to the master's degree, as far as preparation for teaching in high school was concerned, induced Harvard University to undertake some revision. In September 1936 a special fifth-year curriculum for such candidates was therefore inaugurated, which had a number of distinctive features. It provided for advanced work in the teaching subject, consideration of fundamental problems in secondary education, and student teaching. Achievement was to be measured as much as possible by comprehensive examinations. Since it has been in effect, this program has received increasingly favorable attention from school administrators and has attracted a growing number of able students. It has been jointly administered from the start by the faculties of education and of arts and sciences, and has received special financial support from the university.

While considerable satisfaction was felt, after the first three years' trial, in the way things were working out; certain details were thought to be in need of further revision. The subject-matter requirements in a number of fields were found to be not very well suited to the conditions with which graduates had to deal in the high schools. This criticism was made particularly in connection with English and led to a request, in December 1938, that a committee of the faculty be appointed to give consideration to this matter. At the same time but acting independently, the administrative board for the degree of master of arts

in teaching voted to ask for a committee to be charged with examining the university's whole program in teacher education. During the following January the president acted on both of these recommendations simultaneously by appointing the joint committee with which we are here concerned.

The committee was asked to study the entire program of teacher education, at Harvard University, but to give special attention to the field of English. Of the eight members appointed, two were educationists, three were specialists in English, two represented the social studies, and one was from the committee on admissions. During the deliberations of the following spring, the group agreed that it ought to have information of three kinds for the basis of its recommendations: about (1) the needs of present-day youngsters in high school, (2) the secondary curriculum now in use and the responsibilities of teachers dictated by the way the schools were organized, and (3) promising current practice—especially in universities and colleges of liberal arts—for the education of secondary teachers. It was agreed to collect and discuss together existing materials on these topics rather than to undertake to assemble wholly new data. A research assistant was accordingly selected to compile from published and unpublished reports, and plans were made for members of the committee to visit high schools and institutions of higher learning.

It was at this stage, in June 1939, that application was made to the Commission for support. After receiving a favorable answer, the committee spent the next two years in appraising its findings as they came in and drawing up its formal report. The plans were carried out substantially as projected. Visits were made to high schools in every section of the country where the observers could see how English was being handled under widely varying cultural, political, and economic conditions. Valuable testimony in addition was secured from many experienced teachers of high school English who, on three occasions, spent the entire evening in full and frank discussion with the committee. About a dozen trips were undertaken to representative institutions of higher learning that were experimenting

with newer methods in the preparation of teachers. In January 1942, the committee was requested to "suggest any changes in the general program for the degree which seemed wise in the light of its investigations." The recommendations formulated in response were first discussed with representatives of all subject-matter divisions and then presented to the faculty as a whole. Approval was secured by unanimous action and the report was published by the university press.[6]

Highlights of the recommendations

Inasmuch as the analysis and discussion which led up to the committee's conclusions are readily available in the report mentioned, we shall content ourselves here with highlighting those recommendations that have a bearing on the discussion of this chapter. In view of the developments at Raleigh and Texas, it is particularly arresting to find the Harvard committee regretting "a certain remoteness" of the faculty and suggesting that professors who still think of high schools in terms of "a quarter of a century ago are out of touch with reality." What is more, they thought it important that all departments concerned with teacher education should "become more aware of problems in secondary education," and should "deliberately reorient and re-educate themselves, not only with reference to the past training of undergraduates who come to them, but also with reference to the training of those who are going out to create future undergraduates."[7]

In line with this reasoning, the committee advocated that Harvard take the lead in mitigating the "regrettable amount of confusion" existing in secondary education with respect to the proper aims and scope of instruction in English. The group took the position that an adequate program of teacher education in this field could not be developed until such goals were stated simply and directly enough to command a working adherence

[6] *The Training of Secondary School Teachers, Especially with Reference to English,* report of a joint committee of the faculty of Harvard College and of the Graduate School of Education (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1942).
[7] *Ibid.,* pp. 122-23.

from all parties concerned. They called for a special commission to hold conferences to this end, at which delegates from a group of colleges would be invited to "discuss these problems in conjunction with thoughtfully selected representatives of the secondary school faculties and of schools and departments of education." The object was definitely not that of "reinstituting inflexible college entrance requirements" but rather to "re-establish the lost connection" between collegiate departments of English and the public schools.[8]

When the committee discussed the general program for preparing high school teachers, it began by challenging "an initial fallacy of the whole scheme" at Harvard, as they put it, which assumed that "training in education is something that can be applied from above at the end of another program." They maintained that "the only sensible conclusion" was to let the two elements in teacher education—mastery of subject matter and professional training—"ripen together over a longer interval," by dropping "as many courses in education downward into undergraduate training as may seem wise," and lifting upward into the fifth year "appropriate and valuable courses in subject matter." They considered it "more important to accommodate the pattern of courses to human growth" than to be too much disturbed over possible "changes in the status of the graduate faculty in education" that would result from such a program. "The process of interpreting subject matter" could, in their view, be "fused with professional training from the moment the student chooses his career."[9]

The first two years at Harvard and Radcliffe were accepted as the basis on which to build an integrated program for the next three years of training. The process of teacher education during this latter period was defined as imparting to students as much as they can absorb of "three fundamental elements":

A knowledge of subject matter, a knowledge of the psychology of learning in the pupils whom they are to teach, and a knowledge

[8] *Ibid.*, pp. 129-32.
[9] *Ibid.*, pp. 124-25.

of the social setting and social significance of the institution in which the teaching is to be done.[10]

The details are not germane to our argument here but will repay the interested reader's attention.[11] The suggestions made for administering the three-year program illustrate the major emphasis of the joint committee's thinking so well, on the other hand, that brief description may be in order at this point.

From 1936 to 1939, all programs for the M.A. in teaching were administered at Harvard by a joint administrative board of fourteen persons: six from the faculty of education and eight from the faculty of arts and sciences (identical for Harvard and Radcliffe Colleges). The committee's recomendations that this board be reconstituted to include all advisers from the several departments concerned with teacher education, and that its offices be moved to the administrative center of the university, are among those that have already been put into effect. By means of the second proposal, the physical arrangements have been adjusted to make informal conference easy for students and faculty members with common interests. A third relevant suggestion of the committee, the procedure for selecting candidates for teaching majors, may be illustrated by its application to the department of English.

At the end of his sophomore year "or as near thereto as may be," the candidate is to appear before an examining board consisting of "appropiate members" of the English department, the faculty of education, and the university administration. He is likewise to present "an essay of suitable length" on a topic set by this board in English, education, or both. On the basis of the paper and interview, the board is asked to "endeavor to ascertain why the candidate wants to teach, and what his qualifications are likely to be." It is further asked to judge the candidate's personality, his "vocation" for teaching, and his command of both spoken and written English. If the majority opinion is to admit the candidate to the degree program, then he should start his preparation for teaching as a junior. If the

[10] *Ibid.*, p. 122.
[11] *Ibid.*, pp. 134-36.

majority opinion is unfavorable, "he should be so informed; and if he persists in entering upon the program, a vote of three-fourths of the members of the board shall be sufficient to disbar him."[12]

By way of summary

The Harvard joint committee enjoyed a tremendous tactical advantage over the study groups described in our sketches of Raleigh and Texas, in that it was appointed at the request of the faculty. Public opinion was predisposed to listen receptively to the suggestions the group might have to offer. The existing arrangements for teacher education were unsatisfactory to a large number and the study group did not represent the first attempt the university had made to improve matters. There is therefore little occasion for surprise that the committee's work met with so favorable an initial reception.

But perhaps the most significant aspect of the joint committee's work lies in its recognition that neither simple revision of administrative procedure, nor yet even their far-reaching plan for a three-year curriculum, will in themselves suffice to remedy what they conceived to be the basic difficulty—the present distance between the colleges and the public schools. Others should be stimulated as well as heartened by the group's clear awareness of the basis of its own growth, and its insistence that other members of the Harvard faculty become similarly sensitized to the compelling issues in secondary education. For it must be continuously borne in mind that relatively few individuals had the educational benefit of the study procedure. It is important, and not only for the future of teacher education at Harvard University, that this pioneering committee should have pressed for an ongoing process of give and take, both within the institution and between it and the high schools. In the long run, if it is acted upon as sympathetically as the other recommendations, this proposal may well turn out to have contained the vital essence of the committee's influence.

[12] *Ibid.*, p. 135.

Some General Conclusions

In the foregoing sketches we have tried to show what amounts to a revolutionary process beginning to permeate an environment, the main characteristic of which is the inertia bred of sequestration. We have not sought to undervalue the stubbornness of the situation nor the difficulties inherent in the mere task of intercommunication. For optimism should be tempered by the sobering reflection that seldom more than a handful actually participated in the developments we have described, and that it was nowhere easy to share the experience with colleagues who had remained on the sidelines. At the same time, we have wished to point with confidence to the genuine results whenever significant contacts between groups were established. It would be difficult to find three more diverse cultural settings in the United States than those surrounding the North Carolina State College of Agriculture and Engineering, the University of Texas, and Harvard University. Yet in each case the same consequences of true interaction are to be observed, and in fact in two areas.

First, each project described was undertaken jointly by specialists in education and professors of traditional subject matter. There is evidence to suggest that what the Harvard committee referred to as "the covert hostility" between these two groups on most campuses was present at the outset, though in varying degrees, in each instance. Yet, again in all three cases, enough mutual adaptation and understanding was generated by the process of collecting facts and looking at them together, to make possible the beginnings of a joint program. And second, when—through these very facts—contacts were made with the public high schools, the reaction was identical in all three situations and among professors of such diverse fields as chemistry, vocational agriculture, the natural sciences, the social sciences, and English.

But again it is important to remember that the reaction was due in overwhelming measure to firsthand contacts over a period of time—between educationists and arts professors, and between study groups and the public schools. The discussion was not theoretical but based on evidence that all parties recog-

nized as important and as not to be evaded. It is this aspect of the experience in all three institutions that lends such point to the Harvard committee's emphasis on extending the process to their colleagues on the faculty. It was the line of communication rather than any specific change in the curriculum that struck them as containing the real key to future progress.

The experiences we have described, in this and the preceding chapters, with regard to methods of curricular revision make one further conclusion abundantly clear: there is no single formula to meet all situations. Each of the institutions presented, and the same is true of all others in the cooperative study, had to develop a frame of reference and general strategy in terms of the variables in its own environment. We have tried to show how the elements in each case were tied up inextricably with such considerations as the purposes of the institution, the composition of the faculty, the social backgrounds and life interests of the students, and the job which teachers have to do in the public schools. That all factors of this sort include the demands and expectations of the local culture, particularly as expressed in the service area, is implicit in our whole analysis.

The study procedures described in this chapter were more specifically geared to job requirements—that is, to actual conditions in the high schools—than to the personal abilities, interests, and problems of the student body which were the starting point or primary focus for most of the undertakings described in Chapters II and III. It is notable that the immediate connection with guidance procedures was made far less frequently, in the minds of the faculties concerned, and that attention shifted more naturally toward problems of placement and the university's competitive position. The fact that the conclusions reached, no matter what the original approach, were nevertheless so strikingly similar in intent for all the differing local adaptations, suggests that the several considerations in question—student concerns, subject-matter requirements, the demands of the job, and the institution's economic interest—are not essentially in conflict. On the contrary, they appear to be complementary aspects of a single function: service to the children and young people of the nation.

V

Patterns of Teacher Education

THE SKETCHES presented so far have indicated how strong the tendency in the cooperative study was for curricular revision to become comprehensive in scope, no matter what phase of the program was tackled at the outset. This was particularly true with respect to professional education. The auspices of the Commission, as well as the primary interests of most of the institutions with which it was associated, undoubtedly account for the fact that most of the colleges and universities in question considered the subject of professional education (including student teaching) to be their most important point of attack. The thinking that went into the plans and action in this connection was markedly realistic, dynamic, imaginative, and inclusive. The curricula of this kind developed or projected for the preparation of teachers were a good deal broader and more humanistic than the average reader might perhaps expect from the term "professional" education.

Many exceptions to the contrary notwithstanding, we may assert that during the last twenty years professors of education have, on the whole quite naturally, shown a more immediate and undivided concern than their colleagues in other departments for the total job teachers do and are expected to do in the nation's schools. They have been more aware of the relative unpreparedness of such teachers to cope with the educational problems that have arisen from the many far-reaching changes that have occurred in American life since the turn of the century. To be sure, the response of educationists to the situation they sensed has not always been distinguished for as much genuine insight as missionary zeal. Much of their innovating restlessness may legitimately be attributed to loss of direction,

or to impatience with training as they have known it, rather than to solidly grounded educational statesmanship. But this is not the whole story. It is definitely to their credit that alert educators no longer share the complacent conviction that subject matter in itself carries something like universal validity. Their question, "Knowledge for what?" is not to be dismissed or sidestepped. While many of the "answers" suggested by educationists may indeed be criticized as unfocused and inconsistent, it cannot be denied that these individuals are nevertheless steering American education ever closer to the growing edges of the culture. We shall illustrate this last point from the Commission's experience.

Every collegiate institution associated in the cooperative study made one or more important changes in its offering of professional education for teachers, in the course of the three-year period. It has consequently been more difficult than usual—and the task was nowhere easy—to choose programs and experiments for description in this chapter. We have had to limit ourselves to four sketches that nevertheless together illustrate the main drives and problems that characterized most of the work undertaken. The scope of the projects in professional education throughout was usually limited to all or part of the eighteen to twenty-four semester hours of education locally required by law for the first renewable teaching certificate. The revision attempted ranged from changing the sequence of existing courses to developing complete new curricular patterns, and from experimentation by individual professors to group enterprise that sometimes entailed cooperation among several faculties. It is the more comprehensive programs that we have favored in our selection. Our stories have to do with the experiences of a college of liberal arts and of three universities.

The Program at the College of St. Catherine

The subject of this sketch is a private college of liberal arts for women located in St. Paul, Minnesota. The College of St. Catherine is conducted by the Sisters of St. Joseph of Carondelet, one of the important teaching orders of the Roman Catho-

lic Church. There are normally fifty-seven members on the faculty and around 600 students; some 20 percent of the graduating class usually become teachers. The college participated in the Cooperative Study in General Education sponsored by the American Council on Education as well as in the Commission's program. The two national studies got under way at approximately the same time and were kept in touch with one another. The effect of each at St. Catherine's was to supplement and reinforce the impact of the other.

Overview of the program for teachers

When the cooperative study of teacher education was launched in the fall of 1939, there was no concerted movement at St. Catherine's for improving the curriculum for prospective teachers. Most members of the faculty were reasonably pleased with existing arrangements and quite willing to leave matters connected with it to the department of education. The one weakness in the program that was generally recognized was the inadequate provision for practice teaching. Besides extending and building on the emphases of the study in general education, especially with regard to student counseling, participation in the Commission's project meant the development of a new pattern for the education of teachers, seen as a four-year sequence, which commands the sympathy and active interest of the faculty as a whole.

The courses worked out in response to the other national study—an introduction to the humanities and survey courses respectively in the biological, physical, and social sciences—fitted in well with plans for the general education of teachers. As far as specialization in subject-matter fields is concerned, certain changes were made in response to an "almost imperative" demand from the smaller school systems for teachers who could handle "not one social science but all the social sciences, not one physical or natural science but all" of them. Consequently it is now possible at St. Catherine's for students to work for divisional majors in the social studies or general science as well as for the traditional departmental majors, if preferred, in such

subjects as history, biology, or chemistry. Serious study of this approach to the curriculum, quite in line with the developments described in the preceding chapter, is still continuing. Two members of the faculty are serving on committees appointed by the state department of education to work out majors respectively in social science and secretarial studies that "may be adopted by all teacher-preparing institutions" of Minnesota.[1]

Most of the new courses in professional education were ready for trial toward the end of the cooperative study but have not yet acquired final form. Since the academic year of 1941-42, however, the sequence has been as follows. The chief emphasis during the freshman year is on orientation to college life and developing plans for the future; personal counseling is a major and growing aspect of the work at St. Catherine's. If a student wishes to prepare for teaching, an effort is made to appraise her qualifications with her early and to analyze ways in which the resources of the college can be used to supply her particular needs. As a sophomore the prospective teacher is given the opportunity to test her real liking for children and to begin the scientific study of their behavior in a course entitled "introduction to psychology"; lectures, reading, class discussion, and the direct observation of children are the methods used.

The outstanding change for prospective teachers as juniors has been the substitution, during each of the three quarters of the regular academic year, of a sequence of required courses in social understanding for the former free election from among miscellaneous courses in sociology, educational psychology, and methods of teaching. The professional work for the senior year has definitely passed the experimental stage. Special methods courses have been integrated with the required practice teaching and the latter is now done every morning for three months (the fall quarter) in the public high schools of St. Paul. In the second quarter of this year, the student has the chance to draw on and make use of this school experience in a course on the organization of teaching units and relating instruction to pupil

[1] Final report of the College of St. Catherine to the Commission on Teacher Education, pp. 5-6.

needs. Finally, and by way of culmination, a course is offered in the last quarter of the total college program in which students are helped to formulate for themselves a sound philosophy of education based on everything they may have learned.

The sophomore and junior courses

The intent of the work required of prospective teachers during their second and third years at college, over and above the aim of mediating a certain body of information, may be described as testing and developing the student's own sense of vocation. By means of firsthand contacts with children and later with community agencies, these young women are given the opportunity not only to learn relevant facts about the groups with which a teacher naturally works, but also to try out their own liking and aptitude for the duties they will be expected to perform. For instance the lectures, required and suggested reading, and class discussion through which sophomores are introduced to the main factors conditioning human development—organic and physical growth, family relations, the environing culture, and the like—are supplemented and given direction through the guided observation of children, at play and in controlled testing situations.

While this instruction is in progress, moreover, a conscious attempt is made toward giving the student a "surer understanding of her own personality development." The prospective teacher is asked to "consider how effective she may be in promoting the growth of children" and to appraise her own assets and liabilities for such work. She is then asked to look at herself not only for those traits that have a bearing on professional competence, but also for those that "in the fullest sense" make her "an individual." Attention is directed toward the part played by "religion, human relationships, avocations, and art" in personality integration, and special emphasis is placed on developing a "consistent sense of values" and of "personal dignity."[2] The importance of self-direction in education of this kind is

[2] *Teacher Education in a Liberal Arts College,* College of St. Catherine, Bulletin XXII (November 1941).

recognized by sharing the class procedure with students as much as possible. The instructor in charge of this work reported after the first experimental year that while, during the fall quarter, she "took most of the initiative" in the planning because of the students' inexperience, by the spring the girls seemed "quite capable of . . . conducting the course by themselves and of using the instructor chiefly as an expert consultant."[3]

As already noted the junior sequence is aimed at developing social understanding and aptitude. The three quarter courses (and the sophomore offering likewise) were developed in the first instance by individual members of the faculty at Commission workshops conducted during the summers of 1940 and 1941, respectively at the University of Chicago and Northwestern University. Some units represented substantial redirections of earlier courses and others were entirely new additions. Revision has since been made constantly, though in varying degrees, in the light of faculty discussion at the college and of experience in actual practice.

During the first junior quarter, in connection with a course on social psychology given to prospective social workers and teachers in the same groups, the student is asked to choose some project through which to apply the principles and facts learned in the classroom. This has meant to date starting and maintaining some such undertaking as a branch of the United Service Organizations, a Red Cross unit, a bookmobile service, a children's workshop in crafts for story illustration, a "listen to better music" group, or what was known locally as a confraternity forum. In this way students have been given the chance to try out, under supervision, their tastes and abilities for community leadership in the future. During the second quarter, the prospective teacher serves as an intern in the guidance program of a public or private school in St. Paul. She is expected to keep a diary of the counseling procedures in which she has taken part, she is called on to analyze, interpret, and evaluate the service rendered—particularly with regard to social problems—in the light of established principles of case work.

[3] Final report to the Commission, supporting documents, p. 9.

The third step in this sequence is a course entitled "community backgrounds of education." In addition to the lectures, reading, panel discussions, and field trips fairly usual for instruction of this character, students are given a chance at more active participation. During the second year when this course was given, it became evident "from the class discussions" that the girls themselves represented "good source material" because they came from "small, middletown, and urban" environments. Since each of them wanted to "know more about her own community," an outline for an elementary community survey was provided just before the Easter vacation. Each student made such a study and the reports served in class as a basis for comparing home environments that were "similar in size but different in cultural and economic backgrounds." As a result of the discussions the girls "listed their needs as they saw them" and each "planned a reading program for herself to meet these needs."[4]

It is through such methods as these that attention is directed in this course to the range of socio-economic levels within a community and the consequent differences emphasized in the possible backgrounds of children in the same school. Factors that condition educational problems are discussed as well as the local resources that may be used as aids to teaching. An effort is made to bring out the influence a school teacher can exercise, "not merely by recognizing and conforming to the community's peculiar standard of socially acceptable behavior," but also as an active citizen and by "accepting her opportunities and responsibility for leadership."[5]

Arrangements for student teaching

Inasmuch as practice teaching was widely conceded by the whole faculty to be the weakest part of the existing curriculum for teachers at St. Catherine's, this area was chosen at the start as the main point of attack in the cooperative study. Since, moreover, this subject was less easy than those just discussed to dele-

[4] *Ibid.*, pp. 70-71.
[5] Bulletin XXII.

gate to relatively few individuals for most of the necessary treatment, on account of the many relationships entailed, it likewise proved to be one of the important means for developing that generally sympathetic understanding of teacher education in the faculty to which we have already called attention as one of the outcomes of the work.

Up to the time of the cooperative study most students had been doing their practice teaching in the preparatory school on the college campus. The arrangement was quite unsatisfactory alike to the children's parents and to the department of education. In the fall of 1939, after the conference at Bennington, two members of the faculty started negotiations with the superintendent of schools in St. Paul, with a view to securing for St. Catherine's extended privileges for student teaching in the public schools. The superintendent granted their request, asking only for a uniform procedure to be followed by all teacher-educating institutions that might wish to have the same opportunity. After consultation with his supervisors he accordingly drew up a preliminary set of regulations for the guidance of student teachers. At the college a committee formulated similar suggestions and, after conference among representatives of both parties, a guide was developed in the superintendent's office to govern all practice teaching in the city schools.

Seniors from St. Catherine's actually began work in the public schools after Christmas 1939. The requirement in this area is six hours of observation and thirty hours of practice teaching. The greatest difficulty encountered turned out to be an administrative one—that of freeing students for three consecutive hours at a time, since two hours were usually required for transportation besides the hour for service. Schedules became complicated and much time and energy were consumed in working out adjustments after the first trial. The solution eventually agreed upon by all concerned—and several groups were involved—was to schedule the practice teaching thereafter during the mornings of the fall quarter only, and to give the methods courses in the afternoons.

This administrative decision included the idea—new to most

of the faculty at the time—that methods courses should parallel the practice teaching in order to let students present their problems for discussion as they arose in experience. It constituted another instance of St. Catherine's growing emphasis on first-hand contacts as the basis for instruction. A member of the faculty was designated in the spring of 1940 to work out a thorough plan of integration. To this end arrangements were made for her to visit Syracuse University to observe the professional program there developed in the School of Education. Afterwards she attended the Commission's workshop in teacher education, held that summer at the University of Chicago. On the basis of this study and the new schedule, work was started in the fall of 1940. Three hours a week were set aside for the methods courses; half of the time was assigned to classwork under the direction of individual instructors and half to group discussions attended by all student teachers, instructors of special methods, other members of the department of education, and whenever possible critic teachers from the public schools. The period for classwork was not found adequate in practice; arrangements were therefore made later to extend the time and make it possible for students to register for two methods courses if they wished.

While the groundwork for the integrated program has thus been established the faculty still finds many problems connected with it. Individual members have attended additional conferences and workshops sponsored by the Commission, at which they have concentrated on some aspect of the matter. The experience of other institutions, especially as recorded in books, pamphlets, and work documents, has been drawn upon to a notable extent. At the time of the formal closing of the Commission's field program, the instructors of special methods were functioning as a study group and constantly seeking the active help of students and critic teachers. They were giving special attention to preparing a rating sheet to be used by these critic teachers in the schools. In this connection they were making use of a document drawn up cooperatively by the entire faculty during 1940-41, on the characteristic functions of a teacher, the skills and aptitudes needed for performing them, and the re-

sources of St. Catherine's for developing them. Another important problem area before the faculty is that of adequate supervision and observation on the part of the education staff.

By way of summary

Space does not permit full description of every quarter course in the program developed at St. Catherine's for the preparation of teachers. The foregoing account should be enough, however, to convey the essential pattern and the chief educational methods employed. It will be noted that the college lays stress on both student interest and job requirements, and seeks to test and develop the former in the light of the latter. Preparation for the profession and induction into it thus tend to shade into one another and become more thoroughly fused progressively through college. The role assigned to student initiative, proceeding swiftly from observation to active participation and always accompanied by self-analysis under guidance, is of critical importance in the educative process emphasized. Firsthand contacts with children, social agencies, and school people of the vicinity are the natural consequence of choosing to work in this way.

Joint Faculty-Student Work in Texas

Our next sketch will have to do with a project engaged in by the School of Education at the University of Texas. It was carried on independently of the joint committees concerned with subject matter, described in the preceding chapter, albeit during the same period of time. The essential approach of the two undertakings had much in common though the education people were in a position to go considerably further than the joint committees. A notable feature of the education project was the invitation extended to students to become what amounted to junior partners.

The setting

Students preparing at Texas to teach in secondary schools, whether they are registered in the College of Arts and Sciences or in the School of Education, can choose from among some

forty courses in order to meet the state requirement of twenty-four hours in education. The only legal restrictions are to the effect that eight hours must be in the broad field of secondary education and six hours in some combination of methods, observation, and practice teaching. While students registered in the College of Arts and Sciences are not bound to do so, they may of course follow the procedure by means of which the School of Education has in recent years increasingly tried to assist its own students in selecting meaningful sequences from among available offerings.

In the early nineteen-thirties the education faculty organized a six-hour introductory course on child psychology which it recommended for all prospective high school teachers who were ready to start their professional education in the sophomore year. In 1938 this development was carried a step further when a faculty committee was asked to work out experimentally with selected students a six-hour junior sequence in the fundamentals of secondary education to follow the new sophomore course. The next year it was suggested that the same groups address themselves to a six-hour sequence for seniors on student teaching combined with methods. Such plans for a coordinated and functionalized series, covering eighteen of the required semester hours in education, were still in the formative stage when the University of Texas agreed to take part in the cooperative study.

The education faculty made use of the additional resources put at its disposal by the Commission for a vigorous attack on the project it had already initiated. The controlling premise of the experiment we are about to describe was that the need and wishes of the public schools should constitute the touchstone for determining how to change the offerings of the School of Education. The university did not want to set goals so out of line with prevailing practice as to lay itself open to the charge of trying to tell the Texas high schools what they ought to teach or how to run their affairs. Equally basic was the assumption that perhaps a dozen responsible members of the staff, working cooperatively with some twenty-five selected students, could set up a series of curricular experiences that would synthesize

relevant knowledge from specialized fields in terms of its function in the work of high school teachers.

The plan decided upon called for extensive observation and firsthand study of the problems teachers face in actual school situations. Lectures, readings, class discussions, reports, conferences, and similar activities were to focus on the tasks teachers do perform, each of which naturally includes a constellation of specific but related problems. This arrangement necessitated pronounced breaks with the existing fairly conservative routine at the School of Education—breaks which the staff was ready to accept in principle but for which it was not always prepared in terms of the sharp immediacies of day-by-day decision.

The experimental groups X and Y

In the fall of 1939 the education faculty began trying out what it considered some very promising ideas with a section of eighteen carefully selected juniors. These students had elected the revised sophomore course and declared their interest in an experimental program for their remaining two years in college. This study group was given no catalog number or title and came to be known simply as "education X." In order to check, refine, and build on the first attempt at developing course content, another section (education Y) was started on the same two-year experiment in the fall of 1940. As things worked out, the junior year in each case centered during the first semester on the public school as a social institution and, during the second semester, on a comprehensive study of adolescents. The focus of the senior year was a type of practice teaching that would allow the student to synthesize and apply under actual working conditions what he had learned of subject matter, child behavior, community understanding, and professional skill. A word is in order about the methods used to achieve these ends.

Classes met twice a week for two hours each with a faculty chairman in charge. Many staff members attended each session, some to take part and others as visitors, in such a way that at least one of their number thought "it looked as if the faculty

as well as the students were being educated."[6] Up to a dozen members participated regularly and as many more showed interest from time to time. At the first meeting the chairman emphasized that only the most general plans had been made in advance, and that the students were definitely to share in choosing both content and procedure for their own class and for the guidance of succeeding groups. The discussion following the first field trip of the year, to a neighboring high school, led to what the students themselves called their "first realization of the actual problems." In the subsequent consideration of a teacher's function "each student was led to think of his own equipment" for the profession. Curricular experiences were planned in the light of this provocative question: Assuming that you were forced to begin service as a teacher next week, what problems or difficulties would give you the greatest concern?[7] From the answers received the group organized a series of topics for the semester and filed others for future reference.

Among the problems on which students in this and similar ways expressed a wish for help were such matters as improving their own personalities, studying the relation between schools and other community agencies directly influencing youth, learning how to work with early adolescents both in class and elsewhere, and (since the group represented different fields of concentration) learning how to do modern teaching in science, mathematics, health, foreign languages, and the like. As a general rule the class was divided into small committees to work on specific topics its members had chosen from the list compiled by the class. With the active guidance of one or more staff members each committee prepared for joint field work by exploratory discussion and the examination of readily available literature. After such orientation the class and interested members of the faculty spent a day or two in firsthand study of the chosen problems in the nearby public schools. The field trip was usually followed by a full class period of general discussion and similar

[6] Final report of the University of Texas to the Commission on Teacher Education, p. 21.

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 25.

sessions for the clarification of committee projects. Learning was concomitantly advanced by the increasingly critical study of the relevant professional literature. To point up its own thinking as well as for the benefit of later groups, each committee summarized and appraised its experience in a written report with an annotated bibliography. These statements were of particular value to those members of the faculty who ultimately were given responsibility for defining the course sequence.

At the beginning of the spring semester of the senior year, students chose a teaching assignment in some public school. As far as their other duties would permit (most of them carried four additional courses), these seniors had complete freedom of selection with regard to period, subject, classroom teacher, and particular school. Preliminary observation began at once and practice teaching as soon as the students were sufficiently acquainted with their situations. Supervision and guidance were assigned to those members of the faculty who regularly directed student teaching. These individuals began their rounds of visits as early as possible. Assistance was given chiefly through conferences in which "plans were initiated, approved, or revised," the student's problems were discussed, and his performance was "cooperatively analyzed and evaluated."[8]

Student opinion was systematically collected at every stage during the two experimental years with each group. It may be of interest to conclude this section with a sampling of the answers provided by the Y students, at the end of their sequence, to the question: If you knew there was to be an education Z group, what special recommendations or advice would you give them?

Become as familiar as possible with ways of talking to and working with boys and girls. Continue informal, cooperative procedures. Use every opportunity to participate in all activities of the course. Join in the discussions, take all the field trips, cooperate in every way; you will get out of the class exactly what you put into it. Give *much* time to reading. Observe and participate in classrooms as much as possible. Do not worry because the course is "different." Preserve the individuality of the course. Make friends with the

[8] *Ibid.*, p. 36.

faculty; have faculty conferences as often as possible. Learn to know the people you work with: faculty, class members, public school teachers, and pupils.[9]

Results of the experiment and problems ahead

After some two years of exploration with these experimental sections, the education faculty was ready to stabilize the course sequence and assign titles and catalog numbers to the several parts. In the spring of 1942 they decided to bring the sophomore work into line with that of the upper two years and treat the entire eighteen semester hours as an integrated sequence. The fairly opportunistic method of devising the curriculum had emphasized the need (expressed by students as well as staff) for an organizing framework to assure more adequate coverage every year and to improve the coordination from one year to the next. Whether judged from the standpoint of teaching functions or course content, the initial plan admittedly left many gaps and also produced considerable overlap in the offerings provided.

As a basis for the orderly integration of contributions from education and related fields of specialization, the leading spirits proposed that there should be a characteristic theme for the work of each year. Understanding the social scene in terms of personal adequacy for becoming a teacher was selected as the unifying principle for the sophomore work. A realistic view of the Texas high school in its conditioning environment and at least a beginner's grasp of adolescent behavior were chosen as the main objectives for juniors. Organizing subject matter for teaching purposes, responsible practice teaching, and firsthand acquaintance with other duties commonly assigned to high school teachers were the emphases set aside for the senior year.

This allocation of major topics to the three-year sequence gave curriculum planning greater stability but it left essentially unsolved the more complex and difficult problem of relating the findings of specialized disciplines to the functional preparation of teachers. Experiences and subject matter required for a

[9] *Ibid.*, p. 48.

valid understanding of the self, society, American schools, child development, and the nature of the educative process, have to be derived from scholarly syntheses of research in anthropology, biology, medicine, psychology, and the social sciences—to cite only the major groupings. In the nature of the case, the experimental groups of educationists and students associated in the X and Y sections we have described had neither the time nor the necessary training for any such undertaking. Indeed it would be formidable enough under the best of circumstances, if for instance the task were assigned with adequate time to a group of specialists familiar with both the relevant subject matter and the current needs of the profession. Until adequate syntheses are available, forward-looking educationists will have to do the best they can with existing materials and comfort themselves with the expectation that their persistent demand will help generate the requisite concern.

Staff leaders at the University of Texas have made determined efforts to include in each part of their three-year pattern of professional education appropriate content from many areas of scholarship. Take for example the concepts basic to social and community understanding. Faculty members and students combed through the literature of several subdivisions of the social sciences, including the history of education, for material calculated to throw light on the social significance of teaching. Firsthand observation of secondary schools in action was supplemented and pointed up with facts and generalizations secured from the writing of economists, sociologists, political scientists, and humanists. In this way it was hoped that insight would be generated into social dynamics and the way schools are shaped by larger cultural forces. The selection of this material was aided by such preliminary syntheses in social science as are provided by educational sociology, over-all studies of school and community, and the more inclusive integrations widely designated as the social foundations of education.

There is hardly even this much available toward a similar integration of what we may call the psycho-biological foundations of education. The need for synthesis of the half dozen or so

sciences that have light to throw on human behavior and the nature of the learning process is so great and so articulate that the Commission made special provision for assistance in this area from the outset. As we shall describe more in detail in the next chapter, a collaboration center was established in Chicago at the time the cooperative study was launched, where materials were assembled from biology, physiology, genetics, anthropology, sociology, psychology, psychoanalysis, and medicine. Representatives of the collegiate institutions and public schools associated with the Commission had access to this collection for study purposes and likewise benefited from the consultant services, mimeographed work documents, and special conferences and workshops provided by the staff in charge of this undertaking. A member of the education faculty at the University of Texas spent a full year at the collaboration center preparing himself for leadership in the curriculum project. Certain of his colleagues had similar though briefer experiences with the same resources and educational contacts in the course of the cooperative study.

The experience of trying to find suitable study materials, along with the two to three years' experiment in curriculum designing, had a sobering effect on the faculty of the School of Education. While those members who participated actively in the project have no doubt as to the value of what they have set out to do, they have come to see the task as much more complex and exacting than they had originally supposed. Certainly they had not realized ahead of time how much needed to be done in the way of actually developing concepts on the basis of many fields of learning. Nor had they fully appreciated the amount of information prospective teachers would need about the individual child, the individual school, and the individual community in order to make intelligent application of the concepts and principles furnished them. Staff members now look back on the experiments with education X and Y as a necessary step in their own growth and orientation. They confidently expect that the more realistic approach initiated in the fall of 1942 will

eventually bring into being the functional curriculum they dreamed of in 1939. They hope that with continuous application they may look for the full fruits of their effort perhaps by 1950.

By way of summary

The essential conclusion afforded by the experience of the School of Education at the University of Texas with its X and Y groups is that the forces now at work to bring educational thinking and practical reality together are part of a major synthesizing trend that is calling for basic reorientation throughout the world of scholarship and ideas. The issue is too complex and far-reaching to be confined to a single group of educators or even to a particular campus. The fact that it is being repeatedly and insistently raised in many parts of the country, as witness our other sketches in this volume, is evidence of its vitality and strength. The educational promise it contains is of the greatest importance.

As far as the specific project at Texas is concerned, its chief significance to date probably lies in the professional education it afforded the staff. This is of course not to say that the benefit to the students was negligible; on the contrary, their share in a serious experiment on a cooperative basis must have opened their eyes to the problems and challenge of the profession as could few other experiences. Their own testimony as well as that of the professors is unequivocally in this direction. It is noteworthy that, in their informal running appraisals and final summaries, all parties stressed the educational value of first-hand contacts and personal relations in connection with this course sequence. The chief weakness consciously felt had to do with adequate study materials. And this brings us back to the point with which we started: fundamental curricular change at the college level in this exceedingly promising direction will have to wait for its full realization on the readiness of scholars to undertake functional syntheses of scientific subject matter with professional needs as the point of focus.

Curricular Revision at Stanford

Our next account will have to do with the experience of the School of Education at Stanford University, in California, as it set about revising its professional curriculum for teachers. The predisposition on this campus toward liaison and exchange is indicated by the fact that eleven of the thirty members of the education staff also sit on the faculties of other administrative divisions of the university. There are normally some 4,500 students, both men and women, and roughly 250 of them are registered in the School of Education. About 70 percent of the education majors are candidates for the California credential to teach in the public high schools; it is the professional course sequence leading to this certificate that is the subject of our sketch.

The setting and first steps

Interest in improving professional education at Stanford did not, of course, originate with the university's affiliation with the cooperative study, though it did derive impetus from the latter. The education faculty had spent the year of 1938-39 in revising the School of Education's statement of major functions, and the following academic year (after the Bennington conference) was devoted to a spirited consideration of cooperative planning and democratic administration within the school. A major factor in bringing such matters to the fore was the requirement enacted in 1928 by the state department of education for a fifth year of collegiate training for the general secondary credential. California is one of seven states that, with the District of Columbia and many cities, have taken action to this effect within the last ten or fifteen years. The innovation has impelled institutions of higher learning (including four in the cooperative study and many in one of the state programs associated with the Commission) to develop five-year professional sequences out of components previously used independently toward the bachelor's and master's degrees. In most cases, this has meant intensive work on a three-year curriculum starting with the junior year in college and leading to the degree of M.A.

The California state department of education issues the general secondary credential after completion of such a five-year program and on recommendation of the administrative head of an approved school or department of education. At Stanford the committee on credentials of the School of Education is charged with this responsibility. The program leading to a teaching major in a subject-matter field is worked out by the appropriate academic division in cooperation with the School of Education. Each division has a credentials adviser who also appraises academic credits transferred from other institutions. There is, besides, at the School of Education an adviser for each teaching field who gives attention to the total program of the student, supervises his practice teaching, and makes a summary evaluation of his work at its close. If the student is a candidate for the M.A. in education, this adviser continues with him for his degree program. While final authority in all matters concerning credentials rests with the School of Education and while all teaching curricula are thus developed cooperatively, in actual practice the academic divisions exercise considerable autonomy in shaping and maintaining the subject-matter requirements of the total pattern. Sheer numbers are a factor here; among the undergraduate candidates for the secondary credential about three times as many are enrolled in other divisions as in the School of Education.

In September 1940 the education faculty asked its committee on credentials to formulate a proposal for improving the offering in professional education. It did not seem feasible at the time to include the subject-matter portion of the total curriculum. The eight members of the committee were ready to report in November and the rest of the education faculty approved their recommendations. Among other things, the committee proposed that the purposes of the Stanford program of teacher education be "explicitly defined in operational terms" and that courses be reorganized to conform to these objectives so as to "eliminate undesirable overlapping and provide better integration and articulation." To this end, it suggested that a thoroughgoing evaluation of the existing program be made and

that both faculty judgment and student opinion be used throughout as the criteria for what ought to prevail.

The rest of the academic year was accordingly given to a study of general objectives. A specialist in evaluation was asked to talk with all members of the education faculty with a view to determining what each thought should be the school's educational purposes, how the aims of his own courses fitted in with such purposes, what curricular experiences he introduced to attain them, and how he set about appraising student progress toward them. The statements derived from these conversations were collated and included in a wider questionnaire on objectives that was then submitted to the staff for considered judgment. Group discussions were held with students on the same subject and their opinion was solicited on the degree to which they thought the School of Education was attaining each of the objectives in the composite list. Further light on matters of this sort was secured during this and the following academic years from an elaborate questionnaire study to undergraduates, alumni engaged in teaching, and their employers, on the general assets and shortcomings of the Stanford program.

We shall in the course of our narrative indicate the effects of this far-reaching evaluative program as they manifested themselves in the actual revision undertaken in the professional curriculum. Suffice it at this point to conclude with the ten major emphases on which there was general agreement. As stated in the evaluator's final report, the School of Education "endeavors to prepare educational workers" with the following characteristics: an understanding of social and economic conditions, willingness and ability to "undertake social improvement through education," ability to apply principles of human growth and of physical and mental health, resourcefulness in using methods and materials to "provide a stimulating learning environment," breadth and depth of background experience, ability to work with others, ability in creative expression, capacity for "self-direction in professional and personal improvement," possession of a "desirable philosophy of life and education," and

an understanding of the "operation and function" of the school.[10]

Scope and emphasis of the revision

When the statements made by the education faculty about the objectives of their individual courses, their instructional procedures, and their methods of appraising student achievement were examined against the set of guiding concepts above enumerated, the result did not satisfy the faculty. A good deal of individual course revision was accordingly stimulated along with the joint emphasis on the new curriculum. It should perhaps be made clear, at this point, that plans were likewise developed for a single year's work at the graduate level to meet the needs of candidates for the secondary certificate who had completed their undergraduate training at some other college. As a matter of fact, half of the students doing the last year's work have usually been of this category. The School of Education, however, focused most of its energy and talent on reconstructing the ten courses (thirty quarter hours of credit) that make up the professional requirement in the continuous program for Stanford undergraduates.

The university is organized into lower and upper divisions with professional education scheduled to start for the most part with the junior year. Before 1940, the sequence for the secondary credential consisted of the following courses:

Introduction to Education	2	quarter	hours
Educational Psychology	4	"	"
Educational Sociology	4	"	"
Educational Hygiene	4	"	"
Principles and Methods of Teaching	4	"	"
Problems of Curriculum and Instruction	6	"	"
(Three two-hour courses as follows: elementary and advanced courses in the major teaching field, and an elementary course in the minor teaching field.)			
Student Teaching (two quarters)	6	"	"
	30	"	"

[10] Daniel C. McNaughton, "An Evaluation of the Teacher Education Program of the Stanford School of Education" (unpublished dissertation for the Ed.D.

The introductory course may be scheduled in either the sophomore or junior year; all others are taken in the junior, senior, and graduate years. Graduates from other colleges still take this sequence, while students who do all their work at Stanford may choose between it and the revised program now to be described.

The committee entrusted with preliminary reorganization decided to leave the first course unchanged and to regroup the others in the following three sequential blocks of work, to be taken in the last two of the five required years: "foundations of teaching" for the senior fall quarter (8 quarter hours), "organization and direction of learning in secondary school" for the following spring (10 quarter hours), and student teaching combined with a seminar on the "teaching process" for the graduate year (10 quarter hours). Once this allocation was generally agreed upon attention turned to developing the several constituent blocks with the newly formulated general objectives in mind. Work got under way most quickly for the course on foundations of teaching. We shall accordingly illustrate the characteristic procedure used throughout by an account of this particular development.

The chief purpose of this first block in the series was to help students toward a philosophy of education on the basis of an introduction to current technological and social trends, the elements of human development, and the requirements of mental and physical health. In other words, the course was intended to present educational practice as inextricably related to the drives and characteristics of the larger society. Each student was expected to develop this concept by learning to define problems of critical socio-educational importance and to locate and apply information relevant to their solution. It was anticipated that the process would mean formulating a set of values in the light of which to interpret data and suggest action programs. On the human growth and health sides students were expected to demonstrate ability to use facts and principles for an analysis of

degree in the files of Stanford University, California, 1942), pp. 497-504, *passim*. See also Troyer and Pace, *Evaluation in Teacher Education*, pp. 142-45 and 237-41.

the biological and psychological urges that must be taken into consideration if men and women are to live effectively in American society.

When the course was tried out for the first time, in 1941-42, four members of the faculty were in charge and others were called in on special occasions. The group met three times a week for periods of three hours each. According to the proposed plan (which was generally though not inflexibly adhered to) a week was to be devoted to each of the following topics: the nature and purpose of the course, basic needs that determine behavior, the relation of social institutions to such needs, and democracy as a cooperative enterprise to satisfy them. Rather more time (up to two weeks and a half) was assigned to the questions of whom the schools should serve and how they should do so, and to a consideration of education as "directed growth of the individual." The final week was reserved for a discussion of the kind of school we want. Specific activities were agreed upon by the staff and students during the opening week; they consisted of individual and small group projects, lectures and discussion, field trips, and background reading.

Further revision in the light of experience

The topics and time allotments in the above plan reflected the committee's conception of what was needed in view of the general objectives and specific aims of the course. Members were not too concerned about preserving all of the subject matter required by the individual courses in the sequence to which the new program was an alternative. In terms of the quarter hours assigned to the older courses, the block on foundations of teaching during its first year carried four credits from educational sociology, two from educational hygiene, one from educational psychology, and the remaining one from arts and sciences not previously drawn upon for the professional curriculum.

The staff operated as a group in outlining the work and appraising progress. In accordance with the original plan, each instructor assumed responsibility when his specialty was up for discussion but usually was not present when his colleagues were

leading the class. This made for some overlap and left to the student much of the responsibility for integrating the contributions from three separate fields. Moreover each instructor tended to be so preoccupied with covering what he considered the essentials in the limited time at his disposal that, in his understandable zeal, he often cut down on discussion periods and firsthand contacts off campus. Toward the end of the year, the committee appraised the conduct of the block on the basis of faculty and student opinion. They were enthusiastic about the possibilities and thought that many of their recognized shortcomings were due to "lack of experience which time will remedy." But they also thought that the "lack of continuity in the administrative setup," without a chairman definitely in charge, was sufficiently serious to make it "doubtful if the project can be a success if it is not corrected."[11]

As part of the continuing program in evaluation the committee also wished to canvass student opinion rather systematically. Accordingly, a competent person who had not taken part in the course was asked to interview each of the twenty-two undergraduates who had elected "foundations of teaching." The appraisal secured in this way reinforced the conclusions of the staff committee in both directions. Despite a preponderantly favorable reaction the students thought certain changes would greatly improve the block. They said they had not received as much help as they needed on evaluating their own progress or on learning to apply theory in actual school situations. They asked for more opportunities in active participation; less in the way of organized lectures and more emphasis on discussion, work in small groups, projects of their own choosing, and field trips to specific schools and communities. Perhaps their most serious complaint had to do with the way grades had been determined.

In view of such suggestions and its own convictions, the committee changed both the content of the course and the instructional procedure. It secured permission to transfer half of the

[11] Final report of Stanford University to the Commission on Teacher Education, p. 10.

sociological material to the second unit in the new sequence, in the belief that it was needed there for interpreting educational practice and not simply because it was overweighting the first unit. The committee then introduced material on curriculum and methods of teaching to replace the sociology, and recruited staff members from this field who had better contacts than the original group with practical school situations. Four such instructors were added to the steering committee for the second tryout of the course, and after the first week students were also asked to serve.

In order to make sure that no instructor lectured for more than an hour at a time, the schedule was changed to five one-hour periods a week for classwork and two two-hour periods for field trips, projects by small groups, and laboratory experiences. One member of the staff was made chairman with responsibility for attending all sessions and mediating the process of integration. This proved to be a long step forward but did not immediately take care of all problems connected with getting maximum participation from the staff panel. One of the real difficulties, common to all faculty groups similarly placed, is that of using effectively the services of colleagues from special fields in which relatively few of the students are professionally interested, and where instruction in small groups is not feasible.

A major change in the conduct of the course was the greater use of firsthand experience as the focusing point for the study of fundamental educational problems. Students were asked to examine the literature after they had been introduced to a specific situation in Palo Alto or the vicinity. This reorientation had its own difficulties since faculty and students alike were accustomed to the method of systematic reading, note taking, and examinations. But it led to rewarding experiences including a new approach to appraising student achievement. A cumulative folder was developed on each student to contain a fairly complete account of his educational history, current anecdotal comments on his development, and test data showing his attitudes and information on critical issues in education, the broader problems of democracy, and relevant aspects of mental

and physical health. This record was available at all times to the instructors in charge and proved to be invaluable for improving guidance, instruction, and grading. All of these changes have served to enrich the content of the course as well as to promote give and take among students and faculty members alike.

By way of summary

It will be noted that the method used at Stanford for improving the professional curriculum for teachers differs from the others presented in this chapter mainly in its greater initial emphasis on securing and analyzing opinion. The procedure may be described as that of defining educational objectives (or needs) on the basis of the considered judgment of all parties affected, not once but continuously, and of using the results of such study to direct the designing and conduct of individual courses. In this way student interests, the requirements of subject matter, and the practical demands of the profession have been brought together for increasingly fruitful interaction. Perhaps progress was unnecessarily slowed up at the outset by the elaborateness of the procedure for developing general objectives for the School of Education, and its failure to take fully into account the complications due to the demands of subject matter. But this latter difficulty registered at once in actual experience and is being progressively eliminated.

The most effective devices discovered at Stanford so far for dealing with the intrinsic problem of synthesis and crossfertilization include a panel of staff members with different specialties, vesting responsibility for promoting interaction in a staff chairman, sharing the details of planning and conducting the course with students, and organizing subject matter around specific problems first made vivid by contacts with the field. The process of check and revision is still actively under way at this writing. The integrated blocks on the organization and direction of secondary education, and on student teaching combined with the graduate seminar, were tried out for the first time in 1942-43. Refinement of both content and instructional proced-

ure may be expected to follow lines similar to those described in connection with the work on foundations of teaching. Nor is there any reason to conclude that the process of critical revision has run its course even in this last case.

The Cooperative Program at Columbia

In Chapter III we described a graduate seminar at Columbia University in New York, which was an outgrowth of the main project undertaken as part of the cooperative study by three of the administrative divisions on this campus. The time has come to consider the larger enterprise itself, which had to do with the preparation of teachers (chiefly but not exclusively) for public secondary schools. Two of the cooperating institutions were undergraduate colleges of liberal arts: Columbia College with—at the time of the study—some 1,700 men students, and Barnard College with around 950 young women. There were nearly 8,000 graduate students, men and women, enrolled at Teachers College.

The setting

New York is one of the states that has recently established the five-year requirement for the certificate to teach academic subjects in high school. As was seen to be the case at Stanford, this has meant developing at Columbia a three-year professional program leading to the bachelor's and master's degrees founded on the first two years' basic training at the undergraduate colleges. Even before the state action, however, the three institutions concerned had been moving toward exchange and a pooling of their resources in the interests of teacher education. It was to the advantage of each to do so since a far smaller proportion of Columbia and Barnard students go into teaching than is usually the case in colleges of liberal arts, and since Teachers College had been discovering that a growing number of its candidates for the M.A. had recently completed their undergraduate work in the liberal arts tradition. Furthermore, by a line of reasoning similar to that at Harvard University described in the preceding chapter, Teachers College had come to think

of all phases of a teacher's preparation as mutually interacting parts of a single organic process that had better get started as soon as feasible in the student's career.

But despite this strong predisposition to join forces there were, and still are, important differences in the prevailing educational philosophies at the three colleges in question. The Barnard curriculum is in line with most patterns of liberal arts, with emphasis on what is called basic education, a major in one subject (24 semester hours), and a related minor (12 semester hours). The Columbia curriculum for the first two years includes four integrated survey courses, covering most of the standard freshman and sophomore work, which encourage study across departmental lines rather than in single subjects. Teachers College has established a national reputation for the experimental approach to education in all its branches; it has been a pioneer notably in applying discussion methods, the organismic viewpoint, student personnel, and educational measurement.

Plans for the Columbia program were ready for trial when the Commission launched its national study. The three-year period was accordingly used on this campus for a demonstration in practice. A central committee was in charge, consisting of the dean and a professor from each of the undergraduate colleges and five professors from the graduate institution. The latter five individuals together with three other professors from Teachers College likewise acted as an advisory committee for the graduate part of the program. Additional persons were called on for special service from time to time. Altogether, ten people from Barnard and Columbia and forty-five from Teachers College were actively engaged in the experiment. The seriousness with which this professional responsibility was taken may be illustrated by the fact that the central committee met for an hour and a half as often as every two or three weeks. Its members continuously discussed developments as they unfolded and exerted themselves to coordinate the efforts of three such large and different institutions. The unusual pressures of the

times were another major complication with which the group had to contend.

Content of the program

The cooperative program was put into operation in the fall of 1939. At that time, the guidance officers of Columbia and Barnard selected some 110 beginning juniors (two-thirds of whom were young men) to take the experimental sequence. In succeeding years such selection was carried out in the late spring from among interested students completing their sophomore years. The number chosen was usually approximately the same. By the time the first group had reached the graduate year, in 1941-42, some thirty of its members indicated a wish to continue. Roughly the same number of M.A. candidates who had just finished their undergraduate work elsewhere were picked out by Teachers College to join them. The single fifth-year program and the last year's work in the integrated sequence at Columbia were thus administered together at the first trial.

In the words of the final report to the Commission, "the basic task of the undergraduate program is to bring together in working relationship the resources of liberal arts education and professional education."[12] The first two years of the total sequence call for 60 semester hours of the regular work for freshmen and sophomores at Barnard and Columbia Colleges. Admission to the special pre-service course at this stage is, as already suggested, by careful selection. During each of the four semesters of the junior and senior years, students then take 12 hours of advanced courses in their fields of major interest at Barnard and Columbia, along with 3 hours at Teachers College in an education seminar. A total of 120 semester hours is thus required for the B.A. degree. The two patterns for the graduate course, respectively for students who had completed the junior-senior sequence at Columbia (the five-year group) and those who had come without previous work in education from other

[12] E. S. Evenden and R. Freeman Butts (editors), *Columbia University Cooperative Program for the Pre-Service Education of Teachers* (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1942), p. 36.

institutions (the fifth-year group), will be seen below to differ only in the distribution of effort among the various constituent elements:

	Five-Year Pattern *(semester hours)*	Fifth-Year Pattern *(semester hours)*
Courses in major fields	16	12
Divisional seminars	4	6
Central seminar	5	6
Practice teaching	7	8
	32	32

Since the basic curricula at Barnard and Columbia differ significantly, it must be assumed that the cooperative program was not predicated on any particular theory of general or liberal education. As a matter of fact no attempt was made to modify subject matter either in the freshman-sophomore requirements or in the advanced courses other than professional education. On the other hand, the experimental group of faculty members did use the opportunities afforded by the series of seminars to make some challenging innovations that were decidedly more far-reaching than any strict conception of professional education would suggest.

All of the seminars are handled by small groups of faculty members and conducted along cooperative lines. The object of those for undergraduates is to help students progressively toward a "working grasp of some of the ingredients of good teaching," as indicated in the most recent order of the topics discussed: the relation of liberal arts education to teaching in the lower schools, conflicting points of view in American education today, dynamics of human behavior with particular reference to preadolescents and adolescents, the psychological basis of the learning process, the teacher in the elementary and secondary schools, and finally induction into the problems of teaching through observation and participation at firsthand.[13] These and the graduate seminars did not represent completely new developments so much as substantial revisions of earlier offerings. The basic considerations that went into the design had to

[13] *Ibid.*, pp. 37-40, *passim.*

do with the increasing complexity of our secondary school population, the rapid and uneven rate of cultural change in America, the growing demands for a clarification of the purposes of public education and for a definitive psychology of learning, recognition of the essential interrelatedness of fields of knowledge as currently specialized, and a desire to use the methods and findings of modern scholarship in curricular experimentation.

The purpose of the divisional seminars of the graduate year is to indicate the relation among the several subject-matter fields in which students have specialized as undergraduates and with which they are continuing at the time. Such seminars are offered in six broad areas of knowledge: humanities and language arts, social science, science and mathematics, arts and music, home and community life including health and recreation, and elementary education. No attempt was made at the outset to agree on a uniform method of presenting the material in each of these seminars, a circumstance which led to "difficulties in arranging satisfactorily" for their integration with the central seminar and practice teaching. It also "complicated the evaluation" of the total program because of the "very different emphasis" given in each of them.[14]

The central seminar presented something of an organizational problem. As originally set up, a special section of a comprehensive survey course of fairly long standing at Teachers College known as "educational foundations," was given the double task of coordinating the graduate work in the cooperative program and of "presenting the body of material considered desirable as an educational foundation" for teaching.[15] This turned out to be too heavy an assignment in practice and the students complained, furthermore, that the order of topics was not appropriate to the problems and concerns that were developing out of their practice teaching. The solution reached after two years of trial was to set up a two-hour "seminar and workshop" to take care of the coordinating function, and to organize one of the four regular sections of "educational foundations" to

[14] *Ibid.*, p. 61.
[15] *Ibid.*, p. 57.

give "special but not exclusive attention to the problems of inexperienced teachers."[16] Most of the students at Teachers College, it should be said, are already active in service.

Teachers College had considerable experience to draw upon with respect to student teaching when the time came to construct a plan for the cooperative program. According to the arrangement selected, the entire morning every day of the week during both semesters is set aside for this "pivotal" activity. Observation, participation, and responsible teaching are thus "spread through the entire program" of the graduate year, and stimulate "professional motivation of some of the work in all other units."[17] The work is done in several high schools in New York, both public and private, and has proved very satisfactory. Nevertheless, it represents a heavier assignment than is required of other pre-service students at Columbia and so constitutes an administrative problem for all concerned. Another but related source of difficulty, emphasized especially by the students, is the very slight contact the college professors actually have with the student teachers on the job. Most of the supervision is provided by the high school teachers in the field.

The chief problems encountered

It will be seen that the undertaking at Columbia called for integration and coordination on quite a formidable scale. Fruitful interaction was attempted in four major directions: among the administrative affairs of three independent and diverse institutions—each with a board of trustees, funds, and traditions of its own; between liberal arts education of two patterns and professional education; among the several constituent elements of six broad fields of human knowledge; and among the highly individualized methods and theories of different members of the Teachers College faculty. While very real progress was made on all fronts, most of all by general agreement within Teachers College, it cannot be said that the cooperative program com-

[16] *Ibid.*, p. 58.
[17] *Ibid.*, p. 77.

pleted its three-year demonstration as a fully fused enterprise. The groundwork has definitely been laid, however, and the basic requirements set—in terms of functioning contacts—for organic development in the future on an increasing scale.

A feature of the project from the beginning was a scheme for continuous evaluation. Students shared in much of the planning and were consulted repeatedly, informally and through techniques of some elaborateness, in the course of the three years.[18] Other sources of relevant opinion included meetings of the whole pre-service staff approximately twice a month throughout, analytical progress reports provided by faculty members at the close of each year, and conferences and social contacts with students and the teachers in the cooperating schools. Many phases of the guidance service, provided by graduate students in personnel work to all young men and women in the cooperative program, likewise contributed to the evaluative process. We shall draw on this accumulated testimony for our discussion.

While it was generally agreed among all concerned that gratifying gains had been made in the desired direction, there were nevertheless many differences of opinion on particular questions and also some disappointment over the rate of advance. Inasmuch as we are presenting this material in the hope that others may learn from the experience of the nationwide study, we shall emphasize here the nature of the difficulties encountered rather more than the achievement. It must be borne in mind, however, that the majority of those connected with the project believed that the gains distinctly outweighed the deficiencies and that the cooperative program must certainly be continued.

As already noted, disappointment was expressed in several quarters over the slowness with which cooperative planning and educational integration seemed to progress, and the tremendous amount of time and energy they appeared to demand:

. . . the *results* achieved in the changing of the attitudes and opinions of staff members or in adapting the actual work of certain

[18] For a discussion of some of the evaluative procedures and instruments used with students see Troyer and Pace, *Evaluation in Teacher Education*, pp. 154-62.

units to the general objectives were not commensurate with the amount of time devoted to the *process* of planning.[19]

One of the sources of difficulty, reflected in the above quotation, was the great diversity of mental outlook among the individuals engaged in the enterprise. This is of course the essential problem of human communication. It came to the fore particularly in the undergraduate seminars where the variety in background was most pronounced. Two selections from unpublished statements by Teachers College professors will serve to illustrate the problem:

> This course probably contrasts in temper and procedure with most of those taken [by the undergraduates] concurrently in their liberal arts program, and it is quite clear that the mental set of the class offers some real barriers to intellectual progress. The mental set of the instructor is likewise significant here: to one accustomed to strongly motivated graduate students in a professional school, these undergraduates appear in an annoyingly childish light.
>
> The undergraduate seminars continued [in 1941-42] to be handicapped by the relative lack of attention to them by the cooperative staff. . . . I think that this lack of attention to and interest in the undergraduate students reflects somewhat the general attitude of the whole college toward inexperienced, pre-service, and undergraduate students. The general orientation of Teachers College is still focused upon the graduate ideal of professional education and research in spite of its growing clientele of inexperienced students. Happily, some recognition of this fact is being made and some steps taken to remedy the difficulty.

Related to this problem of getting minds to meet is the question of shared experience. The inability of the instructional staff to participate with students in most of their firsthand contacts was perhaps the greatest handicap of the senior seminar and the graduate work. We have already noted this in connection with student teaching. The pressures of existence (not to mention transportation problems) in one of the country's largest universities and most complex metropolitan environments are clearly a major factor here. But the consequence was that the instructors could not always be of maximum help to stu-

[19] Evenden and Butts, *op. cit.*, p. 94.

dents in relating concepts of guidance, learning, or class management to the situations the latter observed in school. Although they thought they had learned much from their field trips, students often were disappointed at the apparent lack of connection between such learning and the class discussion of curricular trends, the psychology of high school subjects, and the methods and materials of teaching.

The last source of difficulty which we wish to emphasize is the magnitude and diversity of what was attempted in the way of integration. Each of the four aspects of the task to which we called attention earlier made good progress in its particular direction. However, relatively few individuals concerned saw the total picture in its real intricacy. The demand for more integration was widespread but each group tended more or less unconsciously to think of coordination in terms of adjusting other groups to its particular drives. The graduate students and the teachers in the cooperating schools, for instance, stressed the desirability of using immediate needs and practical experience as the integrating agency for subject matter and professional methods. The professors in charge of the divisional seminars for the graduate year were more concerned with the systematic organization of relevant knowledge so that students might see their teaching subject in proper perspective. The staff in charge of "educational foundations" was primarily interested in a bio-social synthesis of subject matter calculated to relate education "to society and to the ends of life."[20] And there were additional viewpoints.

By way of summary

The cooperative program of pre-service education for teachers at Columbia University was one of the most elaborate projects undertaken in connection with the Commission's field study, and one that reached a particularly advanced stage of development. Based on a need for joint action felt by three nearly autonomous colleges, it focused on combining the contributions of the liberal arts and of professional education in a

[20] *Ibid.*, p. 59.

continuous program leading to the bachelor's and master's degrees. Significant progress was made in bringing together for fruitful exchange representatives of some of the most important groups in American teacher education: professors of the liberal arts for undergraduates and professors of technical education for mature students, professors of different subject-matter fields, practicing teachers in high school and college proponents of educational theory, and adherents of differing schools of educational philosophy. In the above account we have emphasized the chief difficulties encountered in the course of the three-year demonstration in order that the reader might note the stubbornness and intricacy of the essential problem today before American education—if not society. We also wished to let him note that gratifying gains were made, in the judgment of all concerned, in a situation of infinitely greater complexity than that with which most colleges and universities will have to contend. The fact that the Columbia group could make such headway should serve to hearten and challenge others.

Some General Conclusions

In the sketches of this chapter we have been able to present a substantially more advanced stage in curricular revision than was possible in most of the preceding accounts. In the nature of the case, there was greater predisposition toward experimentation and improvement with respect to teacher education among professional educationists than among subject-matter professors. Furthermore, contacts with the field had previously served to keep schools and departments of education in closer touch with changes taking place in the nation's schools and the larger culture, than was generally true of their colleagues in other administrative divisions. The greater fluidity of the historically recent field of technical education was another significant consideration. Public opinion among such persons was accordingly much more tolerant of prospective change even though it still took a vanguard minority, in each case, to visualize, plan, and carry out an experiment.

A marked feature of the four undertakings described, as in-

deed of most of the work done in the cooperative study in professional education, was the emphasis on sharing the plans and even conduct of the courses with the students. In this respect, all the experiments may be described as steps toward induction into the profession. Guidance and evaluation, in both cases again with great emphasis on the student's own place in the procedure, very naturally accompanied this development. The heart of the professional program, furthermore, was in each instance a series of firsthand contacts, leading from observation to limited participation and on to responsible practice teaching, which carried the student's orientation actually into full service. In most instances, care was taken to make this introduction to the job as rich as possible, to cover all important aspects of the normal life of a school rather than simply classroom procedure.

There was practically no interest among these colleges and universities in the standard "methods" course. The drive of what was done in professional education was toward assuring the prospective teacher an understanding of himself in relation to the vocation of teaching, of the larger implications and cross-references in the subjects he wished to teach, of the school as a social institution in a changing society, of children and young people as they face the complex task of growing up, and of the basic techniques of group work and cooperative planning. On the administrative side this approach resulted in a tendency to organize programs according to large blocks of time and comprehensive subject matter, with increased attention to sequence from year to year.

In other words, the educators responsible for these projects soon found themselves branching out toward the factual material of a good many scientific disciplines. As experimentation proceeded the disposition grew to draw on relevant information and principles from, more especially, the biological and social sciences. For most groups this meant a sobering yet not at all discouraging experience. The complexity of the job of synthesis was found to contain its own challenge as the educational promise involved became steadily more clear. At the same time, most

experimenters came to realize with the Texas staff that the problem cannot be satisfactorily handled by groups of students and faculty members alone. There is need for intensive and thoroughgoing work of a cooperative nature by subject-matter specialists as well as educationists. Thus it may be said that the juxtaposition in actual practice of student interests and the current demands of the profession served to underline and define the relevant requirements of course content.

This is another way of saying that the attack on integration at Columbia University was no more ambitious or diverse than the total situation demands. Each of the lines of crossfertilization started there is nothing short of indispensable. While such terms as "articulation" and "functional integration" can take on very different meanings according to whether the persons using them are thinking of practice and theory, colleges and schools as institutions, or the relations of subject matter within and among the several branches of human knowledge, it should be clear from everything we have said and described that no one such emphasis is more important than the others. In fact it is chiefly within the larger setting of all such relationships that the full meaning of each is revealed. Education, like all of life, is one indivisible process.

VI

Recurring Emphases in Teacher Education

NOW THAT we have given separate attention to the work done in the cooperative study on student personnel, general education, subject matter for special fields, and professional education combined with practice teaching, we are in position to take a broad look at teacher education as a whole on the basis of the composite plans developed separately in the associated colleges and universities. To be sure, very few institutions actually set about revising completely their programs for the preparation of teachers, although in the smaller ones the interaction and confluence of several thrusts had virtually this effect. But the thinking that went into each phase of teacher education—on the large, complex campuses quite as much as in the more closely knit situations—was not only strikingly similar but likewise tended to spill over the confines originally outlined and move toward inclusive diagnosis. As a result, it is possible to pick out certain recurring elements that may be taken as by common emphasis essential to a modern teacher's background.

As repeatedly illustrated in the foregoing sketches, the method of the cooperating centers was to select some aspect of their work locally felt to be important and to give it sufficiently intensive treatment to develop the major ramifications. The second principle in this procedure is worth underlining. For the spearhead approach (as distinguished from a concerted, all-out attack) might have resulted simply in a series of needed but on the whole minor reforms, had it not been for the general will to see each problem in its full implications. It was this

comprehensive way of doing things—reinforced and nurtured by the conferences, workshops, and similar activities sponsored by the Commission—that expanded horizons and led study groups in one institution after another to exchange information, crossfertilize, or even combine forces. This drive toward what we may call organic integration—since it tended to make of teacher education in each instance a single vital process—was in the last analysis the most deeply characteristic feature of the cooperative study. It was responsible for the controlling view of teachers and their pupils, as full and fully functioning personalities, that pervaded all attempts to improve the curriculum.

Among the program emphases thus constantly brought to the fore, by all odds the most important was practice teaching combined with professional orientation. Accordingly, we shall devote most of this chapter to a more detailed consideration of problems and experiments in this area than would have been desirable in the preceding chapter, where we took up professional education as a whole. In addition, while the several curricula developed for the preparation of teachers differed a good deal in detail, approach, and range of topics covered, their main drives tended to come together on at least three common elements: an understanding of child behavior and human development, with special reference to school ages; a working knowledge of social process or what may be called community behavior; and—though to a distinctly less emphasized extent—appreciation of the arts and music as an important aspect of modern living. The instructional method called for in connection with all three, both for originally opening up the subject and progressively to focus the argument, was direct experience of some kind combined with group discussion and supplementary reading.

Since we have called attention to many specific courses and course sequences designed to cultivate in students the three types of understanding just mentioned, we have thought it worthwhile to run over briefly the chief means drawn upon by the study groups of the associated centers to develop them. We

shall do this, then, before turning to our main topic for this chapter—the most essential of the "essentials"—which is practice teaching.

Study Methods and Resources

The fact that the subjects of child study, community understanding, and the arts were placed by some institutions under general education and by others under professional education calls for brief comment. It reflects divergence in jurisdictional control more than anything else. Courses in child development, for instance, were usually assigned by the state teachers colleges to the first two years' work where all prospective teachers, as well as other students, were likely or even required to take them. The last two years of college were then free in these cases for intensive work on subject matter and for practice teaching with related courses or seminars. Similarly at St. Catherine's, it will be recalled, the study of child behavior was demanded of all students preparing to teach. It was placed early in the required sequence, however, because the instructor in charge considers it "not so much a professional course as it is a part of general education":

> Every person, regardless of occupation, can profit by an understanding of human growth and development. Especially is this true for college girls, most of whom will eventually marry and have families.[1]

It was considered a strategic time for taking the work for the added reason that it afforded students the opportunity of testing their real liking for children before going on with their professional training.

On the other hand, the programs in professional education developed at such universities as Columbia, Stanford, and Texas included the same emphasis in the work for the junior or senior year—the point at which the educationists had some control of the curriculum. The fact of the matter is that, regardless of their ideas as to whether other people need a thorough grounding in

[1] Final report to the Commission, supporting documents, p. 6.

human development or not, and regardless of where they thought such training should ideally come in the total sequence, all curriculum groups in the cooperative study agreed that teachers cannot afford to be without it and consequently used such means as were at their disposal for seeing that their students were served.

Much the same consideration governed the allocation of work in the arts and in what is often called social or community understanding. Frequently two or even all three of these leading elements in a teacher's preparation were combined, as in the integrated area courses in general education at Troy and Milwaukee. More than one individual course in the total curriculum was usually designed to develop the insight desired. Almost invariably the several emphases came together and culminated in the experience of practice teaching, where they also had a chance to combine with all other aspects of the student's preparation. And at every stage, as already noted, the instructional accent was on direct experience under guidance.

Toward understanding child behavior

We noted in Chapter I that interest in child growth and development was so widespread and articulate at the time the cooperative study was designed that the Commission took steps to provide assistance in this area from the beginning. A collaboration center under the supervision of the Commission's division on child growth and teacher personnel was opened in the fall of 1939 at the University of Chicago. At this central location there was assembled a significant collection of books and recent (often unpublished) research findings on problems of human growth from the fields of biology, genetics, and physiology; cultural anthropology; and psychology of different schools as well as psychiatry. The collection is heavily weighted with anecdotal records and case materials of a very specific type. During 1939-40, fifteen men and women, most of whom were active college professors with doctoral degrees, were invited to spend the year at the center. In 1940-41, twenty-two individuals were similarly invited from the collegiate institutions and pub-

lic schools in the cooperative study, and from the state project in Georgia. Others attended for shorter periods.

All told, more than fifty psychologists, college teachers of education, and public school officers and classroom teachers spent from three to ten months at the collaboration center, going over the assembled materials and discussing together the educational implications. The procedure consisted of individual study and reciprocal stimulation through vigorous discussion in committees. Specialists were brought in from time to time to present their research projects. The term "collaboration" was used in this connection with a special and perhaps unusual meaning. The men and women who agreed to work together intensively were not expected to produce a book or indeed any materials jointly; they collaborated in mutual education. The program aimed to demonstrate the values of group methods in furthering in-service professional growth at an advanced level. The specific outcomes in addition consisted of enriched courses, often of the fused or integrated type, and improved literary output on the part of individual collaborators in the years following their stay in Chicago.

During 1940-41, furthermore, many of the first year's group were of material assistance to the Commission's field program. Two of their number acted as staff members to the collaboration center the second year. Eleven individuals gave consultant service on problems of child study to ten different centers associated in the cooperative study, two of the states in which the Commission collaborated with local committees of statewide competence, and three institutions elsewhere. The division on child growth and teacher personnel has likewise been associated with the University of Chicago since 1941 in conducting a summer workshop on human development and education. After the Commission terminated its field activities the host university took over the sponsorship of the collaboration center.

Through access to the materials and contacts provided by the Chicago office much of the preliminary work was done for the revised courses in child psychology offered in the programs we have been describing. This was particularly the case for the new

curricula at St. Catherine's and the School of Education at the University of Texas. We shall have occasion to refer to the collaboration center again as the place where educational services received much of their first impetus and nourishment. The one feature that may be cited as characteristic of all plans developed at the center, apart from the inclusive approach, was the central position given in child study to firsthand observation and contacts with youngsters in natural surroundings.

Toward understanding social process

On a smaller scale but nevertheless through much the same basic procedure as that used at the collaboration center, the summer workshops sponsored by the Commission, usually in partnership with other agencies, served representatives from the associated colleges and universities quite literally as "shops" in which intensive work could be done notably on revising or developing special courses. In most instances such offerings were part of a sequence or pattern agreed upon at the home institution, but there were also several cases of individuals working on their own courses with the knowledge and backing only of their immediate superiors. The resulting demonstrations did, however, often serve the purpose of calling the attention of colleagues to the possibilities and of thus laying the future foundations for more widespread experimentation. In either case, the results of the workshop attendance were usually further enriched by discussion and firsthand contacts at home or on other campuses, often both.

The summer workshops offered participants a combination of personal guidance, resources for individual study, and stimulation through group discussion and informal social contacts. Not the least of their educational value derived from the fact that the workshoppers came from colleges and public school systems in different parts of the country. School people and college folk, administrators and classroom instructors, thus worked and lived together closely for a period usually of four to five weeks. The workshops most relevant to the present discussion include the series on human development and educa-

tion already mentioned, a national workshop in teacher education held in 1940 at the University of Chicago, and regional workshops of similar scope in 1941 at Northwestern University, George Peabody College for Teachers, and Stanford University.

Among the interests prominently served at the general workshops, expressed in advance by the prospective attendants, was that of social or community understanding. Many courses in this area, concerned either primarily with developing social insight and knowledge of the culture or else fused with the related interest in human development, were outlined, elaborated, or fully worked out on these occasions. By way of example, we may cite the freshman and sophomore core courses at Troy and the junior sequence in the professional curriculum at St. Catherine's.

Another illustration is afforded by a course in educational sociology prepared for the emerging professional program at Stanford. The basic planning was done at the Commission's national workshop in 1940 at the University of Chicago. The instructor's first major task was to formulate specific objectives for himself, reflecting the attitudes and information he hoped to develop, and related to the broad concepts of function which his School of Education had drawn up the year before. These objectives had to do with critical social issues affecting the ability of public schools to function democratically and positively in our changing culture. This individual worked in a study group on evaluation and consulted freely with invited specialists in social understanding as well as fellow workshoppers engaged in similar undertakings in their home institutions. Finally he planned a series of curricular experiences—class discussions, outside reading, out-of-class activities, and field trips —by means of which to attain his objectives.

During 1940-41 this instructor's experiment played into the comprehensive revision of educational aims undertaken jointly by all of his colleagues. His methods served to stimulate others to look at their own course offerings in similar fashion. He was one of the four instructors given charge of the junior block in the revised professional sequence offered at Stanford first in

1941-42. We have already noted in the preceding chapter how student opinion, after the first year's trial, served not only to fuse the sociological material more effectively with the rest of the sequence, but also greatly to increase the emphasis on student participation, field trips, and other forms of direct experience.

Its resources did not permit the Commission to set up a collaboration center in the social studies on the same principles as those governing the center in child development. Experience has served both to underline the necessity for some such opportunity as soon as possible, and also to demonstrate that the task in both areas is much more complex and exacting than was generally believed when the Commission was making its original plans. In response to widespread demand for at least information on what other educational institutions were doing toward developing social insight in students, the Commission undertook a modest investigation in the winter of 1942. A competent observer made visits to sixteen colleges, including four directly participating in the cooperative study and two that were closely associated. This individual distinguished three aspects of the subject—sociological information, skill in group methods, and a sense of social responsibility—and looked into the devices used to inculcate any or all of them. His findings covered survey courses, field trips and longer excursions, community surveys, social action projects, student government, work experiences, and similar or related activities; they have been made available to the public in pamphlet form.[2]

The role of the arts and music

Although interest in the aesthetic and emotional side of life as a significant part of a teacher's preparation was widespread, it did not command the forefront of attention in the cooperative study to the extent characteristic of the above two emphases. The importance of this area was apparently sensed and acceded to rather than fully comprehended. It should also be said that

[2] Gordon W. Blackwell, *Toward Community Understanding* (Washington: American Council on Education, 1943).

the Commission did more to promote and cultivate interest here than was found necessary in connection with any other point of attack in the cooperative study. Possibly the area is less difficult to focus and implement than either child behavior or social understanding, for emphasis on the arts and music found a place in many of the required course sequences developed. Possibly our culture is still too inexperienced and even immature in this regard to appreciate the real complications. Nor is it always clear from the work so far accomplished or projected exactly what educators had in mind when providing for such courses.

The experience of the Texas subject-matter specialists provides a case in point. It will be recalled that the committees working in general science and the social studies each called for a course in the arts to supplement and replace older requirements in general education for prospective teachers. The reasoning that went into this demand is not clear from the records except that it had something to do with what these professors saw in the secondary schools they visited. They were impressed with the enormous diversity of the high school population, the great range of the average high school teacher's normal duties, and the meagerness of the general culture of both students and teachers. They appear to have argued that anything that could help a teacher's imaginative understanding and increase his capacity for sympathy would be of the utmost importance. For there can be no doubt of the seriousness of their intentions here in view of the tenacity with which they defended their proposals.

We may say accordingly that the true significance of the emphasis on the arts in the cooperative study is to be looked for not so much in the actual content advocated anywhere as in the motivating recognition of the critical importance for good living of the emotions and creative imagination. This seems to be more than is covered by the current general interest in artistic self-expression as an educational device for very young children. Ability to handle simple arts and crafts has indeed been widely included as a tool subject in the essential prepara-

tion for elementary teachers. But there is more than "equipment skills" at stake in the programs we have been describing. Despite some tendency to stress chiefly the purely recreational function of the arts and to associate them disproportionately with life's lighter moments, there is evidence pointing to a deeper appreciation gradually defining itself in practice. Again we go back to the Texas scientists. They had *secondary* teachers in mind when they called for a requirement in the arts, and they appear to have been aiming at much more than simply counteracting tensions.

The struggles of the Milwaukee State Teachers College with its "fifth area," described in Chapter III, will be recalled in this connection. The emphasis on the arts in the Troy program of general education provides another illustration. As we described in the same chapter, these consist of a core course on the arts in individual development for freshmen, and a second on the arts in contemporary society for sophomores. For both materials are drawn from music, the graphic arts, and literature and given a practical application to everyday life. Such matters as clothes, furniture, diet and health, radio and movie programs, current magazine stories, home decorating, town planning, and the like come in for attention. The reason for including such courses, it will be recalled, was the drabness of local existence as revealed by the study of student backgrounds and interests. Much of the specific content was planned at the Chicago workshop of 1940, where a special study group was organized for art educators.

It was in order to introduce as many people as possible to the pleasure of creative self-expression, and to stimulate and spread the sort of thinking illustrated in the above course plans, that the Commission made a point of providing, at every workshop with which it was connected, a special laboratory in the arts and music. Participants were given the opportunity and were actively encouraged to try their skill at woodcarving, clay modeling, weaving, drawing and painting, or playing simple instruments. While such undertakings varied considerably in their success—reflecting for the most part the relative serious-

ness with which they were taken—the composite results were distinctly gratifying.[3]

Direct experience as a means of integration

As already noted repeatedly, firsthand observation and student participation as well as more elaborate forms of direct experience—such as field trips, visits to schools, and the like—were heavily relied upon for the instruction in the three large areas indicated above. By way of specific illustration we may refer to the Texas experience with the X and Y groups in professional education. It was the first visit to a neighboring high school that focused attention on the real problems and later field trips were used for progressively intensive study. This method was so widely characteristic of the experimentation done for the cooperative study that two further examples deserve very brief treatment at this point.

The Milwaukee State Teachers College tried out with a small group of selected students a plan for distributing professional education for elementary teachers over the entire four years of college. As agreed upon by the college administration and the authorities of a suburban system of public schools in the vicinity, the experimenting students were freed from the usual academic requirements and placed in direct contact with school children beginning early in the freshman year. Each succeeding year they filled a wide range of teaching responsibilities in the same or varied buildings, devoting something like ten hours a week to this work. At the same time they took such academic courses, under guidance, as their firsthand experience and their own good judgment indicated. No formal work was done in professional education or psychology. Not only did the students develop quite unorthodox programs in this way, but credit was also allowed for certain outside activities and reading, whether or not directly related to the practice teaching. When a special conference was called to evaluate the method

[3] For a follow-up study (confined, however, to three public school workshops) of the results of such art programs see, Ray N. Faulkner and Helen E. Davis, *Teachers Enjoy the Arts* (Washington: American Council on Education, 1943).

after the first nine students completed four years on this basis, particular stress was laid on the educational value of the self-direction and steadiness of purpose derived from this continuous contact with everyday life.

Our concluding illustration has to do with the experience of a professor at the University of North Carolina in revising a course in secondary education. The impetus of the cooperative study led the staff at Chapel Hill to poll former students for their opinion on what most needed correcting in the program of teacher education. The recurring statement that the work "lacked practical and concrete experiences in actual school situations" stimulated this particular individual to change his methods. In order to determine what should go into his course he studied the recent experimental literature in secondary education, and simultaneously approached the students for suggestions. The most striking changes made had to do with instructional procedure:

> Perhaps three-fourths of the ideas in the revised course were also in the old course but the new framework caused learning to take place in actual school situations, where knowledge was not acquired so much through verbal processes as through the necessity for understanding a working situation well enough to participate in it.

As the students became accustomed to taking responsibility for some independent work under guidance, they became increasingly critical of the existing content and organization of the course. Again the source of first inspiration and continuous check was contact with high schools as they are. To continue drawing upon the instructor's memorandum, the "questioning attitude" of the undergraduates led to "the first venture in teacher-student planning" for the conduct of the class. In succeeding quarters with other students the originally "unwieldy group procedure" got "streamlined" but the instructor ended by doubting if he would "ever go back to a teacher-planned and directed course." This shared procedure definitely included the process whereby grades were determined. Out of some 225 undergraduates who had collaborated in this course at the time

the report was sent to the Commission, only two "were unable to arrive at a judgment that agreed with" the instructor's own.

By way of summary

Many readers will have noted that there is nothing strikingly new about the emphases or study methods described in the foregoing section—at least as far as the literature is concerned. Such persons are asked to remember, however, that the Commission was not organized to develop new theory or to push back the frontiers of learning, but rather to see to it that certain ideas cherished by educational statesmen were given some currency and test in actual practice. The approach under discussion throughout this book is still very far from being generally accepted. But the significant fact revealed again and again by the Commission's experience is that these ideas do work when given so much as half a chance, and hold great promise for the future. Interest in living children, in functioning communities, in schools with their particular setting, and in related aspects of practical reality, is proving to be more efficient than the older preoccupation with "methods" in the abstract. When such interest gets the upper hand new life is infused into teacher education.

In this section we have indicated the main resources drawn upon for their work in the cooperative study by the several groups addressing themselves to curricular revision. Additional assistance was provided by two forms of service not specifically emphasized here, though constantly referred to in the longer sketches of the earlier chapters. These were the special consultants sent to individual campuses to assist with particular problems, and trips arranged to other institutions to observe what is being done. Such factors were but additional means used to promote intercommunication and crossfertilization.

In general, it will be seen that the college instructors here in question coveted for their students very much the same educational experience as that whereby their own eyes had been opened. Frequently, as we have shown, their experiments were made on a cooperative basis. Just as the assembling of factual

evidence combined with direct observation of schools in action revealed to faculty groups a new way of looking at the curriculum, so they insisted that their students be given the same opportunities through field trips and other off-campus experiences. The more students and alumni—especially those actively engaged in the profession—were consulted, the more this trend was reinforced. Just as group discussion and contact with people from other institutions served to give direction to individual initiative, as far as particular instructors were concerned, so they in turn relied increasingly as the cooperative study progressed on the active participation of students—in small and large groups as well as individually—in the management of their own education. It was a case of learning by doing.

Student Teaching in the Cooperative Study

Inasmuch as the heart of professional education in each curriculum presented has been shown to be some form of student or practice teaching, it is fitting that we should place the chief emphasis of this chapter on so all-important a subject. In roughly half of the associated institutions new work was done specifically in this area, or some phase of it, in addition to the consideration afforded it by all groups concerned with professional education. We shall present here a general overview of the main considerations, and then conclude the chapter with two fairly detailed sketches by way of illustration.

Certain administrative problems

One of the important consequences of the widespread emphasis on direct experience at every stage of teacher preparation, among these colleges, was a marked lessening of the earlier separateness, not to say isolation, of the program in student teaching. Once faculty members and students accepted the instructional approach of cooperative analysis and discussion on the basis of firsthand observation, it was but a step further in the same direction to fuse the older methods courses with student teaching in some way, and to look upon both together essentially as a more complex and advanced version of what

had been done earlier. In this connection it was easier for most educationists to see the psychological relation between practice teaching and such emphases as child study and community understanding, than between this experience and the courses for mastery of subject matter. It was at the former point, at any rate, that revision of student teaching usually took hold. The trend was to make of general and professional education one increasingly less differentiated process, with specialization in the teaching subjects left more or less by itself. The true integration of the full program must clearly await a meeting of minds between subject-matter specialists and professional educationists that has so far reached only the first stages of development.

But we should not give the impression that it was easy to establish the connection between student teaching and the rest of the professional program. The need for intensive work on this matter was apparent in almost every institution in the cooperative study. The fact that rather special administrative problems—having to do with time, place, and the motivation as well as supervision of students—are connected with this activity has usually meant organizing a separate office to run it, with a director in charge. Inasmuch as a large proportion of this officer's time and energy has to be given to the many problems of public relations and administrative routine involved, it is not surprising that he should in most cases have relatively little left for his colleagues on the college staff. Complicated relationships make for organizational apartness almost in the nature of things. We emphasize this point because it proved to be a heavy obstacle to the improvement of practice teaching in the Commission's field program.

As just pointed out, one of the major administrative problems had to do with scheduling enough time to allow for the broad purposes of the program. The plan generally preferred by these institutions at the beginning of the cooperative study called for one hour each day, five days a week, for approximately one semester to be given to practice teaching. This arrangement usually carried three or four semester hours of credit. Less fre-

quently, students were asked to spend half of each school day for a semester in such work, for which they received six hours of credit. A few colleges had set up plans, or did so in the course of the three years, whereby some of their most mature students were asked to spend a full quarter living away from the campus, giving all of their time to working in a particular school and studying the local community. Even more rare was the practice of asking all students to devote a quarter or semester to nothing but student teaching and related activities. In every instance, such changes as were made were in the direction of providing for a more concentrated block of time. The general purpose was to give student teachers a chance to work with children in a variety of ways, to see how the school operated in all its branches, and—to some extent—to work with individuals and groups in the community.

Arranging for appropriate places in which to do practice teaching was just as difficult a problem. Both matters involved relationships with many busy people. Plans of all descriptions were in effect at the opening of the national study. One of the most common was to have all practice teaching done in a school controlled by the college. Most schools of this sort were located on the campus but some were in rural or semirural communities and supported by the college expressly for student teaching. Another fairly common arrangement was that whereby a college and its municipality owned and operated schools jointly. This plan was usually followed in relatively small towns although the case of Wayne University and the Detroit Public Schools provides a notable exception. In most larger cities, if the college did not maintain a campus or laboratory school it frequently entered into an agreement with the local authorities for using the public schools as practice centers. Such changes as were introduced in the course of the cooperative study by institutions of all kinds were often in this direction, even when the college operated a school of its own. The objective was to provide students for their final practice teaching, after observation and introductory participation in the campus school, with an experience as nearly as possible like the conditions with

which they will be asked to deal in service. The most definite break with tradition occurred when public schools were used at some distance from the campus, and the student had to live in the community for a period of months.

Most institutions in the cooperative study that had the opportunity found it profitable to work with both campus and public (or for that matter private) schools. There were definite advantages and disadvantages associated with each procedure, and they did not actually serve quite the same educational purpose. All matters related to supervision by the college staff, cooperation between school and college faculties, and correlation of practice teaching with the rest of the curriculum were made markedly easier by the accessibility and relative pliability of a practice center on or near the campus. On the other hand, laboratory conditions seldom prepare fully for life as it must be lived eventually. Besides, college existence has so many interests and pressures of its own to compete with a time-consuming activity like practice teaching, that the strain on the average undergraduate may be too great for optimum use of the learning opportunities provided by a campus school. Student interest was almost invariably found to be of a much higher and more mature order when the young men and women concerned had a chance practically to identify with the active profession. At the same time, there can be little doubt in view of the Commission's experience that the early introduction to actual problems through direct experience—beginning as soon as possible after the student's vocational choice was made—contributed significantly to developing this maturity of outlook. The ideal arrangement appears to be approximated when preparation for student teaching can be undertaken with the resources of a campus school to draw upon, and when the practice teaching itself is done in some school independent of the college and at a distance from the campus.

The interplay of these administrative problems and the application of the program emphases previously discussed will be suggested in the two sketches we have chosen for this chapter. Most of the improvements made in this area had to do directly

with the practice period itself or with the courses leading up to it. Before illustrating this development in our detailed accounts, however, we shall give brief consideration to two somewhat special expressions given in the cooperative study to the far-reaching interest in student teaching: revising the campus school and off-campus practice teaching in small communities.

Improving the campus school

While a number of important changes were made in the curricula and teaching procedures used in campus or laboratory schools controlled by these colleges and universities, such revision was given particular emphasis at the Southern Illinois State Normal University at Carbondale, and at Prairie View State College in Texas. Both institutions maintain schools with elementary and secondary grades on the campus and have established relationships with other schools at some distance as well. The latter are used primarily though not exclusively by students majoring in rural education or vocational agriculture.

At Carbondale, one of the projects undertaken as part of the cooperative study was a modernization of the campus high school. In the course of the three years, visits were made by staff committees of three or four members each to three individual high schools elsewhere and to all of the secondary schools of a fourth system. The main interest in this connection was to study the "merits of the so-called core curriculum"[4] with a view to experimentation on the home campus. Three special consultants, in addition to members of the Commission staff, assisted with the program and several teachers on the school faculty as well as the principal attended summer workshops. While intensive work was thus done on certain aspects of the common problem by individuals and small committees, the school faculty as a whole discussed all findings and reached its conclusions as a group.

As a result of this study, there developed on the faculty a

[4] Final report of Southern Illinois State Normal University to the Commission on Teacher Education, p. 156.

"greater comprehension as to what constitutes a good guidance program." The homeroom work was reorganized, increased attention was given to the individual counseling of pupils and to personality testing, an extensive program in remedial reading was introduced, and teacher-pupil relations were improved. The core curriculum was instituted in three subject-matter fields for initial trial. That "greater professional interest" was widely stimulated by this enterprise is shown by the fact that "several faculty members have taken additional work in graduate school" and others "plan to do so in the near future." Staff morale was generally acknowledged to have been strengthened by the process of "working on problems which concerned the whole school."[5]

At Prairie View the revision was rather more drastic since it meant transforming an outmoded institution that "had been treated as a college stepchild"[6] into a modern community school. The college is a coeducational land-grant institution for Negroes that puts major emphasis on preparing elementary teachers for rural schools. While each of the six administrative divisions—respectively of agriculture, arts and sciences, home economics, mechanic arts, nursing education, and graduate study —is fairly independent in the matter of arrangements for practice teaching, the campus school represents the most important project to this end. It is organized as a department of the division of arts and sciences and is operated by the department of education.

Revision of this school was central to Prairie View's participation in the cooperative study. The object was to make it a place in which students could observe and share in the sort of work contemplated by the changing curriculum for them in their later service. Five general conferences were held that had a bearing on this subject: two on student teaching, two on elementary education, and one on community contacts. Among the ten consultants who worked at the college from time to

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 160.

[6] Final report of Prairie View State College to the Commission on Teacher Education, p. 243.

time were specialists in modern practices in elementary and secondary education, child development, student teaching, the art of teaching, and community relations. All of these were asked to help specifically with reorganizing the laboratory school. Six members of the staff with responsibility for teaching in the school as well as at the college, or for supervising student teachers, attended summer workshops to give intensive consideration to some aspect of the matter. The individual finally selected to head up the reorganized school was a member of the education department who had spent four and a half months in Chicago, at the Commission's collaboration center in child development.

For the last fifteen years or so, Prairie View has been gearing its program increasingly toward serving the people of Texas where their need is greatest. Based on this institutional orientation, the cooperative study served to focus attention definitively on the small rural communities of the state—from which most of the students came and to which they would for the most part return upon graduation. Part and parcel of this trend was the decision to start close to home and make of the campus school a place through which local standards of living could be enriched and directed forward. Students were thus given a demonstration of what can be undertaken elsewhere. Substantial improvements in the plant and grounds were made with the aid of parents and other community leaders. Hot lunches were arranged for in cooperation with the division of home economics. The foundations were laid for a program of adult education. Classroom procedure was modernized, new teaching aids introduced, and more attention given throughout to meeting the personal and social needs of the youngsters. An activities program is now in operation in the elementary grades and the core curriculum in the high school.

Off-campus practice teaching in small towns

The significance of the experimentation done in many of the associated institutions with placing students for their final experience in practice teaching at some distance from the campus,

lies very largely in a recognition of the importance of small towns and rural districts in the educational scene. Like the reorganization of Prairie View's campus school, it represents not only a realistic approach to conditions as they are and must be faced but also an idealistic hope that educational agencies may play a part in raising the quality of local life. The great majority of classroom teachers begin their careers in such communities and relatively few of them have been psychologically prepared for the professional conditions and opportunities they are likely to meet. Besides, many educators favor the small-town or rural school as a practice center because the situation is simple and yet potentially challenging enough for inexperienced young people to handle well. Finally, any preoccupation with the needs approach to educational strategy is more or less bound to focus attention eventually on this hitherto largely neglected area of our culture.

Practice teaching at the Colorado State College of Education at Greeley is of interest in this connection. A new program was introduced as part of the work of the cooperative study which differed from the earlier arrangement especially in two important respects: many students are now given a chance during their period of preparation to understand by direct experience something of what it means to be a teacher twenty-four hours a day, and they are also introduced on the spot to the typical problems of small communities. The development represents the culmination of a long trend at Greeley toward increasing the time allotted to student teaching and professionalizing the conditions under which it is done.

The new plan was tried out with a limited number of students in 1940-41 and was subsequently officially adopted. Students, called associate teachers in this connection, are now assigned on full time for either the fall or winter quarter to one of the twenty-odd schools that have agreed to cooperate in this program. Not more than one student is assigned to any one supervising teacher while principals and superintendents have been asked to watch progress and relationships in the interests of all parties. The student's experience is supposed to include

preliminary observation, actual classroom teaching as soon as feasible, introduction to the school's problems of administration and its guidance program, active participation in extra-curricular activities, and some knowledge of the community. A minimum of two periods a day is to be kept free of classroom duties in order to make possible this wider acquaintance. An outline for a simple community study is furnished each student and provides the basis for a written report.

The stimulus for developing this program derived from the fact that Greeley graduates were apparently showing certain limitations when they started on their regular jobs. The trouble seemed to be in the matter of community contacts and, to a lesser extent, of participating in the entire school program. Some five or six years ago the president of the college and the director of public relations urged the director of student teaching to work out some appropriate plan to remedy matters. The first step was to study different schemes in operation elsewhere and to consult extensively with the superintendents of the state as well as with certain colleagues on the Greeley staff. As the revised program took shape, a report was made to the entire faculty, referred to the curriculum committee for study, and then returned to the faculty for final adoption.

It should be said that not all student teaching at Greeley is to be conducted according to the new plan. For one thing, many undergraduates simply cannot finance themselves away from the campus for a quarter and it has not been possible so far to arrange for them to earn during this period of service. The college has a campus school, furthermore, in which certain laboratory experiences are provided. It is expected, however, that after adjustments have worked themselves out, most students will be given the wider opportunities called for under the new arrangement. The program carries sixteen quarter hours of credit. Of the 53 students who registered in 1941-42 for this plan, 15 were elementary majors and 38 majored in secondary subjects. The little towns in which the affiliated schools are located—the farthest nearly 350 miles from the campus—vary in size from roughly 600 to 12,500 inhabitants. Students should

accordingly not find simple community studies too arduous or too complex for their resources.

College and School in Williamsburg

We shall now describe certain related developments that took place concurrently and in interaction in the department of education at the College of William and Mary, and in the Matthew Whaley School in Williamsburg. Relations between the two institutions are both close and of long standing, dating as far back as 1873. In 1930 the school moved into improved new quarters erected by the cooperative efforts of the college and the city of Williamsburg. It is the town's only public school and offers work in eleven grades—there being no twelfth grade under the arrangements of Virginia. The college and the municipality own it together; the department of education has joint authority with the school superintendent in recommending teachers for appointment. The same department provides two supervisors of instruction at the school who are likewise directors of student teaching at the college. Besides acting as a laboratory for the college, Matthew Whaley serves public school people of the neighboring counties in much the same capacity. Visitors and observers are given every attention; informal conferences are frequent. A group of tidewater supervisors has been meeting voluntarily for more than ten years now to study together at the Williamsburg school one Saturday a month.

Developments at Matthew Whaley

Prior to the cooperative study of teacher education, the line separating the elementary from the secondary grades at the Matthew Whaley School was fairly sharp. The two divisions were housed in the same building and directed by the same administrative officer, but their programs were quite distinct. In the elementary school an informal activities program was in effect, organized around pupil interests and giving particular attention to effective social relations in group living. The high school, in contrast, followed the more systematic curriculum

usual at the secondary level, organized by subject departments and stressing individual achievement. Each division had its own teachers' organization and its own study committees. This difference will be perfectly familiar to most educators in our public schools. It poses the problem known as articulation between educational levels in the average city system.

During the period of the cooperative study several factors operated to bring the two groups together. Some of these were planned and others must be credited to good fortune. Significant among the latter was the fact that the size of the school district was enlarged in 1940; this meant that about the same number of children were brought to Matthew Whaley from the country as already attended from Williamsburg. The new pupils were not used to the curriculum they found and some adjustments became necessary. This mild upheaval gave the elementary and secondary teachers more problems in common than had previously been the case. Then by the time curricular changes had been worked out, defense industries and military camps began to appear in the neighborhood. Children of service men and workers entered the school. Their parents began to ask about the individual work in high school, the activities in the elementary grades, and the reason for having so many student teachers around. The differences in these criticisms led the classroom teachers, supervisors, and administrators to see the wisdom of a more uniform policy throughout. Incidentally, these criticisms likewise served to sensitize the group to the importance of taking into account the educational goals of parents for their children. All in all, therefore, the influx of new pupils from far and near did much to prepare the way at Matthew Whaley for the cooperative efforts that were to follow.

While these changes were in progress a unifying interest in child development was beginning to permeate both divisions. At the time, the two supervisors from the department of education at the college were in charge respectively of elementary and secondary instruction, and they directed student teachers according to the same classification. The elementary supervisor spent the year of 1940-41 at the Commission's collaboration cen-

ter in Chicago, where her concern for children of all ages was intensified. During the same year the Commission supplied the school with a consultant to help work out plans for the comprehensive study of child development. The secondary supervisor carried responsibility for organizing and conducting the planning conferences, as well as for acting on their recommendations. Two key people in the instructional program thus qualified themselves for leadership in an area that cut across grade boundaries.

All teachers in the school attended the preliminary meetings and from these there emerged a coordinating committee charged with directing the whole school in a long-term study of children. This committee was made up of the superintendent, the vice principal, the two supervisors, and the chairmen of three study committees of classroom teachers. The policy of having both elementary and secondary teachers on each study committee was followed throughout. Each of the three study groups reported to the whole faculty from time to time over a period of eighteen months. The teachers found that their interest in all phases of child development could find an effective outlet in a study of school records and reports to parents. By common agreement and with the assistance of the Commission's staff in evaluation, the faculty worked out a new system of reporting. Along the way they held numerous conferences with parents, made case studies of individual youngsters, and experimented with records of differing type.

As a result of the many experiences of the three-year period, the school staff was brought closer together as one organic body. This happened because all recognized common needs and went to work under able leadership to meet them. One of the immediate effects was a realignment of the functions of the two supervisors. Each extended her interest and some of her activities to phases of the school program for which she had not previously carried direct responsibility. Thus the elementary supervisor became interested in child development at all ages, and her colleague developed similar concern for curricular organization and teaching materials throughout.

The consequence of this arrangement was greater flexibility and variety in the program for student teachers. While the supervisors still directed elementary and secondary majors as before, each was now in position to send her students to any part of the school where observation or active participation was thought to be desirable. There were schoolwide programs and festivals in which student teachers could and did take part. There were teaching materials and procedures at all grade levels for student teachers to study. And there were community forums on the school program in which student teachers could share. But best of all, the faculty of Matthew Whaley was demonstrating to prospective teachers how a staff can pool resources and work together to improve the education offered to the children of a community.

Developments in the department of education

A corresponding trend toward functional unity took place on the college campus while these developments were proceeding at Matthew Whaley. The line separating student teaching from the courses leading up to it became increasingly less distinct as the cooperative study ran its course. While the amount of direct experience assigned to the preliminary courses increased, the amount of supplementary reading and class discussion in connection with full-time practice teaching was likewise increased.

We may illustrate the closely related character of the sequence by the program offered to prospective elementary teachers. At William and Mary candidates are not admitted to the department of education until they have satisfactorily completed their first two years of college. Majors in elementary education are then required to take two strongly integrated courses on principles and methods during the junior year, scheduled one immediately after the other to afford a continuous block of time, and to do practice teaching with related classwork in the senior year. The entire sequence carries twenty-one semester hours of credit. As already noted, the director of elementary majors in their practice teaching is also a su-

pervisor at the Matthew Whaley School; she is likewise one of the instructors for the junior courses. We shall draw heavily on her account in the final report to the Commission for the description to follow; it was based on very detailed records on a small group of students tracing their progress through the entire sequence and, for that matter, on into the first professional experiences.[7]

When these particular girls met for their first education class as juniors, they had been told to come prepared for a trip to the Matthew Whaley School. The first meeting was held in the school building after the group had walked down the village street together. The instructor told the girls a little about each of the seven classrooms visited before they went in, and asked them to compare what they saw with what they could remember of their own early schooldays. The students came away eager to ask questions and the second meeting of the class was given over wholly to a discussion of what had been observed. It was next agreed that each young woman should visit a chosen classroom for a full period and report to the class as a whole. After the resulting discussion, during the latter part of the third meeting, the instructor placed in the students' hands pictures, books, pamphlets, and typed materials dealing with the same school and the same children they had observed. They were also shown how to use the files that had been built up in the course of years. Each girl was given data on a pupil to study for presentation to the group. Then the instructor worked out a plan whereby she could rotate individual conferences without disturbing the observations.

For weeks the procedure was one of alternating observation, description, reading, comparing, and questioning. By midyears each girl had started to keep four looseleaf notebooks. The first was organized around the central principles of elementary education; it contained analysis forms, sets of criteria, and evaluation scales or checklists for studying children's activities. The second was for the benefit of the entire

[7] Final report to the Commission, pp. 35-72.

class and recorded what went on in the particular classroom each student had chosen for intensive observation. The third notebook contained practical plans as well as hopeful dreams for an imaginary classroom, and the fourth was for techniques, suggestions, and conclusions noted for each subject-matter field. These notebooks served as the basis for general discussion; they were added to throughout the remaining time at college and, in some cases, even on the job afterwards.

Specific problems came to the fore as the group went along in this fashion. One had to do with individual differences among children. This led to a fairly detailed study of a pupil by each student, with emphasis on his relations to other youngsters. To do this effectively each girl found she had to spend much time in the child's classroom and also to do a good deal of outside reading. In addition, she had to plan and direct activities in which the youngster was engaged. In this way each student made the transition to active participation and responsible teaching in a very natural way.

When these students returned as seniors they were assigned for practice teaching to the same rooms in which they had done most of their junior observation. The classroom teachers welcomed the young women whose arrival they had been expecting and gradually invited their initiative and cooperation. Along with their teaching duties, students made plans for practice in certain skills and developed ideas which they hoped to carry out in connection with the major activities already taking shape in class. Each girl decided to make another intensive study of a child and the school's cumulative records were put at her disposal.

The regular teacher in charge of each classroom played a significant role in the student teacher's education. She held a joint conference each week with all of the students working with her. This served the double purpose of helping each undergraduate to visualize what went on in the room throughout the day, and so to see the relation of her own work to what the others were doing, and of providing student teachers an opportunity to compare notes. The regular

teacher also met each student individually or with one other student—the preferred arrangement—to discuss progress and make plans. In the main these conferences were about what needed to be done for the children, but occasionally the time was used for a look at each student's program to make sure she was having a chance to sample all skills and experiences she would need on the job—and to practice those in which she most needed help. This type of weighing and balancing, however, was usually done in talks with the director of student teaching.

As the end of the year approached, the students under discussion went through a sudden flurry of dismay and self-doubt. The director and supervising teachers took advantage of this emotional situation to get them to work out an overview of a teacher's job. Each student was likewise invited to select some problem she could foresee in the position she had already accepted by this time for the following year, and to organize her thinking on the subject for presentation to the group. The accumulated experience of the two years now concluding—developing the notebooks, studying individual children, responsibility in a classroom, and a final self-appraisal—served to provide these girls with a comprehensive picture of the school as an institution in a particular environment. They began to reach toward the larger contacts. Professional organizations, about which they had heard from time to time from the school staff, came to be regarded as resources to which they would be able to turn for support, professional opportunities, and fellowship.

We have now completed our presentation of the elementary program. Its essential feature will be seen to be the mingling of direct experience and the discussion of principles at every stage so as to make the transition from course to course, and from college to active service, as easy and natural as possible. The program for prospective secondary teachers moved in the same fundamental direction but did not get as far toward developing a single, continuous process. The major difficulty was found in the circumstance that high school teachers have to

specialize in subject matter to a far greater and more individualized extent than is true at the elementary level. This in turn meant that the college instructors were likewise more specialized in their respective fields. While interest in such matters as counseling or evaluation of pupil progress was shared by all undergraduates majoring in secondary education, it soon developed that prospective science teachers had questions and problems of their own which were not the same as those confronting prospective teachers of English or history. The best way of handling this situation was found to lie in holding few meetings for the entire group of secondary majors, more meetings in small groups by subject-matter interest, and still more purely individual conferences.

A brief appraisal

In the above sketch we have described a situation in which problems of supervision and integration were at a minimum. Not only was the practice center within easy walking distance of the campus but the two institutions were brought together even more closely by an interlocking staff. The experience of the cooperative study was used in both places to underline mutual interests, not only between the two but also within each. The numbers involved throughout were sufficiently small to permit conducting all relationships and phases of the program for the preparation of teachers on an intimately personal basis. Student teachers, classroom teachers, and the directors of student teaching knew each other on the basis of almost daily contact. All of this made for a continuity and meaningfulness in the educational sequence such as it would be hard to improve.

The Matthew Whaley School was clearly a better place for practice teaching at the end than at the beginning of the cooperative study. This was chiefly owing to the fact that the staff had become more group conscious after the joint consideration of important interests held in common. Closer contacts had also been established with parents and the community at large, while the influx of new pupils had diversified the range of social backgrounds represented. The beginnings had been made

toward rewarding contacts with adult groups and other local agencies. The area in which the greatest variety and richness of opportunity were available to student teachers was nevertheless in classroom situations. It was possible for the undergraduates to work with individual children, with small groups, and with classes of the usual size. As the elementary and secondary divisions of the school came closer together in thinking and method, the chance for student teachers to participate in worthwhile activities of a schoolwide character was materially enhanced.

There were, however, certain drawbacks—to the school as well as to the college—in having but a single practice center at the disposal of the department of education. With the increasing emphasis on direct experience for prospective teachers and the growing registration of students for this training, at William and Mary, the facilities of Matthew Whaley were quite heavily taxed. At times it became something of a problem to find enough genuinely educative things for undergraduates to do without interfering with the program for children. It was not easy to establish the student teachers as assistants to the regular classroom teachers because there were enough of them in the building almost to constitute a distinct social group. Besides these young women were very much in the thick of campus living and engrossed in undergraduate affairs. As already indicated earlier, this competition for student interest was found to be a problem wherever student teachers did their practice work on or near the campus. Special efforts were made at William and Mary—not without heartening success—to minimize this difficulty by scheduling concentrated blocks of time for work at the school and in related discussion. The fact that the problem was not entirely eliminated, however, is evidence of how deeply inherent it is in the general situation here described.

An Illustration from Florida

We have chosen for our concluding sketch an example from one of the all-state programs in which the Commission was active, rather than from the national cooperative study. We have

done so because the Florida enterprise presents a somewhat unique demonstration of joint efforts between collegiate institutions and public schools, addressed to the subject of student teaching. First projected in 1939-40 and tried out experimentally in 1940-41, a program is being worked out whereby prospective teachers are given realistic experience in practice teaching under guidance, on a scale well beyond the somewhat limited and traditional opportunities formerly available. As the plan is shaping up, students have the benefit of working in the regular public schools over an extended period and substantially on a full-time basis. Associated in the undertaking are the state department of education, representative systems of public schools, and the seven institutions of higher learning that (in the absence of state teachers colleges) offer four-year programs for the preparation of white teachers. Our account will have to do specifically with developments at one of these latter, namely the Florida State College for Women.

The setting in the state program

Inasmuch as the Florida project is given detailed analysis and description in another volume in this series, we shall content ourselves here with only a brief introduction.[8] The program to be described had its beginnings in the late nineteen-thirties. As is not unusual in southern states, an advisory council on teacher education was organized in 1937 at the call of the state superintendent of public instruction. This body has met at least twice a year since its appointment and is composed of representatives of all local collegiate institutions, the state department of education, and the Florida Education Association. Despite its purely advisory character, practically all recent changes in Florida's requirements for certification have resulted from the council's recommendations.

When the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools went on record as approving a minimum of ninety

[8] See Charles E. Prall, *State Programs for the Improvement of Teacher Education,* prepared for the Commission on Teacher Education and to be published by the American Council on Education in 1945.

clock hours of practice teaching as a prerequisite for certification, the advisory council urged action that resulted in the introduction of student teaching throughout Florida. Prior to 1937, the state had not made any such requirement for certification. But this step only partially met the needs of the situation because many of the local colleges and universities had no practice schools at their disposal, because such campus schools as were available frequently offered training only at the elementary level, and because there was widespread feeling among the state's educators that experience limited to demonstration or campus schools ran the risk of being unrealistic and atypical.

In February 1940, the advisory council suggested that what it called an internship program (a term covering undergraduate practice teaching off campus) be developed and that institutions start experimenting along these lines in the fall of that year. Three of them actually did so: the Florida State College for Women, Florida Southern College, and the University of Tampa. Significantly enough, during the same academic year of 1940-41, the president of each of the seven institutions of higher learning appointed a committee to study the local program of teacher education with the proposed internship as the focus of attention. It was indicative of the spirit in which the matter was taken up that representatives of the arts and sciences faculties served on these committees along with professors of education.

Toward the close of 1940, the Commission agreed to help Florida work out its plans by furnishing a special consultant with whom to explore the relevant problems as thoroughly as possible. It likewise provided funds and leadership for a statewide conference at which a genuinely representative group gave concentrated attention to the issues previously defined. The consultant spent January and February of 1941 working with the several collegiate study committees and then took his findings to the state advisory council. The central difficulty he uncovered had to do with relationships between the directing teachers (as they were called) in the public schools and the departments of education at the colleges from which the student

interns came. Problems were found to have arisen over the selection of such directing teachers and over the supervision of the students by their own colleges. Schedules offered another perplexing question. There had been discussion over the role of general education in preparing for the internship, over the planning needed to make the experience most meaningful for the student and the school alike, and over methods of evaluating an intern's professional growth during the period of service.

As fast as any one institution uncovered its problems through its study committee, the results were communicated to the others through the advisory council. The success of this procedure in synchronizing thought and bringing the resources of each group to bear on the experience of all, was emphasized at the last meeting of the advisory council before the proposed statewide gathering. The conference in question was held in the spring of 1941 at Camp O'Leno in the northern part of the state. In addition to the consultants and visitors, there were just under 100 individuals in attendance including 41 directing teachers from fourteen public school systems, 35 representatives of the seven collegiate institutions, 14 members of the advisory council, 6 student interns, and 3 members of the state department of education.

Since most of the preliminary thinking had been done in the study committees of the training institutions, it was thought that the conference members would have a better point of departure for their study and a clearer impression of the functions appropriate respectively to such institutions and the schools, if the viewpoint of classroom teachers were systematically canvassed ahead of time. To this end a questionnaire was devised on which the relative importance could be checked of suggested elements in preparation to be stressed before the internship period. The instrument was sent to approximately 300 selected teachers in the Florida public schools; usable returns were received from 151 elementary and 85 secondary teachers. In planning the conference, attention was focused on those items thought to be very important by 60 percent or more of both groups. Care had been taken to secure a sampling from all

sections of the state and both rural and urban communities.

The conference met according to educational level and field of interest, in small discussion groups which had been arranged ahead of time to expedite matters and ensure reasonable homogeneity. The questionnaire returns served as the starting point for most deliberations. At the close of the five days given to intensive work, the conference as a whole took formal action on the recommendations developed in the discussion groups. Those most relevant to the present account include fixing the internship period at a "minimum of eight weeks"; authorizing the development of a "code of desirable practices" to govern the actions of all concerned—in the training institutions as well as in the schools; emphasizing the desirability of consulting a teacher before an intern is assigned to him and taking his directing responsibilities into account when determining teacher loads; and defining the guidance of an intern as "a total school problem" in which the whole faculty assists the directing teacher.[9]

The conference further agreed to urge continued study and experimentation with the intern program throughout the state, and to hold additional conferences from time to time in order to enlist the thought and understanding of increasing numbers of Florida's educators. The whole undertaking, it will be seen, has derived its strength and peculiar vitality from the systematic attempt to promote group thinking and doing among all people affected by the plan all over the state. The project has continued to develop along the lines indicated despite considerable slowing up since 1942-43, as a result of wartime conditions.

At Florida State College for Women

The introduction of off-campus practice teaching on full time for increasing numbers of undergraduates had far-reaching effects in all seven degree-granting institutions. Significant concomitant modifications in the curricula for prospective teachers —especially with respect to personnel services and general edu-

[9] *Florida Conference on Internship Problems,* Bulletin No. 24, Division of Instruction (Tallahassee: Florida State Department of Education, 1941), pp. 20-21.

cation—actually colored each institution's total program. However, for obvious reasons, the most immediate and drastic changes occurred in the professional courses given before and after the intern experience. Practically every college or university revised its pattern of required work in education to fewer courses of broader scope and with greater emphasis on laboratory experience. The total amount of credit hours involved—approximately eighteen including the internship—remained the same.

Developments at Florida State College for Women will serve to indicate the general course of events. At the time of the study there were 134 individuals on the faculty, at this institution, and over 1,800 undergraduates. Of the four administrative divisions, the college of arts and sciences was the largest, with nearly half of the enrollment, and the school of education next, with a good third. Even before the statewide adoption of the internship program the education faculty had tried to improve existing arrangements for practice teaching. The campus school was too small to provide direct experiences for students in psychology and educational methods if it was also to take care of student teaching. Nor was it found possible to work out plans with public school administrators in the immediate vicinity to take care of some 150 student teachers every semester. This dissatisfaction with local facilities and lack of success in extending them created a readiness on the part of the education faculty for the advisory council's proposal. The first reason for working on the internship was thus to relieve congestion in the campus school, although certain individuals likewise recognized from the outset the greater educational possibilities of the new scheme.

The study committee appointed by the president in the fall of 1940 was made up of four educationists, two social scientists, and one professor each of English, home economics, music, and psychology. All four administrative divisions of the college were represented. The group made a series of recommendations to the curriculum committee in December, which were transmitted to the entire faculty for approval and received favorable action.

These proposals were as follows: (1) that the first half of one semester of the senior year (nine weeks) be devoted to the internship, and the second half to study on the campus to include a three-credit seminar based on the off-campus experience; (2) that the required professional work be substantially consolidated without affecting the eighteen credits for the entire sequence; and (3) that all departments of the entire college participate in developing plans to avoid prolonging unduly the time needed by student interns to complete their requirements for graduation.

It will be seen that the first and third recommendations affected instructors of subject matter as much as the education faculty. How were students to be adequately taken care of during the last half of a semester after they had been away from the campus for nine weeks? This did not actually turn out to be too difficult a problem, as things worked out in practice, on account of the small number of students to be absorbed into the stream of any one class and their unusual willingness to do individual work. As more undergraduates take part in the internship program, furthermore, it may prove feasible to organize concentrated courses to start in the middle of the semester especially for them. If such courses are based, as is to be expected, on the gaps in their preparation demonstrated to the students in practical experience, it may be anticipated that their influence may spread significantly to the rest of the curriculum. Some subject-matter specialists have already begun to experiment with student-faculty planning and the use of direct experience.

The most difficult of the study committee's recommendations had to do with consolidating the professional sequences. This was especially true of the courses preceding the internship and, as at William and Mary, it was more difficult in the case of prospective secondary teachers than for elementary majors. More and more faculty members were affected as the revision proceeded and consequently had to be drawn into the planning procedure. For example, there were the people in charge of the "required electives" in education, or what are often called service courses to meet special weaknesses in the backgrounds

of individual students. Such requirements found their way into the programs of most undergraduates and were in addition to the general orientation and methods demanded of all education majors. If the entire professional program was to be actuated by the revision under way, the special instructors could not wisely be left out of the deliberations.

The psychology offering provided another particular problem since the department of psychology in charge of it was a subdivision of the college of arts and sciences. Education majors took a general orientation course in psychology, along with students from any other divisions of the college, and usually followed it with another semester's course either in educational psychology or child growth and behavior. Questions of procedure and educational aim thus necessitated a meeting of minds between the psychology staff and the educationists. Furthermore, with increased attention to laboratory experiences both in psychology and educational method, relations had to be kept in mind with the teachers in the campus school. The whole process of streamlining and integrating the professional sequence, at this college, involved group thinking within the institution on a constantly widening scale.

The internship off-campus

Florida State College fully accepted the plan discussed at the Camp O'Leno conference in providing for full-time practice teaching in the regular public schools. In making assignments such matters have been taken into account as the cost to the student and the wishes of her parents as well as the school's suitability from the educational point of view. After agreement was reached at the college, the school administrator was then approached and a particular classroom teacher asked to direct the intern's entire experience—covering schoolwide activities and community contacts as well as classwork. Only one intern was thus assigned to a directing teacher, and frequently another individual was asked to take charge of the next student to be sent to the same school. Actually, the list of cooperating schools and directing teachers has varied from one semester to another.

As things have worked out to date, each intern has assumed as much of a professional relationship to the school and the community as is possible in the brief term of nine weeks. She has lived in the town, usually in a home where there were children and she was accepted as a member of the family. The extent of her participation in community affairs has depended on the directing teacher's own activities in this respect. Some such teachers have had very active contacts outside the school building and have drawn heavily on community resources for their classroom work. But even if there were no such natural avenues as these for the intern, she has always had a certain amount of contact through a partial survey she has been asked to make under direction from the college. This little sociological study has covered the county organization of public education, its supervisory program, and the teachers' organizations of the county. Within the local attendance district it included such items as the tax levy and the administrative setup. The student has likewise been expected to find out certain facts about the community such as the makeup of its population, its principal industries, per capita wealth, social and cultural life, religious point of view and activities, local mores, recreational facilities, and similar resources. A written report covering these items has been made to the college toward the close of the internship.

Opportunities for sharing in schoolwide activities have likewise varied; they have, however, usually included some directing of extracurricular programs, supervising playgrounds, planning and producing assemblies, going to faculty meetings, learning how to handle equipment such as mimeograph and motion-picture machines, administering and scoring standardized tests, and helping with the office routine. It has been the responsibility of the directing teacher to see that the intern was not exploited in this connection; in general, student interns have given about a third of their time to such activities. If the directing teacher happened to be a member of a very active curriculum committee, the intern had a special opportunity to study the inner workings of a school. In selecting centers for practice teaching the college was understandably as much interested in what the

whole faculty was doing toward curricular improvement as in the quality of the individual directing teacher.

Most of the intern's time has been given to teaching classes. Directing teachers have tried to arrange matters so that interns spend as much time as possible with the same group of youngsters. In the case of elementary majors it has been relatively easy to keep them with the same children throughout the school day. Students majoring in secondary subjects have usually been expected to spend an hour a day teaching their own field of specialization, and to follow the same pupils into one or more additional classes. In the latter situation they have not done much in the way of planning or teaching, but they have helped each classroom teacher in the analysis of individual or group behavior. This general emphasis on studying human growth and behavior through the observation of living children developed from agreements reached at conferences held every semester at the college, among school administrators, directing teachers, and the education faculty.

Once a week student interns have written reports to the college supervisor of student teaching, describing in some detail what they had been doing and giving some appraisal of the educational value of the experiences. The directing teachers have signed the reports and it has been left optional to the school whether the principal and supervisor should sign likewise. The intern and directing teacher have usually collaborated in evaluating the student's work. No formal rating scale has been used. The directing teacher has prepared an anecdotal statement at the end of the period describing what the intern had done, how well it had been done, and what the student's strengths and weaknesses appeared to be. The college supervisor of student teaching has used these statements, along with other data, to determine the final mark for practice teaching.

Faculty members have not found it difficult to provide satisfactory courses with which to follow the internship. Practical experience has served to make students well aware of what additional training they wanted, especially in their fields of specialization and in such areas as technical English, speech, and com-

munity understanding. Besides, students have been much better able to understand generalizations presented in lectures than their colleagues who had never tested themselves away from the campus atmosphere. The most important offering of this nature provided by the educationists has been a three-credit seminar in education. This has been based on the weekly reports from interns, the fact-finding surveys, and the reports of the directing teachers; its purpose has been to point up the broad implications of the experience the students had just completed. After two years of experimenting, the education faculty has come to feel that this postinternship seminar is an essential feature of the program.

A brief appraisal

Perhaps the most significant thing about the whole Florida program is the fact that student teaching has been used as a means of improving the whole program of teacher education. It has been the focus of far-reaching group thinking within institutions, as illustrated above in the case of the State College for Women, and of significant joint effort between the colleges and the public schools. From the experience of practice teaching influence has been exerted in both directions, toward introducing laboratory methods and firsthand contacts in the preceding courses—more especially with respect to child psychology and educational methods—and toward pointing up and markedly enriching the professional and subject-matter courses that follow the internship. As we pointed out in connection with the program at Troy, the fostering and stimulating effect of the statewide effort in behalf of teacher education can hardly be overemphasized.

As far as the off-campus experience is concerned, the point selected for comparison and contrast with conditions at William and Mary, the reader may have noted that the advantages and disadvantages are precisely the reverse of those discussed in the earlier sketch. The big assets in the Florida situation are the students' motivation—their virtual identification with the profession away from distracting campus interests—and the relative

ease with which a few interns can be absorbed into the total school routine. There is no strain on local resources or incipient competition for educational opportunity among the increasing numbers sent out every semester from the Florida State College for Women. And the normal quality of the school's life is completely preserved in the absence of a separate group of people who are neither wholly teachers nor wholly outsiders. With many schools and directing teachers at the service of the college, furthermore, the opportunity for variety and range of experience is enhanced and the quality of later class discussion disirably diversified. On the other hand, everything related to supervision and integration of the experience into the professional sequence is enormously complicated by the factors of distance and human relations.

Some question may have been raised in the reader's mind concerning the wisdom of using classroom teachers to direct student interns without providing definite preparation for them. The Florida situation developed from a cooperative plan that has much to commend it. Yet if teachers are to help students get the most out of their experiences, educationally speaking, the practice of depending on persons who may know relatively little about the college and of changing directing teachers as often as every other semester, may be open to some objection. Eventually, large numbers of classroom teachers will by this means have had experience in the area, and the thinking of schools and colleges will thus have been brought close together in the long run, but for a considerable time to come there may be some educational risk from the college's point of view. The joint conferences on the campus every semester represent an attempt to mitigate this possible weakness. And there are indications that the Florida educators are working for greater continuity. It is to be expected as the plan continues to operate, that some schools will be used more often than others as practice centers and that the services of certain directing teachers will be especially in demand. But there is apparently no expectation that a single school or two will ever become the exclusive laboratories for any of the Florida institutions of higher learning.

Some General Conclusions

On the basis of everything presented in this chapter it should be clear that there is no one best arrangement for direct experience in general, nor yet for its special and major application in student teaching. The educational program anywhere is always the product of a number of factors that are weighted differently from one situation to another. At times the presence of a campus school, or of a particular kind of campus school, affects what can be done in connection with introductory courses in professional or general education, as well as with practice teaching. The resources of the local community and service area present another important set of variables. Human relationships—and the more complex they become the more critical they are—may always be counted upon for important bearing on the subject. In short, the modern trend toward enlarging the educational field of operation provides at every step opportunity for learning at firsthand some of the most fundamental lessons of a functioning democracy. Nor is the learning by any means confined to the students.

All changes in the direction of bringing classroom procedure into line with practical reality have had their natural culmination in the experience of student teaching. The vitalizing spark has been set off now in one part of the program, now in another, but this aspect has remained central in virtually all of the experimenting done in the cooperative study. At William and Mary it was the intensive study of child growth and behavior, both in the department of education and at the Matthew Whaley School, that started the integrating process on its way. In Florida, more especially at the State College for Women in our treatment, concentration on the requirements for the internship itself led to an increasing emphasis on firsthand observation and participation in courses of educational method and child psychology. Had space permitted, we could have shown how, at Ohio State University, similar enrichment of the whole professional sequence derived from diversified community contacts and field excursions. In this case it was an attempt to understand the social significance of a school in its natural environ-

ment that led to a redirection of teacher education. In short we may conclude that it does not seriously matter at what point in the program direct contact is established between theory and practice as long as—and the proviso is critical—the particular lead is followed through to its full implications. Teacher education will never be served adequately by the efforts of individuals or small groups working alone.

With reference to what practice teaching can mean in a teacher's preparation certain trends stand out in the Commission's experience. Increasingly, as the cooperative study ran its course, institutions tried to provide for greater range and scope in the opportunities made available to students in this connection. To the former all but exclusive emphasis on classroom work were added the chance to share in extracurricular activities, the normal life of the school in all its aspects, and in community programs or undertakings of various kinds. Faculties at the same time stressed the need to improve the quality of such participation throughout, especially by preparing for it by added attention to child behavior, social understanding, and firsthand experience with creative self-expression in the arts. More concentrated time given to each phase of the program, making for integrated or fused courses of various patterns accompanied by student planning and much attention to guidance, was a marked feature of the whole development.

As the scope of student teaching was broadened, the necessity on the one hand of spreading related forms of direct experience over a longer period of time and of concentrating the final, synthesizing stage into an intensive shorter period became apparent. Spread was thought to be important in order to prepare for getting the full benefit from the relatively brief period anywhere available for practice teaching, and to allow the process of maturation to run its course sufficiently in advance. As already indicated, the trend within the cooperative study was decidedly toward making of practice teaching as self-contained and professionally realistic an experience as possible. After such contact with practical reality, the student's sense of vocation was usually found to have been sufficiently stimulated

to make possible and desirable a relatively quick overview and self-analysis before he joined the professon in earnest.

These developments in professional education have naturally been accompanied by shifts in the administrative arrangements for the supervision of field experiences and student teaching. Elements of both centralization and decentralization are to be found in the general trend. There has been a quite substantial tendency, in the associated colleges and universities, to centralize the management of off-campus contacts. Some of them have appointed a certain person to make all initial arrangements with schools and other agencies, to plan small and large conferences made desirable by the unfolding program, and to handle the placement of students in their various assignments. Such an individual became a liaison officer between different departments and divisions on the campus, and between the institution and the service area.

On the other hand, the trend in supervision was decidedly in the opposite direction. Individual professors of psychology, sociology, or educational methods have tended to leave the campus with their students and share their experiences as much as possible. The entire education faculty in many places has taken joint responsibility for supervising student teachers. And developments such as those in Florida illustrate the further decentralization represented by depending on classroom teachers. These two tendencies working together appear to be making for the maximum educational use of the off-campus experiences provided. That they likewise serve to undermine departmentalism and other forms of professional isolationism is a further asset of the first importance.

VII

Colleges and Schools

THE DISCUSSION so far in this report has had to do with the preparation of teachers before entering the profession. This was true even of the five-year programs at some of the universities which led to the M.A. degree. While the responsibility for teacher education of institutions of higher learning has never exactly stopped here, it has until recently been considered decidedly the main duty to be performed. This is becoming less true with every passing year. Beginning in the nineteen-twenties and on a steadily increasing scale during the thirties, the demand for further assistance to experienced teachers has been widespread and pronounced. At this writing, the prospects are that in-service education in all its rich variety will assume even greater significance in the future.

There are many reasons for this development. The striking changes in the American educational scene since the turn of the century, more especially since the first world war, that account for it have been pointed out too often to make detailed treatment necessary here.[1] Suffice it to indicate that perhaps the most critical factors in precipitating the movement were the enormous increase and diversification of the high school population—actually strong enough to transform the teaching job to be done as well as materially to increase its size. Besides, the great need in the early twenties for both elementary and secondary recruits to the profession, followed some ten years later by an oversupply of candidates, led rather naturally to improvements in employment practice and selective standards of admission. Promotion and salary increases as well as original certification have been made widely contingent upon attendance at

[1] See for example, the Commission, *Teachers for Our Times*, Chapters I and III.

summer sessions or advanced degrees. Finally, the lengthening average tenure of office since the thirties and the growing complexity of the curriculum as the American cultural outlook has expanded, have combined to reinforce and add point to the requirements set by employing agencies.

Some form of in-service education for school teachers was an important interest of every university and many colleges in the cooperative study. By far the greater part of the experimenting and innovating undertaken in this connection had to do with the reconstruction of individual courses or course sequences—often entire summer programs—both of the "refresher" type and for advanced degrees. The prevailing emphasis was on much the same combination of direct experience, personal guidance, and group planning that we have shown to have dominated modifications made in programs for undergraduates.

But some experiments were more complex and wide ranging; a notable part in their development was played by practicing teachers themselves. The narratives in our earlier chapters have indicated repeatedly that forces are actively at work within the educational world to bring the thinking of schoolmen and college professors into productive contact. The task is complicated, to be sure, and must usually be undertaken in the face of considerable inertia and some mutual suspicion. It tends to be handicapped at every stage by sheer physical distance and the problems of time and transportation. But the leaven is nevertheless clearly producing its effect. Most conspicuously is this true in connection with matters of professional education and above all with student teaching. As we have emphasized more than once, the reorientation of preparatory work—especially for secondary teachers—is being directed toward the schools as they actually are, or are becoming, in our particular society of today. The process has necessitated face-to-face contacts. It has been educational not only for the students in question, but perhaps most critically for the college professors and school people concerned with the new approach.

The same spirit of give and take is manifesting itself increasingly in this area of in-service education of which we have been

speaking. The four programs through which we propose to substantiate this assertion here were selected from among the more enterprising projects referred to above. All of them were in some measure cooperative in character and significantly dependent on joint thinking. They cover the main areas with which education for experienced teachers is normally concerned: work for advanced degrees, informal summer workshops, university extension, and integrated year-round programs combining all of these features.

A Pattern for the M.A. in Ohio

The program to be described in this sketch was developed as part of a joint effort to improve teacher education undertaken by the five publicly supported universities of Ohio, the state department of education, and invited administrators and classroom teachers from the public schools. Both educationists and subject-matter specialists participated from the institutions of higher learning. The initiative was taken chiefly by Ohio State University which, through its membership in the cooperative study, enlisted the interest and partial support of the Commission on Teacher Education. At the time of the study, the combined faculties of the five institutions numbered some 1,500 individuals while the combined enrollment varied around 29,000 undergraduate and 2,000 graduate students, including some 6,500 education majors in both classifications. Ohio State University was the largest of the five, with well over half the total faculty and undergraduate bodies, nearly 90 percent of the graduate students, and some 40 percent of the enrollment in education.

The state workshop of 1940

The five institutions concerned with the Ohio program were Bowling Green State University, Kent State University, Miami University, Ohio University, and Ohio State University. In the middle nineteen-thirties, leaders in the several colleges of education had reached the conclusion that they "should be guided in their efforts" to prepare teachers by the "needs and demands of the public schools" which employ them.

This meant that some means should be developed whereby the public schools and teacher education institutions might jointly plan the nature of such preparation. Indeed, a professional conception of teaching led inevitably to the further conviction that the best job of teacher preparation can be done only if the public schools themselves take an active responsibility for certain aspects of this preparation.[2]

To the end of establishing some "practical method or channel" of communication, it was proposed early in 1939 that the five deans of education sponsor a workshop on teacher education to be attended by representatives of both school people and college professors. Almost a year later funds were secured from the Commission and the workshop was held for three weeks in the summer of 1940. It met on the campus of Ohio State University. Just over 100 men and women attended from the state department of education and the public schools as well as private and public institutions of higher learning.

During the first two weeks, intensive work on a proposed study guide on teacher education was done by 45 individuals who divided themselves into sixteen very small groups, each person attending two or three, to clarify the questions that had been submitted for consideration. Every study group was headed by an "analyst" to point discussion, and finished with a written formulation of propositions. This part of the program was carried out by 4 representatives of the state department of education, 21 professors and deans from the five universities, and 20 persons from the public schools. For the third week these individuals were joined by an additional 51 schoolmen and 10 professors from other, largely private, institutions of higher learning. The total delegation from the schools included city and county superintendents, supervisors, elementary and high school principals, and 9 classroom teachers.

It was the function of the second or advisory group, as it was called, to go over and criticize the work already done. The whole discussion was addressed to three sequential questions: what do

[2] *A Program for Teacher Education in Ohio* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1940), p. 3.

we want in teachers and administrators, what are the procedures appropriate to the attainment of this purpose, and what organization and administration of institutions will best promote these procedures? The method was to take up each question first in some ten small groups and then discuss the appropriate propositions in general session before subdividing again for the next question. The final results were printed in the pamphlet already quoted and used as a study manual for the state's teacher-educating institutions during the following academic year of 1940-41.

The report contained thirty-eight propositions, the first twenty-four of which represented a list of "factors of competency" to guide the education of prospective teachers. The first work on these factors had been done the year before at Ohio State University by the faculty supervisors of practice teaching, the year's student teachers, and some sixty supervising or directing teachers in the public schools of Columbus.[3] The object had been to devise together an instrument for the appraisal of practice teachers, to be used as the basis for discussion between the student and his supervisor after his performance. The workshop version was tried out the next year with the cooperation of fourteen systems of public schools and then revised a second time in the light of experience. The latest form is known as the Ohio Teaching Record, revised edition. The "factors of competency" it contains received the formal sanction of the state department of education in 1941. Teachers in Ohio are granted a first or provisional certificate when they enter service, which is valid for four years. At this point further certification may be refused, the same certificate may be renewed, or the next higher, so-called professional certificate may be granted. This last is awarded on the recommendation of individuals who have observed the candidate's teaching and other professional activities. Before 1941 this had been done without any very clear or uniform standard of judgment. It was to improve this situation that the state department asked that future recommenda-

[3] For a more detailed discussion, see Troyer and Pace, *Evaluation in Teacher Education*, pp. 181-95.

tions be made on the basis of the above criteria of teaching competence.

The social studies conference of 1941

Interest in revising the current programs of teacher education soon spread from the colleges of education, at these five universities, to certain departments in the graduate schools. A notable instance was the concern displayed over functionalizing the offering leading to the master's degree for high school teachers of the social studies. An exploratory conference on this subject was held in February 1941, again on a statewide basis. Of the fifty-two persons invited to attend, forty-one represented the publicly supported universities, ten came from the public schools, and the remaining individual was the state supervisor of certification. The university delegation included the five graduate deans, seven deans and professors of education, three supervisors of the social studies in campus schools, and twenty-six specialists in economics, geography, government, history, political science, and sociology.

The purposes of the meeting were to discuss the "present patterns of graduate requirements" for the master's degree "from the standpoint of their influence upon the preparation" of secondary teachers of the social studies, to consider how these might be improved, and to give particular attention to "the values and methods of firsthand field investigations" as an element in such graduate education. The basic work of the conference was done in two sets of four discussion groups, each of which addressed itself first to the values of direct experience and then to relevant "patterns of graduate work." At the closing session the entire conference met as a group and formulated a statement of "general agreements."

Among these final conclusions several are of special interest. For instance, under "desirable qualifications" for the teachers in question, the official minutes give the following as the first item:

> A broad background of training in the whole range of the social sciences based upon a five-year program of college or university

study. This program should include in addition at least one year of actual classroom experience as employed teacher or intern between the fourth year and the completion of the year of graduate study. It was further agreed that administrative officers and teachers in the state universities should recommend to their students the general social studies major instead of majors in the special social sciences, as a preparation for secondary school teaching in the social studies.

A "basic measure of the success" of the program was to be its "degree of effectiveness" in developing "ability to translate intellectual understandings into practical actions and judgments." The "techniques of field work" were to be employed "whenever feasible" as part of the regular courses. The "graduate year of training" was to be "carefully integrated with the undergraduate program," and guidance of the candidate's intervening professional service was to be the "joint responsibility of departments of education, departments of social sciences, and those working in the public schools." The existing regulation for certification, based on "a minimum of fifteen semester hours of training distributed through two or three fields" was considered "inadequate"; in its place the conference called for a "forty-hour comprehensive major" as the "only basis" for the four-year provisional certificate. In all, there were thirty specific items in the list of general agreements. The conference concluded by calling on the graduate dean of Ohio State University to

> . . . appoint an interuniversity committee for the purpose of developing harmonized and coordinated patterns of graduate requirements for the preparation of teachers of the social studies by the five state universities.

Subsequent developments at Ohio State

In keeping with the conference spirit, each of the universities in question set up a committee to implement the recommendations. We shall confine our attention from here on to what happened at Ohio State University. At the request of the social scientists and educationists who had attended the February meeting, the graduate dean appointed in April a committee of eight persons as follows: an economist to act as chairman, two

educationists, a geographer, an historian, a political scientist, a rural sociologist, and another sociologist. Their mandate was to study the "actual educational needs" of secondary teachers of the social studies and the "policies and practices of other graduate schools" with respect to comprehensive majors in this field. They were further asked to formulate "an appropriate program" including the necessary administrative arrangements, and to report their findings to the graduate council for action.

The committee began by organizing two subcommittees of three members, each chaired by an educationist, to assemble the facts in the two study areas specified. According to the report sent to the graduate council, the "most strikingly evident inference to be drawn from the investigations" of the first subcommittee was that "from national authorities in the field down to the teacher in service" there was "virtually unanimous" agreement that the "prime" needs of the teachers in question were "a social philosophy, a broad background in the various social science fields, and an understanding of the interrelationships among them." This conclusion carried the implication that most existing programs for the M.A. degree did not lead to the desired grasp and insight.

The work on which these findings were based included the examination of eleven scholarly books and reports on the topic, a nationwide statistical study of high school offerings in the several social studies with the respective pupil enrollments, and conferences with two selected groups of alert teachers of the social studies in public and private schools. The survey indicated that the greatest demand was for American history with European history a close second; political science was next in order by reason of the prevalence in high school of courses in civics and problems of democracy. The obvious dependence of the latter (for that matter of all three) on the facts and viewpoints supplied by economics, geography, and sociology raises the importance of these subjects far above the level indicated by their incidence as separate courses. The first of the two conferences was held in May with eighteen teachers from the junior and senior high schools of Columbus. While all were in sub-

stantial agreement with the definition of "prime needs" quoted above, eleven were not so sure about the desirability of requiring a thesis for the master's degree; they wished to add "or equivalent scholarly work" as an alternative. The second conference was held in the summer with fifteen experienced teachers who were registered for graduate work. This group committed itself without reluctance to a thesis requirement along with the main conclusions of the subcommittee.

The second subcommittee, on graduate policies and practices governing the comprehensive major in social science, addressed a letter to the thirty-four graduate schools represented in the Association of American Universities. Nine out of the twenty that replied already had in effect special programs in the social studies for teachers, and three others had plans "under consideration or in active preparation." Certain common characteristics of the most recently established programs impressed the subcommittee. There seemed to pervade them "an explicit recognition of the obligation" to meet the real needs of high school teachers as adequately as possible. All offered "a broader type of training than has been provided by the traditional master's degree in education or in a subject-matter department." This was achieved by "close cooperation" among the departments, schools, or colleges within the institution in question. All of these programs, furthermore, were "highly flexible" and could be "adapted to the interests, needs, and undergraduate background of each individual student." In order to make this adaptability workable, "particular attention" was given to student guidance; in at least two of the responding institutions an advisory committee rather than a single adviser was provided for each candidate.

On the basis of the reports made by its subcommittees and the experience of its members as teachers, the full committee recommended to the graduate council that "an additional field of specialization leading to the master's degree," besides the six departmental ones already offered, "be provided for teachers of the social studies in secondary schools." It called for an "interdepartmental committee" to supervise graduate work of a com-

prehensive nature, and for an "advisory committee of three" (ordinarily to be composed of an educationist and two social scientists) to be appointed for the guidance of each interested candidate. It drew up a list of "preferred electives" from the courses currently offered by the departments of education and the several social sciences, and specified the following coordinating device:

> . . . the central element of the program [shall] be a seminar of three hours per quarter, for three quarters, for the coordination of the materials of subject-matter fields and their application to the problem of secondary school teaching.

The graduate council of Ohio State University adopted this report in November 1941 and appointed the same group as the interdepartmental supervisory committee they had asked for. The new committee has since relied chiefly on individual counseling and the coordinating seminar to assure a suitable program of studies for each candidate. The committee has also been asked to experiment with the required thesis, as it goes along, with a view to making this document contribute as cogently as possible to the functional education of the graduate student.

By way of summary

In the above account we have tried to suggest some of the advantages of combining statewide and local planning. While effective proposals and procedures are seldom developed without close reference to the conditions surrounding a particular campus, there is much in the way of incentive and guidance to be derived from joint enterprise with other institutions. The advantage of including the state department of education in any such deliberations is clear from the resulting influence, in this case, on state requirements for certification. Contact with school people all along the line, both in the statewide and local efforts, served to keep thinking realistic and geared to the developing future. A statute requirement that associated the five universities in question accounts, in part, for the failure to secure greater participation from the state's privately controlled

institutions of higher learning. The value of fuller collaboration should be obvious and is recognized by most of the educators concerned with this program.

It will of course be noted that the revision at Ohio State University did not completely meet the suggestions made at the February conference on graduate work in the social studies. The committee regrets that the opportunity has not occurred to submit their proposals to the criticism of the appropriate schools and departments in the other four state universities. Perhaps the greatest weakness in the new scheme lies in accepting some sixty or seventy existing courses, without modification, as the means of imparting the necessary factual content. Nobody knows better than the committee itself that new courses should be devised to treat all subject matter with comprehensiveness of outlook. But full revision of this sort cannot advance any faster than changes in the thinking of the staff members concerned. The process has been well started and should gather momentum if it continues to rely in the future on the methods employed so far.

Other subject-matter groups in the five universities have been favorably impressed by the master's degree curriculum designed for experienced high school teachers of the social studies. Detailed plans have been worked out for a similar statewide conference of the graduate departments responsible for teacher education in the arts of communication—covering English speech and literature, foreign languages, and the graphic and plastic arts. Wartime restrictions have delayed calling the meeting and may prevent it for the duration. It is to be hoped that constructive intercommunication of the sort here described will be only held in abeyance rather than permanently frustrated by the obviously legitimate demands of the nation's war effort.

A Summer Workshop in Spokane

Our next account will deal with relationships between the Spokane Public Schools and two institutions of the vicinity: the Eastern Washington College of Education at Cheney, fifteen miles away, and the State College of Washington at Pullman,

some eighty miles south of the city. In this case it was the school system that was associated in the cooperative study of teacher education. At the time of our narrative there were nearly 400 elementary and 245 high school teachers employed, along with a central staff of administrators, supervisors, and special teachers totaling forty-five. At the College of Education there was a staff of nearly sixty and a resident student body of over 1,000, some two-thirds of whom were women. The State College, a land-grant institution and likewise coeducational, had a faculty of 225 members and an enrollment of over 4,400 undergraduate and graduate students. The school of education, with a registration of nearly 400, was one of ten administrative divisions.

Workshops in teacher education

In the preceding pages we have frequently referred more or less in passing to summer workshops and, in the preceding chapter, we indicated rather more specifically the important function of such offerings in the Commission's field program. Since workshops represent one of the most popular as well as novel developments in the education of experienced teachers, we have thought it desirable to include brief description of a specific example here. As far as colleges and universities are concerned, these programs represent a greater departure from traditional conceptions of course content and teaching procedure than either summer schools or extension work.

While the term "workshop" is currently used a bit loosely, in teacher education it most characteristically designates an arrangement whereby active teachers may do intensive work on specific problems that have arisen in their schools, under conditions such as the busy months of the academic year seldom permit. The movement derives its appeal and peculiar strength from that same reliance on direct experience as the stimulating and integrating agent in learning that we have emphasized throughout this book. The content of the program is determined in the first instance by the interests and defined concerns of the participants. Through personal counseling, guided self-evaluation, and frequent informal contacts with fellow work-

shoppers as well as the usual sources of information—books, mimeographed material, audio-visual aids, and the like—the original interests are then greatly expanded and diversified in the course of the five or six weeks of the typical workshop. The method is to combine intensive individual study with discussion in small groups of persons with similar or related problems. Workshops are usually held in central locations where resources for study and firsthand experience are abundant and varied.

The effect of the several conditions surrounding most workshops, emphatically including the social arrangements and activities, has been to generate an atmosphere in which mutual acquaintance is facilitated and the larger implications of any problem come to expression. It is natural at such gatherings to talk and think about the whole child or the school as a complex social organism, for instance, and to recognize the common ties between schools and their communities, on the one hand, or between schools and institutions of higher learning, on the other. The very composition of the typical workshop attendance tends to suggest interrelationships and widen horizons.

Workshops have been conducted to date in a variety of ways and with different ends in view. Most of them are held on college or university campuses and are attended predominantly by school administrators and classroom teachers. These have been national, regional, or statewide in scope. Others have been designed primarily for the personnel of particular school systems and have met in one of their own buildings. Some workshops have covered all areas of active concern to teachers and some have been specialized as to subject matter. An example of the latter is the series on human development and education, held since 1941 at the University of Chicago. But all of them stress both the practical and the comprehensive approach.

Since about 1940 the workshop for particular school systems has been making rapid strides. Such workshops are commonly sponsored by a board of education in cooperation with neighboring institutions of higher learning. As already noted, they are usually held on school property, in the administration building or a large high school, and are conducted primarily by school

leadership. The colleges and universities offer arrangements for graduate credit as desired, make their libraries and other collections or facilities available, and ordinarily contribute the services of certain members of their education faculties. These school workshops have been of special interest to the Commission on Teacher Education. It is for this reason that we have selected one of them for treatment here.[4]

The Spokane workshop of 1941

As part of its activity in the cooperative study, the Spokane school system decided in January 1941 to conduct a workshop for its educational personnel during the following summer. The action was taken after more than 100 teachers had expressed a preference for this type of in-service education as a substitute for the attendance at regular summer sessions ordinarily required periodically for salary increments. A committee was appointed to make the arrangements. This body secured the cooperation of Washington State College and the Eastern Washington College of Education in directing the project and giving academic credit for work done. It likewise set about discovering the number of prospective participants, along with their professional responsibilities and particular interests, and selected a workshop staff according to the facts discovered. The plans were completed in association with the Commission on Teacher Education.

The active interest of the two colleges resulted rather naturally from the fact that for a number of years their education students had been going to Spokane for much of their preliminary observation and practice teaching. The institutions had likewise been conducting extension centers for the benefit of Spokane teachers. The college directors of such work lived in the city. The arrangement finally agreed upon provided for a co-

[4] For a discussion of the function of such workshops in the year-round program of in-service education conducted by a school system, see Prall and Cushman, *Teacher Education in Service,* Chapter V. A description of the origin and characteristics of the workshop movement itself will be found in Kenneth L. Heaton, William G. Camp, and Paul B. Diederich, *Professional Education for Experienced Teachers* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1940).

ordinating committee from the colleges and for the services of two extension instructors on the workshop staff. At the State College six semester hours of credit were allowed while the College of Education granted up to nine such credits. Of the 166 persons from the Spokane system who attended, 57 elementary teachers worked for credit at the latter institution, 56 teachers from all levels did so at the former, and 53 merely had the experience locally certified for salary increments. Each college received a $4.00 registration fee and $10.00 in tuition for every student, the latter being allocated to the workshop budget to take care of the staff salary provided. Neither college was willing to grant credit for the workshop to teachers other than from the Spokane system.

The workshoppers from the local public schools included about a fifth of the classroom teachers from the city's forty elementary and six secondary schools, as well as over half the administrative and supervisory staff. Twelve individuals from other systems, who were willing to work without credit, were accepted as participants. The workshop ran for a good five weeks, from June 18 to July 25, and was held in one of the senior high schools. A staff of fourteen consultants on full time, and eleven on part time, was in charge of the program.

Some aspect of curricular revision, including the integrated or core approach, was the workshop problem for over half the participants. Other major interests held in common by twenty to thirty persons were community relations and resources, pupil guidance, and child growth and development. Most of the remaining individuals worked on problems of either articulation or evaluation. Among the special resources made available to these men and women were a professional library of over 1,000 volumes, a nursery school operated by the WPA in connection with the workshop, field trips, and a laboratory for informal work in the arts and music.

A questionnaire on the values and shortcomings of the workshop experience was circulated to all members at the close of the period. Returns of 92 percent were received. In addition to establishing the fact that "nearly everyone had received real,

definite help" on the professional concern he had taken to the workshop, this response testified to the more subtle outcomes usually hoped for from undertakings of this sort. For example, 128 out of 160 people said that they had come to "realize in a larger way the importance of the community" in the school's regular work. As many as 55 people thought that "a considerable change" had occurred in their "*basic* educational philosophy," while another 22 acknowledged having experienced "some change" in this regard. In fact, 113 people thought that some phase of their educational viewpoint had been altered. Large numbers (78 to 115 for the several items) found that "greater importance than they had previously thought" should be attached to such matters as the pupils' extracurricular activities, their out-of-school jobs, the community, home visitation, cooperation between parents and teachers, mental health, physical health, democratic practices in the classroom, and such basic tool subjects as for instance reading.

Certain later developments

One of the consequences of the summer's experience was closer working relations between the schools and the colleges, more especially the State College. At the suggestion of the extension director from this institution, a committee of seven—three from the college and four from the schools—was appointed by March 1942 to revise the extension courses so as to fit them more closely to the educational needs of the school personnel. The workshop served to make clear certain methods and emphases that would be useful and the committee set about getting further information by questionnaire. Returns were received from more than 200 teachers, roughly a fourth of those circularized. Several persons asked for more in the way of graduate courses and help on subject matter; others called for practical work "in the sense that they could use the material directly in their own classrooms," and still others asked for the workshop type of seminar to which they could bring their individual problems. The offerings planned on the basis of these returns were characterized by the extension director as likely to reach

about the same number of teachers as before, but as being "vastly different" in kind. Three or four of them might have been developed even without the joint committee, but the rest were the direct result of cooperation.[5]

The committee drew up plans for several extension courses and two research projects for the year 1941-42. No consultant service to building or systemwide groups on over-all problems has as yet been introduced although the committee hopes eventually to establish work along such lines. Two courses on specific teaching problems were offered, for each of which some twenty individuals registered, dealing respectively with remedial reading at the secondary level and problems of pupil guidance. Seven courses were included that dealt strictly with subject matter such as nutrition, mathematics and science as applied to aviation, and power politics in the Pacific area. The committee is likewise interested in the possible development of additional summer workshops, to be held either at the college or in Spokane, concentrated courses on professional or content subjects, camps, traveling colleges, and the like.

The story of the Spokane schools and their neighbors among institutions of higher learning highlights the meeting of minds that is steadily albeit rather slowly coming about among practitioners in different branches of the educational world. In this case it was the desire to bring the resources of colleges to bear on the immediate concerns of active teachers that provided the significant contact. To date, the flow of service has been chiefly from the college to the schools, as far as the 1941 workshop is concerned and the resulting revision of the State College's program of extension courses. But, quite apart from the important learning connected with the practice teaching of their students, the college instructors must obviously have benefited from the close association as well as the school people. Many of them are quite conscious of the enrichment their campus courses have received from their firsthand knowledge of the problems with which classroom teachers have to deal. Perhaps the joint com-

[5] Final report of the Spokane Public Schools to the Commission on Teacher Education, pp. 46-48.

mittee of the State College and the Spokane Public Schools may eventually find ways whereby the teachers can contribute more directly to the improvement of the pre-service curriculum. Possibly it may be thought mutually worthwhile to use the schools as laboratories in the graduate education of principals and supervisors. And there are other possibilities. Certainly a promising start has been made in Spokane toward college-school cooperation in the education of experienced teachers.

Off-Campus Programs in Nebraska

We turn now to the University of Nebraska for a look at certain attempts on a wider scale to serve teachers where they live and work rather than exclusively on the campus. At the time of the cooperative study this institution had a faculty of over 500 and an enrollment of 7,200 students, two-thirds of whom were men. At Teachers College, one of twenty-five administrative divisions, there were 950 students—or a good 13 percent of the total. The programs we have to describe were initiated at this college and carried on, for the most part, in cooperation with the University Extension Division.

Service away from the campus, particularly in the fields of agriculture and education, has been a marked feature of this university's work since before the first world war. A case in point is the striking service to small high schools which it has conducted for the past fifteen years. The object is primarily to help diversify and enrich the curriculum in those schools where at best not more than six teachers are available, or where only those courses can be given without serious financial loss which some fifteen or twenty youngsters happen to need. A cooperative relationship has been worked out whereby the university develops any new courses for which there is demand and prepares detailed, individualized, and up-to-date instructional materials; the schools provide the necessary study time during the regular class day and supervise the students at work; and the university maintains a correspondence teacher to follow the progress of each student, mark all papers, and measure final achievement.

This program was substantially assisted in the beginning by the Carnegie Foundation and later by the education division of the WPA for Nebraska. At the time of reporting to the Commission, contacts were being maintained with over 500 schools in thirty-four states besides Nebraska, and there were between 1,500 and 2,000 registrations a year.[6] While our narrative will be concerned with other projects, designed for the professional education of active teachers, we cite this program here by way of introduction to our story. It is through services of this kind that a public opinion has been created among the school people of Nebraska that makes it natural to turn to the university when help is wanted.

The centers for in-service education

An important phase of the Nebraska program for the professional development of active teachers is the work of the so-called in-service education centers. Experimentation with this approach has been going on for the past six years, not only in uncovering the factors that stimulate teacher growth but also in extending university services to outlying and relatively isolated districts. The work began in December 1938, when an organization known as the Otoe County School Men's Association asked the dean of Teachers College to send a member of his faculty to make suggestions and help with procedures for a program of in-service education in their county. Twelve out of the fourteen local schools had said they would participate and had some ideas about what they wanted to do. The college agreed and a staff member from the department of secondary education was assigned to the project. Otoe County is in the most eastern part of the state and immediately adjacent to Lancaster County where the university is located.

Beginning with the academic year 1939-40, three additional centers were arranged for at the request of organizations similar to that which got the first one started; they represented from fourteen to seventeen individual schools in each case. By the

[6] In 1943-44 the number was nearly 4,000.

time the university compiled its final report for the Commission eight such centers were being operated in widely scattered sections of Nebraska, through the part-time services of nine persons at the university. Sometimes the schools were located in a single county while elsewhere the basis of organization was a small geographic region. While the schools in question usually took care of all twelve grades in a single building, it was the teachers at the secondary level that were especially interested in the experiment to begin with. The trend since the first year or two has been in the direction of including more and more of the elementary people as well.

The plan agreed upon has consisted of group work conducted by the university coordinator, as he is called, at each center for at least two consecutive years, usually on alternate Saturdays from about the first of October to the end of February. Morning and afternoon sessions of two hours each have been held at every meeting. The chief purposes of the first year's work have been to bring the entire secondary faculties of a vicinity together to exchange experience, and to get each school to analyze and appraise its own situation. The superintendent, athletic coach, agricultural specialist, and the teachers of all academic and vocational subjects have accordingly tried to formulate together a suitable philosophy to give direction to their entire school program. As they did so, it was striking to note how often and how immediately this comprehensive and joint approach led to desirable change in classroom practice, because attention had been drawn away from departmental considerations and focused on the needs of children. During the second year, each faculty has been asked to concentrate on some specific area of common interest or on correcting some particular weak spot recognized through the first year's general analysis.

Before establishing a center for in-service education the university usually requires a minimum registration of twenty regular participants. There is a nominal fee for auditing. As might be anticipated, the matter of working out acceptable arrangements for graduate credit has not been easy—nor indeed has it been fully settled despite substantial progress. While most of

the teachers enrolled could qualify as graduate students, the biweekly institutes differ markedly from ordinary practice and the conditions under which they have been held—away from the campus and with only limited libraries available—do not fit traditional graduate standards. However, it has been the university coordinator's job to bring such resources as books, equipment, and the special contributions of certain colleagues to bear as much as possible on each center's unfolding needs. Furthermore, educational values not obtainable in the campus situation and inherent in the continuous check from everyday experience, have been making themselves increasingly felt and appreciated.

In the fall of 1942, a policy to govern graduate credit for work done off campus was developed by a committee at Teachers College and later adopted by the Graduate College. In substance it provided that education courses given away from the university should be classified in two categories: first, regular offerings by the departments concerned that could be given off campus virtually unchanged and with no sacrifice of quality; and second, courses specially designed for outlying centers and consequently never given on the campus. All courses of both types were to be approved in the regular way, the instructors were to meet university standards, and the administration was to be carried out by the University Extension Division. Credit up to six hours toward the master's degree and nine hours for the doctorate were to be allowed for courses in each category —making it possible to earn a total respectively of twelve and eighteen credits toward a higher degree in courses conducted off campus.

By way of illustration

The first year's work in a typical in-service education program may be illustrated by what took place in the extreme western part of the state, 400 miles away from the university. The North Platte River has carved out an irregular valley in this section which has been reclaimed from a near desert condition by irrigation. A string of prosperous towns and villages has grown up

along the river banks with a fairly self-contained cultural outlook because of the distances between them and the more populous areas. Keenly feeling the isolation, however, certain educators from the whole area organized the North Platte Valley School Administrators Association for the study of local problems. It was this organization that appealed to the University of Nebraska in 1939, and asked it to state the terms on which leadership could be supplied.

After hearing the conditions detailed above, the association set about calling a trial meeting in January 1940—not without some trepidation. The attendance totalled seventy representatives from seventeen different schools. Arrangements were accordingly made at once for a second meeting two weeks later at which registration was to be completed. Eight Saturday institutes were subsequently held in various towns along the river in as many as three counties. The superintendent of schools in the host town usually brought up to ten interested citizens with him, including members of the parent-teacher association, local editors, schoolboard members, the wives of teachers, and occasionally some elementary teachers.

The chief focus for the original work was found in *Evaluative Criteria* published in 1939 by the Cooperative Study of Secondary School Standards. Considerable interim study was done in each participating school. In one case, a faculty meeting was held for two hours every week to discuss the proposed ratings of elements in their program and consider accumulating evidence. Several schools had students make community surveys or gather data on graduates. The biweekly sectional meetings were used to report and discuss the ideas and procedures thus individually developed. At no time was there any difficulty in getting general participation; attendance was very regular and enthusiasm ran high.

For a description of typical activities during the second year of this program we shall return to Otoe County in the east. After a preliminary series of discussions in the spring of 1939, very similar to those just presented, the teachers of this center became greatly interested in curricular problems—using the

term in its widest sense. They agreed that each school should address itself to some particular shortcoming identified in its curriculum the previous semester, should formulate plans and have these checked by the whole group, should then put these plans into effect and report progress from time to time, and should at the close of the semester draw up a report on the whole experience, including suggestions for future action. At the first session attention was also given to the question of public relations. An outstanding job had been done the year before in keeping the several communities informed and interested. Since local support was held to be essential to any real success, visitors were encouraged to attend all sessions and a special meeting was planned at which seventy-five citizens were present. The local newspapers gave considerable publicity to this center's work.

Without exception the participating schools examined their offerings and procedures critically with a view to revision. Two very brief examples will serve to demonstrate what was done. In Nebraska City (about 7,000 inhabitants), for example, the first year's analysis had indicated that the course in commercial arts needed attention. Seniors taking commercial stenography helped the teachers make a survey of local office jobs. A questionnaire was developed covering the number, variety, and requirements of all available positions in this category; items of salary, hours of work, and turnover; and an evaluation of the training courses offered at the high school. The students got the instrument filled out by virtually every stenographer and office clerk in town. Some of the conclusions drawn from the results were as follows: far too many office workers were being prepared in view of the possible openings; the school was offering more typing than necessary and not enough English; the work in English, shorthand, and typing was not properly correlated; commercial students should be trained in the use of other business machines besides the typewriter; and the course in office practice needed broadening in scope.

In the little town of Douglas (360 inhabitants), on the other hand, the curriculum evaluation had pointed conclusively to a

deficiency in the health program. The first step toward change taken by the school was to bring the problem to the attention of the community by means of a general "clean-up week," letters to parents, and health demonstrations, with the help of the parent-teacher association and the local press. Health education was then connected with the subject matter of all regularly established classes. Study units were planned by teachers and students together as the need for them arose. Health examinations for all pupils were introduced as an annual practice. Fresh fruit was served to the children who brought their lunches from home. The entire community became health conscious and noted with pride that no contagious diseases broke out during the year of 1939-40 when the project was under way.

Toward community schools

Inasmuch as interest not only in public relations but also in what is called social or community understanding was a major concern of the in-service education centers, it may not be amiss to add another illustration to show how far in this direction some units have been trying to go. In 1941-42, for example, two of the field centers put their chief emphasis on developing community schools—that is to say, on bringing about such a blending of the life in the school and in the community that the two function virtually as a single unit. One such center was Otoe County where this interest followed very naturally after the activities described above. The other was Ogallala field center to the west, almost as far from the university as the North Platte River group. We shall take the latter for our illustration.

The year's institutes for this center were held every three weeks from November to March in Ogallala, a town of some 3,200 inhabitants in Keith County. People attended from within a radius of fifty miles. On the basis of the previous year's general self-appraisal, the schools in this group had concluded that they were not gearing their programs closely enough to community life. As they analyzed this common problem, at the first of the eight meetings, the participants decided rather quickly that they would not try to revolutionize the school

structure at this juncture, but would rather look for ways of bringing school and community into closer touch through the existing channels. They began by making in each situation an investigation of what was already being done in this line, and then every participant who was working for academic credit selected some area to explore for teaching resources.

For instance, a history teacher from Ogallala itself made a comprehensive search for local resources to aid in the teaching of American government. She catalogued the facilities within reach of her classes through which contacts might be made with federal agencies; she found that many departments and bureaus reached directly into the lives of every person in the community, and then worked out projects to acquaint her students with these opportunities. Classroom teachers in the neighboring town of Paxton (550 inhabitants) concentrated on what could be found locally to help improve the reading habits, appreciation, and comprehension of their students. A teacher of mathematics in Ogallala looked for ways of connecting classwork in mathematics with the youngsters' everyday lives. Two other teachers, in Ogallala and Chapell (1,100 inhabitants) examined the local possibilities for their students to have work experiences. The group found that several schools were already putting their buildings and facilities at the disposal of community groups, that in some cases educational opportunities were being extended to young people after leaving school, and that one or two schools were providing adult education.

While these activities proved to be worthwhile and stimulating for the participants, they also served to bring out the nature and extent of the problem they had tackled. According to the official report,

> . . . it became obvious almost at once that the school was traveling one segregated road and the community another. Whenever these roads met, the meeting was generally happy and in some instances quite fruitful, but again the demarcation was always carefully defined.[7]

[7] Final report of the University of Nebraska to the Commission on Teacher Education, p. 88.

This situation was thought to be "so deeply ingrained in the mores of the average Nebraska community" that "extreme tact and care" were called for in working out the program. At the close of the study period the group drew up certain suggestions to govern next steps. They wanted the resources of each community "thoroughly canvassed and catalogued," with a view to discovering not only "places of interest, items that may be borrowed, laboratories of actual experience that may be used," but also "which persons had traveled" and a list of the "unique skills, hobbies, experiences" of citizens who might be willing to contribute to the school program. After such a canvass, they thought that the several resources should be "assigned to the various curricular areas where they would do most good." Then, the skills and facilities which the school had to offer the community should be similarly canvassed and catalogued. Finally, while the "original impetus" was expected to come from the schools, the group hoped that "once started, the movement would incorporate the best leadership available in the whole community."[8]

Emphasis on child behavior

While these in-service education centers were developing, the department of educational psychology and measurement at Teachers College was experimenting a good deal with new procedures. The entire staff spent some three years revising its basic course for consideration by the college faculty. One member of the group spent the year of 1940-41 at the Commission's collaboration center in child development, at the University of Chicago, and the chairman attended the 1942 workshop on human development and education at the same institution. The experience of these two men and the mimeographed materials they brought back from the collaboration center have since been used to good effect in various parts of the Nebraska program for the state's experienced teachers.

One instance of this development may be seen in the work for 1941-42 at the field center for the North Platte Valley. That

[8] *Ibid.*, pp. 89-90.

year's program of in-service education was built on the two-year enterprise started in 1939-40. The topic chosen was child development and the psychologist who had been one of the Chicago collaborators was asked to serve as coordinator. Thirty classroom teachers and administrators registered for credit in the course and an additional thirty-five persons enrolled either as auditors or frequent visitors. The average attendance was above fifty.

It was agreed that the main business of the year's work was to be the day-by-day study of children. Each member of the group selected two pupils about whom to keep cumulative daily records. In every instance one youngster was chosen because he was something of a problem, and the other because he was a fairly "normal" member of the class. This technique was agreed to largely because it focused attention on living children in natural surroundings rather than on interpretations of child behavior in the literature. Not that reading was considered unimportant; on the contrary, it was hoped that more rather than less reading would result from the arrangement and such actually turned out to be the case. A summary of the reading done by the thirty individuals working for credit indicates an average of eight titles each, not including mimeographed bulletins and similar short materials.

The procedure consisted of starting with the question, "What *do* (rather than what *should*) I know about this particular youngster?" and then accumulating detailed information from the office files, classroom records and notes, the records of other teachers, and the child's own home. Teachers were encouraged to get together in small groups to discuss their findings—though of course on professionally confidential terms. Such meetings were also used to point up the implications of the intensive case studies for the understanding of child behavior in its more general aspects. In one instance a first conference of four teachers on a certain pupil led to another meeting of twelve teachers, each of whom had something valuable to add, then to another conference at which eighteen people contributed information, and finally to a general meeting of more than forty

persons who considered not only the case of the youngster in question but also the merits of the method as a device for studying child behavior.

Very similar procedures were found valuable in connection with what the department of psychology and measurement calls its psychological clinics. These have been held for a number of years both as a service to local schools and as a means of training students in the use of various instruments for testing mental ability, educational achievement, and the like. They are operated on the campus and also in the field as so-called traveling clinics. Attention is given both to unusually gifted children who need special programs for rapid advancement, and to the mentally retarded or deficient. In other words, cases and problems of many kinds are handled and the clinics strive to be practical laboratories of everyday life. All six regular members of the department have participated in this program.

An important feature of the work is its use as an aid to teachers in understanding the youngsters in their classrooms and designing programs that will meet their particular needs. Whenever a child is referred to a clinic the request is made for as complete a statement as possible on his background and general development as well as on the specific problem under consideration. From these preliminary analyses decisions are made, whenever possible, about the instruments to be used and the individuals best fitted to handle the case. During 1941-42, three such clinics were held in connection with the work at the North Platte Valley center just described. Because of this relationship with the project in in-service education it was possible to approximate ideal conditions more nearly than is true of most clinics conducted by the department. In all instances, however, conferences with classroom teachers and parents are planned after the children have been examined. At the field center a total of forty-five youngsters were tested, several of whom had already been studied by their teachers. In two instances, the area office of child welfare took part along with the public schools and the University of Nebraska.

When these teachers were invited as usual to prepare the

preliminary statements for the clinic, they used much the same approach as that which had met with such success at the center of in-service education. An important consequence was that, in a sizable number of cases, the "problems" on which the teachers were seeking help were cleared up in the process of careful study before the clinic ever met. In this way, an objective long sought after by the department of educational psychology and measurement was accomplished and teachers were aroused to think constructively about the behavior of their pupils. After each session of the clinic the examiners met with the teachers and welfare workers concerned, in groups or as individuals; conferences were also held with fifteen parents. As a further result of the tie-up between the field center and the traveling clinic, some of the findings and case studies were used for demonstrations of model staff conferences with the participation of classroom teachers, principals, superintendents, school nurses, and the visiting psychologists. Special efforts were made throughout to emphasize the essential sterility of these procedures unless they are followed up adequately—which usually means in cooperation with other local agencies.

By way of summary

Space has not permitted including in our narrative the very similar program of in-service education promoted in the first instance for elementary teachers. Nor have we had occasion to mention the advances made to several of the state's publicly supported teachers colleges to share in the extension program. But we have surely presented enough to indicate the range and vitality of the Nebraska effort as well as its significant ramifications. As far as content is concerned the most outstanding characteristic of all phases of the program is its practical emphasis on everyday problems in particular settings. Curricular revision is animated by the desire to make the most of every local environment combined with the will to share university resources as widely as possible.

As important as anything about the whole development is the interaction it represents among different parts of the home

institution. The ground for the in-service education centers was plowed in no small measure by the correspondence courses and related services of the University Extension Division. The centers in turn offered the educational psychologists at Teachers College an unusual outlet for experimentation. The psychological clinics were made to do triple service as aids to school administration, undergraduate preparation, and the education of experienced teachers. The fact that nine faculty members from the college have given part time to work away from the university in close touch with practicing teachers augurs well for the meaningfulness of their courses on the campus. Thus pre-service education for teachers stands to gain at Nebraska by the institution's efforts to serve teachers in service.

A Year-round Program in North Carolina

Our final sketch in this chapter will have to do with the overlapping, to a large extent coterminous, programs of graduate and in-service education for teachers developed by the consolidated University of North Carolina. As we pointed out in Chapter IV, this institution consists of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, the State College of Agriculture and Engineering at Raleigh, and the Woman's College at Greensboro. At the time of the Commission's field work the combined student body varied around 8,250 young men and women during the regular session, 46 percent of whom were at Chapel Hill, 28 percent at Raleigh, and 26 percent at Greensboro. The combined staffs totalled nearly 660 persons. While each of these semiautonomous units conducted work of its own for the cooperative study, they also functioned together in behalf of the program we are about to describe. Direction of the joint effort was entrusted by the university president to a committee of nine members, three representing each campus.

The setting and first steps

When the greater university was established in 1935, certain functions in the education of teachers were specifically delegated to each of the three units. The separate schools of edu-

cation were abolished as such and the several departments consolidated into one division with a single director for the entire university. The undergraduate preparation of teachers of agriculture and industrial arts was assigned to Raleigh, and of teachers in home economics, commercial arts, elementary and secondary subjects to Greensboro. Most of the graduate work for teachers was allocated to Chapel Hill, the exceptions being in agriculture, industrial arts, home economics, and commercial work. The object of this whole arrangement was to eliminate the considerable duplication that had previously obtained on the three campuses. At the same time, the advantages were not altogether obvious to the faculties of the former schools of education. The national study sponsored by the Commission was seized upon as an opportunity for doing something worthwhile together.

The all-university committee gave more attention to graduate work for experienced teachers than to any other topic. This was because an important problem in this area had been created by recent action of the state department of public instruction. The master's degree was made prerequisite for all administrative certificates to be issued after June 1, 1942 and at the same time there were to be salary increases for classroom teachers holding such degrees. This development was made possible by the fact that over 92 percent of all white teachers in the public schools of North Carolina already had the equivalent of a college education. It was likewise decided that any "further upgrading of standards for the certification of teachers should be based on graduate study." The effect of these regulations was to call forth "an unprecedented demand" from practicing teachers for "part-time and summer study on the graduate level."[9]

There was some apprehension among the state's leading educators that this situation might overtax the resources of existing graduate schools and tempt other institutions to enter the field when they were not properly equipped to offer graduate work.

[9] Final report of the University of North Carolina to the Commission on Teacher Education, p. 7.

On the other hand, many of these same persons recognized that the master's degree as currently administered was more suited to research workers than to the actual needs of most classroom teachers and school administrators. Among these were the individuals responsible for preparing teachers at the university. Faced with this double problem of safeguarding standards and at the same time functionalizing graduate education for teachers, the all-university committee at North Carolina decided at once to spend most of its efforts working toward a solution. It agreed to see what other states were doing with these problems and to associate itself closely with the state department of public instruction. The questions it raised for consideration covered changing the requirements for the master's degree, expanding the graduate work at Raleigh and Greensboro, and developing a possible all-university graduate faculty in education.

As a preliminary step, once the organization for the cooperative study was completed and the chief problems selected, a trip was made in the late spring of 1940 by the dean of the Graduate School and the state director of certification to look into "graduate study for teachers and its effect on certification practices." With the financial aid of the Commission, these two individuals visited institutions of higher learning in Kentucky, Ohio, and Michigan. They also spent some time at the University of Chicago conferring with persons at the Commission's summer workshop in teacher education. Further information and opinion were secured by correspondence with graduate schools and state departments of education all over the country. The "results of this investigation were clear and specific"; they proved to be especially valuable to the university in working out proposals for part-time study, as we shall describe, and in cooperating with certain state teachers colleges of North Carolina. They were likewise useful to the state department and played a significant role in the state's educational circles generally.[10]

In our treatment we shall discuss the later developments un-

[10] *Ibid.*, pp. 8-9.

der the headings of part-time graduate work during the regular year, summer activities, and the graduate major in elementary education at Greensboro.

Part-time study during the regular year

It so happened that the specific requirements for the M.A. certificate had not been formulated by the state department of public instruction before the all-university committee started its study of graduate work. A committee representing its own certification division, the public schools, and North Carolina institutions offering graduate instruction was called together by the state department to make recommendations. The individuals from the university who served on this committee were likewise connected with the cooperative study. The requirements as finally agreed upon were not rigid but left each institution fairly free to deal with individual students on the basis of their past training and future needs. Increased emphasis was called for on social understanding, human growth and behavior, study of the curriculum, and fields other than professional education. In fact, the new requirements permitted classroom teachers to take four-fifths and school administrators three-fifths of their graduate work in courses not usually labeled "education." The committee's proposals were officially adopted by the state board of education.

In the course of three years of experimentation, the department of education at Chapel Hill worked out with the Graduate School plans for a degree now known as the master of arts in education. It calls for a five-course major in education and four additional courses. The latter may be taken in as many as three fields provided the student has had the necessary undergraduate experience. A thesis and proficiency in either statistical methods or a modern language are required. The degree is intended for classroom teachers and administrators who want something more flexible than the program for the regular master of arts degree. The "real adjustments" connected with this work are made in the process of "advising the individual student." As the graduate courses in education themselves were

revised less emphasis was placed "on the minutiae of methods and administration," in favor of attention to "a deeper understanding of the children" with whom students are expected to work, "the society in which they function, and the curriculum which serves both the child and society.[11]

It is in the administration of this degree that most of the experimenting with in-service education has been done at this university. There was an active tradition on which to build. For more than twenty years the University Extension Division had offered correspondence and extension courses for part-time study. After 1935, graduate credit was allowed for two courses toward the master's degree provided they were taken under carefully controlled conditions in one of the regular extension centers which we shall describe shortly. In 1938, Saturday classes for graduate students were started at Chapel Hill on an experimental basis. During the period of the cooperative study this work was made an integral part of the university's program in teacher education and was extended to the campuses at Greensboro and Raleigh. An employed teacher may now take for residence credit one-half of his M.A. program in courses of this part-time nature given on Saturdays or in the late afternoons and evenings; he is not permitted to take more than ten quarter hours on this basis in any one year. Regular members of the graduate faculty are in charge of these courses and every effort has been made to keep the offering varied and comparable in quality to what is available to students on full time.

A further word is in order about the so-called extension centers. These developed from the university's extension program which has been in operation since 1921. Until 1932 this work consisted mainly of undergraduate courses given by regular staff members in centers "scattered rather haphazardly over the state." The location of such centers is "determined largely by demand" and has been "limited only by personnel, difficulties of transportation, and agreements with other institutions" engaged in similar programs.[12] Most of the original students were

[11] *Ibid.*, p. 12.
[12] *Ibid.*, p. 89.

primarily interested in securing higher certificates for which they needed a college degree. After 1935 this situation changed sharply since the bulk of the educational personnel had attained the B.A. standard; the action taken by the state department of public instruction, already described, redirected the demand from the field. Between 1932 and 1937 several classes were organized "around problems and projects of local significance"; attendance was limited to principals, superintendents, and classroom teachers recommended as "outstanding" by the administrators. Approximately 300 individuals enrolled in such classes and the credits they earned were almost wholly at the graduate level.

During the three years of the cooperative study, the attempt was made to develop this graduate extension work into "laboratory courses" to serve two purposes: (1) to meet the needs of individual students working for credit; and (2) to aid the school system in the study of locally significant problems, developing curricular materials, and making plans for local projects of a professional nature. Two centers operated with notable success on this basis in 1941-42; in Gastonia County the school project had to do with evaluating the curriculum and planning its revision, while in Columbus County special emphasis was placed on the industrial arts. A number of the extension centers have been developing wholly in this second direction, as field institutes for school improvement or in-service education without any particular concern for graduate credit. The cost in such cases is carried by the school system in question.

Summer activities

In order to supplement the extension courses considerable attention has been given at North Carolina, as at most universities since the middle nineteen-twenties, to making use of the summer months for the further education of experienced teachers. Two developments in this line are of particular interest here, one undertaken in cooperation with two of the state's five publicly supported teachers colleges, and the other a series of special workshops arranged at the request of the North Carolina Education Association.

Inasmuch as the first has to do exclusively with graduate training we shall discuss it first. In the spring of 1942 a project was initiated that was locally regarded as one of the "most significant experiments in utilizing the facilities of the university for graduate study." Teachers living in the western part of the state, at some distance from any of the university campuses, had made known their desire to begin their graduate study at an institution near their homes. The matter was discussed by representatives of the Graduate School, of the Appalachian State Teachers College at Boone, and of Western Carolina Teachers College at Cullowhee. As a result, it was agreed that the Chapel Hill department of education would "offer a limited program of basic graduate courses" at each of these colleges during the summer quarter. The latter were to be "responsible for strengthening their library facilities and looking after the administrative and financial details." The university was to plan the course offering and select the staff. Students were to be permitted to take one-third of their residence work for the master's degree at either college. This arrangement was "successful enough in the summer of 1942 to justify repeating it the following year in spite of the war."[13]

A similar innovation toward maximum use of the university's resources has been the spring intersession school carried on at Chapel Hill since 1940. Because the public schools of North Carolina close during the last week in April, it has been possible to fit in six weeks of graduate study for active teachers between this date and the opening of the regular summer session.

The second development to which we wished to give special attention in this section is that of the summer workshops of 1940 and 1941. These were consciously planned as part of the larger program of part-time and in-service education already described, and were sponsored jointly by the university and the North Carolina Education Association. The 1940 workshop was offered at the request of the association's rural department, while the one in 1941 had been asked for this department and the urban department together. On both occasions care had been taken to

[13] *Ibid.*, p. 15.

admit only participants who were thought to be serious about the problems on which they wanted to work, and whose projects could definitely be carried further in the course of the next year on the job. The workshops served an exploratory function in which profitable lines of activity were visualized and planned in broad outline. The major emphasis or theme at both of them had to do with closer school-community relations. Participants could earn academic credit in this connection if they so desired.

The workshops were held on the campus at Chapel Hill. They differed from the program of the extension centers during the regular year mainly in their more intensive character over a concentrated period of time, and in the fact that they were attended by classroom teachers, supervisors, and administrators from all over the state and elsewhere instead of from a single school system. Since this enlarged contact with fellow educators working on similar problems in different communities was one of the most stimulating aspects of the program, it will be worthwhile to present the analysis of one summer's attendance in detail. Of the 124 graduate students who made up the 1941 enrollment, 106 were from North Carolina and the rest from South Carolina, Virginia, Florida, Georgia, Alabama, and Kentucky. Among the participants from the home state almost every local type of community was represented; 48 came from small towns and rural districts, 24 from towns of 5,000-20,000 inhabitants, and 34 from cities of 20,000 inhabitants or more. In all, 21 different urban centers and 42 of the state's 100 counties had citizens at the workshop. More than a third of the group were elementary teachers (14 of them in charge of the seventh grade) and nearly a fifth were administrators including principals of district organizations, elementary, and secondary schools. Sixteen of the high school teachers gave their fields of specialization; in rank order of incidence these were mathematics and science, English, foreign languages, history or the social studies, home economics, and physical education. One-fourth of the participants were men.

Inasmuch as one of the chief educational objectives at both workshops was that of opening the eyes of participants to new

methods to be employed in the home situation, particular interest attaches to the answers given by the workshoppers themselves on an evaluative questionnaire to the question: What ways of working have you developed that you plan to make use of in your school next year? At the close of the 1941 workshop, 26 participants indicated that they hoped to do more in the way of teacher-pupil planning, 23 specified including the community in the curriculum, 15 expected to follow "the workshop plan" in their teaching and give more attention to group work, and another 15 planned to center their work more upon the interests of their pupils.

The elementary major at Greensboro

As one of its particular projects for the cooperative study, and with the endorsement of the all-university committee, the Woman's College at Greensboro developed for presentation to the graduate council a comprehensive plan for the master's degree in elementary education. The council, composed of representatives from the three constituent units of the university, approved the plan in principle and it was put into operation beginning with the summer of 1942. The elementary major is accordingly now given for two of the required three residence quarters on the Greensboro campus under the direction of a local graduate committee. Since graduate work is not available at this institution in some of the supporting departments, candidates are still required to take one quarter at Chapel Hill. The degree is officially under the jurisdiction of the Graduate School but responsibility for advising students about taking it has been vested in the department of education at Greensboro.

It will be recalled that one of the questions to which the all-university committee in charge of the work for the cooperative study wished to address itself had to do with developing a possible graduate faculty representing the entire consolidated institution. In the fall of 1941 this matter was of special interest to the local study committee at Greensboro. In the course of the ensuing debate, four ideas came notably to expression and wide acceptance. First, the Chapel Hill campus was conceded to be

"logically the center for most graduate work." However, and in the second place, there was concern lest the principle of allocation of function be interpreted too literally and statically; the local committee wished it to be "so redefined as to bring it into conformity with changed conditions such as the new state certification rulings and the greatly enlarged scope of women's activities." Third, the group held out for a five-year program for the preparation of elementary and secondary teachers as "essential to one of the important functions of the college." And fourth, they called for a "democratized control" of the Graduate School despite "full recognition of the preponderant interest" of Chapel Hill in this regard.

As the Greensboro committee set about formulating plans for what it had in mind it ran into the usual obstacles connected with "vested interests resistant to change" and the prevailing "concept of graduate study." But its most serious trouble lay in the fact that the Greensboro campus could not actually offer all needed graduate work for the degrees it had in mind and articulation with Chapel Hill was complicated by adminstrative arrangements; Greensboro operates by semesters while Chapel Hill combines the quarter system with certain courses that run for a full academic year. A working solution acceptable to all parties was found, as noted above, in connection with the elementary major. For all its disappointment at not having arrived at a similar solution for the degree in secondary education, the Greensboro committee nevertheless characterized its success as "material":

> Because the needs of elementary teachers are so very wide, a great many members of the faculty at Woman's College eventually will make a contribution to the major. Thus the preparation of teachers becomes in a very obvious way the function of the institution rather than of a department thereof. There are many wholesome implications.[14]

By way of summary

The foregoing account will have indicated the resourcefulness

[14] *Ibid.*, pp. 120-27, *passim.*

with which the University of North Carolina has set itself to meet the rather suddenly increased demand for graduate education made by the state's practicing teachers. Work for the master's degree in education can be done in a remarkable variety of ways. There are residence students at Chapel Hill on full time and at all three campuses on part time. Elementary majors can work on a full-time basis at Greensboro for some two-thirds of their program. There are graduate students during the regular year in the authorized extension centers. Others attend the spring intersession or the summer quarter at Chapel Hill, and still others go to summer sessions at two state teachers colleges. Most of these arrangements have been worked out in consultation or active cooperation with other educational agencies, and have been directly influenced by the requests of the teaching profession. The university's chief collaborators have been the state department of public instruction, the two state teachers colleges, and the teachers' own organization—the North Carolina Education Association.

It will readily be seen that variety of this order poses something of a problem in maintaining standards. Of this the university itself is sensitively aware. Great efforts have been made to offer basically the same courses no matter what the setting or administrative arrangement, and to keep the several offerings comparable in quality. The one exception to the standard course emphasis is provided by the Greensboro program for elementary majors which specifies a particular content of its own. All courses and instructors are approved by the Graduate School and the basic requirements for the degree—the education major, thesis, and statistical methods or a foreign language—are deliberately kept at a high level of scholarly attainment. Each student has an adviser to assist him with his program and must pass a comprehensive examination after completing his residence study.

Accompanying this flexible program for the master's degree has been the further adaptation to local demand represented by the service programs of the extension centers and the summer workshops. While graduate credit may be earned under pre-

scribed circumstances through these meetings, it is not usually a major concern of the participants. In general, these programs may be described as representing a drive toward organic unity in local systems because large portions of the school faculties join forces in behalf of the recognized needs of the particular youngsters for whose education they are responsible. As was seen to be the case in the similar centers of Nebraska, the resources of the university are used to reinforce and give direction to an enterprise that developed at the grass roots.

And there is evidence to suggest that similar lines of communication and joint effort have been at least well started among the several departments of education of the consolidated university. The process of working together on the immediate problems of graduate education for teachers did much to "dispel certain misunderstandings" connected with the original allocation of functions. As the section from Greensboro in the final report put it, the degree of success attained in the course of the cooperative study was evidence of the "power of common sense in the solution of common problems when used by men of integrity and good will."[15]

Some General Conclusions

The four sketches of this chapter illustrate a development which is the logical outgrowth and culmination of the sort of activity we presented in our earlier chapters. In the past, for that matter it is still largely true today, there has been an unnatural and mutually frustrating gap between the thinking of school people and college folk. The two groups have not known each other or fully recognized their common interests. The attempt to make the curriculum serve student needs registered in the schools well ahead of the colleges mainly because the former were closer to the changing cultural habits of the nation. When the high schools found themselves actually confronted with "all of the children of all the people" most of whom had no intention of going to college, they obviously could no longer continue

[15] *Ibid.*, p. 125.

as they had done when serving only the relatively few who wished to prepare for a higher education. The conditions in the classroom grew less and less like campus assumptions based on experience before the first world war.

But as more and more of the nation's young people also went to college and the program there became increasingly diversified, attention began to be directed toward counseling procedures and educational measurement as an aid to diagnosis. And as institutions of higher learning became preoccupied with student interests and needs, it was not long before they ran into the changes taking place in the schools. The current demands of the teaching profession thus tended to play into curricular revision on the campus. College professors—as individuals and in small groups—began to make contacts with communities and to visit in classrooms. This was particularly true of those teaching the social studies or professional education. Direct experience then started to make headway as an educational device and the natural consequence, when this movement was given full rein, was a virtual partnership with active teachers in some aspects of pre-service training. As already emphasized in the preceding chapter, this has been notably and most rewardingly the case in connection with practice teaching away from the campus.

The Commission on Teacher Education, in association with the collegiate institutions and public schools in the cooperative study, deliberately set out to foster this whole trend. The reorientation of in-service education represents its natural culmination because the personal interests and needs of active teachers *are* in large measure the demands of the profession. On the basis of the full experience of the Commission's field program, we may present here certain general characteristics of fruitful relations between schools and colleges which we have had occasion to observe. It should hardly be necessary to add that the variables in any particular instance are numerous and delicately balanced; each setting provides its own facilitating and countervailing conditions—as we have sought to indicate in all narratives of this book. Generalization on how to proceed should accordingly not

be carried too far. With this caution to the reader, however, we may summarize the Commission's experience.

In most cases informal relationships preceded the introduction of working agreements and the development of functional programs. This has been true in connection with introductory courses in education, practice teaching, or programs of in-service education. When school people have been asked to the campus for consultation or to share in forums or panel discussions, and the like, and when college folk have in turn visited the schools and interested themselves in their affairs, then the foundations have usually been laid on which more far-reaching collaboration has been built. The most significant contacts of this kind have been the occasions when college professors have asked for help in developing courses for the pre-service education of teachers. The sketches of Chapter IV contain good examples of this stage of interaction.

Another important factor making for understanding has been the interest displayed by certain college people in the welfare of the institution's service area—including the immediate community or the whole state as the case may require. The full confidence of schoolmen has, however, been enlisted, for the most part, only when this interest went beyond academic concern with sociological data or the wish to instruct students. When college people have tried to help the area solve its socio-economic and cultural problems, and have enlisted the institution's resources in behalf of local efforts to raise the standard of living, then perhaps more has been done to cement desirable relations than through any other method. The stories of Troy and Prairie View come to mind in this connection.

School administrators and classroom teachers have shown respect for such college groups as have experimented with new patterns and practices. Functional courses, summer workshops, extension centers and field courses based on identified problems, and the like have been popular with school people. The willingness to break with tradition in order to serve the actual needs of the schools has been widely interpreted as evidence of vitality. Most college groups have found it necessary to associate them-

selves intimately with a few schools before feeling qualified to render service of this type. Widespread visiting of a necessarily limited character has not usually been found satisfactory.

The universities and colleges that have gone furthest in establishing good working relations with schools have seen to it that as many staff members as possible engage in some kind of field work. They have wanted increasing numbers to share in off-campus activities as part of their regular responsibility instead of developing special extension staffs on full time. This has made the interaction definitely a two-way process and benefited pre-service as well as in-service education. It has also served to strengthen the morale and functioning power of the field staff since nobody is isolated and any activity in which sizable numbers are engaged tends to be respected on the campus. This does not mean, of course, that the ideal is for every college professor to give part time to field contacts. There will always be important work to be done in laboratories and libraries that absorb the entire energies of those endowed with the necessary aptitudes. A genuinely growing university has many functions to perform and should be thoroughly alive to all of them.

Such have been the methods and drives of the schools and colleges which the Commission has been able to assist as they have tried to come together. The developments we have reported are not new to education but they are still in the beginning stages of authentic growth in the field. Their true significance lies in the future programs of which they constitute the essential foundation. The stages through which the course of improvement proceeded were often more suggestive than the curricular changes actually put into effect. It is for this reason that we have emphasized them in our narratives. They represent limited but nevertheless telling progress on the way to genuine collaboration among all sections of the educational world in providing the nation's children with that service which is their due.

VIII

Integration and the Group Approach

WE HAVE now completed our survey of the cooperative study of teacher education as far as content is concerned. Representative working groups in the associated colleges and universities have been described as they set about improving local programs of student personnel, general education, subject-matter concentration in certain fields, professional education, and practice teaching. Other groups have been shown engaged in some aspect of education for experienced teachers after full induction into the profession. Throughout there has been paramount emphasis on what for lack of a better term are called "needs"—the interests and background deficiencies of students, the prerequisites for grasp of subject matter, and the actual demands of the job to be done. An important aid in clarification and likewise integration at every step was found in most instances in evaluative procedures of some kind, usually including some form of self-appraisal by students. We have likewise briefly described the special aids to study which the Commission sought to make widely available and may claim to have found useful. These include consultant services, the resources of the collaboration center in child development, workshops, conferences, intervisitation, and the like.

In the course of discussion we have had much to say about the comprehensive or "organic" approach to the problems in question. We have made a good deal of personal interaction, the exchange of experience, and cooperative undertakings of all kinds. In our selection of illustrative materials we have given marked, almost exclusive preference to group achievement

despite the fact that quite possibly the most extensive response to the Commission's influence occurred in the work of individual members of the faculty. The time has come to make fully explicit why we lay so much store by group action, what we mean by organic unity or institutional group consciousness, and how far we think this joint process got among the collegiate institutions of the cooperative study. Such then will be the task of the present chapter.

The Modern Drive toward Integration

We shall begin by asserting categorically that the distinction so often made between individual and group development as the proper focus of education is wholly artificial. These two goals cannot be separate and in conflict with each other, at least not in our day and age, since they are mutually dependent. As the sphere of effective individual control of everyday life has been progressively narrowed by technical and political developments, in the course of the past hundred years or so, group activity to counteract the restriction has become a social necessity of the first importance. But the original principles of organization were reinforced by the mass methods of large-scale industry in such a way that they contributed materially to that fragmented institutionalization of contemporary existence which has undermined the individual's natural basis for unity. Hence the widespread search or, more often, groping for the means of integration. The problem is not simply that of turning to group action for a fighting chance but even more basically of finding the right group. And it is just because there can be no substitute for a flowering personality in the American scheme of values that this matter is of such critical significance.

This is obviously not the place for elaborate social analysis. We should like to emphasize, however, that the modern search for unifying principles is very much more than the educational problem of how best to systematize human knowledge. The evidence points to a slow but accelerating shift taking place deep in the most active sections of the culture. In fact, protected as it is from the first impact of most social pressures, the educa-

tional world is well behind many other institutions in this regard. The more recently established federal agencies—like the Woman's Bureau, Children's Bureau, or the Office of Indian Affairs, and most conspicuously the Tennessee Valley Authority—have jurisdiction theoretically over all interests of a section of the population in contrast to the older departments—like those of cabinet rank—with their responsibility for a single interest of the entire population. The national or international organization of labor unions by individual trades, sponsored by the American Federation of Labor, is challenged head on by the so-called vertical organization of all workers in a single industry advocated by the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

By a double or ambivalent movement, in essence identical with that described in Chapter II in connection with student personnel, there has likewise been in modern times a marked concentration of governmental authority in one or at most a few centers accompanied by increasing reliance, even dependence on local initiative. Centralization here likewise has entailed decentralization and both appear to be on the increase. Regionalism, or the tendency of neighboring communities or sections of the country to come together around common socio-economic interests without regard to state boundaries, has been growing steadily since at least the nineteen-thirties. The influence of major social disaster—world depression and world war—has served to accelerate and intensify, at times to distort but never to deflect, these several manifestations of one fundamental trend. The most significant organization of our times follows the comprehensive or "total" pattern.

But it is time to return to our particular business and take a glance at developments within the world of education as observed in the Commission's field program. We shall attempt to do this very briefly under the headings of resistance among college teachers and planning in the cooperative study. We propose afterwards, as heretofore, to amplify and illustrate the argument with two accounts of institutions that have made substantial progress toward developing the organic unity we have in mind.

Resistance among college teachers

Probably the most important single factor to account for the lagging tendency of organized education, referred to above, is its relative seclusion from new developments in the culture. As we noted in the preceding chapter, the schools are usually nearer to the situation than the colleges and universities because they are confronted earlier and more insistently with the changes taking place. Besides, the conditions of university life are peculiarly adapted to individual effort and in large measure set up barriers to joint enterprise. Some rather far-reaching reorientation of campus mores will have to take place before the resistance of most educators to group action can be appreciably overcome.

To begin with, the educational experience of the average member of a college faculty puts a premium on self-dependence. There is ordinarily very little in the graduate study widely required of him that is calculated to develop ability to work with others. While some experience in classroom teaching is often provided through graduate assistantships, instructorships, and the like, these rarely mean an opportunity to share in thinking about educational policy or curricular problems even for the department—let alone the institution as a whole. The positive emphasis of this training is on personal research and independent study. Much time has to be spent working in libraries or laboratories, in reading and writing by oneself. Indeed, the dissertation especially for the doctorate must not only be done independently but is expected to break new ground. In calling attention to this situation we do not wish to question academic standards, nor to challenge their appropriateness for the purpose in mind, so much as to emphasize their failure to give prospective college teachers any predisposition for joint enterprise.

After receiving his appointment the young member of the faculty finds himself in a situation that continues the drive set by his graduate preparation. Despite some highly important countertendencies—carried by such synthesizers as ecologists and social anthropologists, for example—the dominant organization of human knowledge is still that of rigorous specialization.

The natural consequence is the departmental setup on the average campus. It is not unusual to find college faculties of 150 members divided into thirty or more nearly autonomous departments, each in turn subdivided according to special subjects. This arrangement makes it natural for the individual professor to confine his attention to, and get most of his satisfactions out of, the particular field in which he did his preparation. Promotion depends to a critical degree on his status among fellow specialists the country over—through publications and activities in national societies—instead of primarily on the professional respect of his colleagues at home. When to this basic pattern is added the tradition of academic rank, which deprives young instructors and sometimes all but full professors and department heads of any real voice in local affairs, it is hardly surprising to find that group action has but little natural appeal.

Besides, the daily work of the college teacher confronts him only seldom with his intellectual equals. Most of it is spent with students—largely undergraduates—and contacts with fellow staff members are strongly influenced by deference to each other's specialty. Rarely is a professor in the position of having to justify himself before his real peers. Everything in the environment tends to make him an "authority" whose views cannot be challenged very seriously in the home situation. None of this is good preparation for healthy give and take.[1]

But the resistance to innovating group action found on the average college or university campus is not entirely a matter of educational conditioning. By the time the professor has got himself accepted in his specialty and consequently established in his institution, his understandable concern is to defend that specialty against any encroachment. He has a vested interest in the departmental structure and his laboriously acquired academic rank. So, without being too conscious perhaps of what he is doing, he instinctively sets himself to oppose group action across departmental or divisional lines. Some of the commonest

[1] For a stimulating discussion of campus mores see Logan Wilson, *The Academic Man, A Study of the Sociology of a Profession* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1942).

techniques of avoidance encountered in the cooperative study may be worth rapid review.

One such device is to attribute the obstruction to someone else. Individuals and committees may blame the schools for doing a poor job of teaching, or school boards for being conservative, or the general public for lack of proper faith, or state departments of education and accrediting associations for their restrictions, or the local administration for getting in the way. Another line is to ask for proof that any proposed new practice is better than the old; since the suggested innovation has usually not been tried out in practice there can be no such positive demonstration. Sometimes the technique is that of admitting the proposal's general merit at the outset but then having recourse to a long list of possible "dangers" to be taken into account. Or again one can say the idea is all right in theory but it will never work in practice. Such a statement is calculated to make the proponent look impractical and the challenger as if he had both feet on the ground; it can be a perfect block.

Still another way to delay action is to call for a thorough investigation of the whole matter; the results of such surveys can then often be used later to justify either further study or continuing the program as it is. Again, a committee report can be drawn up so as to make all important recommendations dependent on the actions of other groups or institutions. And of course there are all sorts of catchwords or emotionally charged slogans such as, "Remember, we are trying to win a war!" or "Is that really democratic?" which have been used effectively to divert attention from the problem in hand. In short, college professors are quite as clever as anybody else in finding reasons for not doing what they do not want to do.

But the situation is not entirely black—as the preceding chapters should have established by this time. Widespread and stubborn as this resistance undoubtedly is there are nonetheless good grounds for sober optimism. Nor do we wish to leave the impression that the above proposals are always and necessarily to be taken as techniques of avoidance; in the Commission's experience many of them were offered in good faith and proved

to be exceedingly useful despite the inherent risks. By far the most important single factor in the countertrend that is stirring even on some of the largest university campuses—for the more complex the organization the greater the difficulty—is the incipient dissatisfaction of the profession itself. In addition to the frustrating sense of lost purpose and uneasy drifting which they share in some measure with most of their contemporaries, scholars and college teachers are increasingly coming to feel the need for integrating principles in their own province: the pursuit and dissemination of knowledge. Specialization has gone so far that it is beginning to generate its own corrective and demand a synthesis of some kind to bring the great diversity into meaningful unity. In a growing number of fields, research findings cannot be fully understood until they have been seen in some larger perspective and matched with data from other fields. This can seldom be accomplished under existing circumstances without group action.

As certain individuals, notably social scientists and educationists, have made rewarding contacts with community groups and local schools in the interests of their own subject matter, off-campus influences have begun to affect many institutions of higher learning. The attempt to marshal university resources in behalf of some problem has drawn more and more people into cooperative activity. Interpersonal exchange has proved stimulating for all concerned, as witness the striking success in recent years of the workshop movement and of joint study on a statewide, regional, or national basis. Release of energy and renewed conviction have widely accompanied this strengthening tendency of educational groups to reach out to one another and join forces. It has also resulted in much more active give and take on the home campus. The sense of institutional group consciousness that develops when this process has approached its maturity is what we mean by organic unity. Had the trend in this direction not existed at all, the Commission could not have planned and carried out its cooperative study on the lines we have described.

Planning in the cooperative study

Evidence of the potential pliability of collegiate administrative arrangements is to be found in the wide variety already in existence and the degree of experimentation that has been, and is being, done in this regard. When the Commission first established relationships with the participating centers in 1939, at least five ways of reaching administrative decisions were found in practice among them. In some cases, the responsible executive made such decisions single-handed according to his own best judgment; certain local coordinators for the cooperative study were appointed in this way. Again, other administrators did not act until after a good deal of counseling with individuals whose judgment they valued; delegates to the first general conference called by the Commission at Bennington College[2] were frequently selected in this way. A third pattern was that of basing executive decision on recommendations from an established formal body such as, for instance, an appointed advisory committee. In a fourth group of institutions, certain areas of responsibility were vested in elected committees; in one of the associated colleges this arrangement has become particularly far-reaching with jurisdiction now over such matters as the basis of staff promotion and the administrative setup. In the fifth and last category, power to make decisions affecting general policy was given to the entire faculty.

During the three years of the cooperative study, the Commission staff and all of the institutions and school systems associated with it undertook to wrestle with the problems of joint action. In most units some sort of planning committee emerged and, in all cases, it proceeded along lines and performed functions different from those just outlined. In no two instances did this body take quite the same shape or assume identical scope. Some centers argued for cooperative activity primarily for its own sake as an exercise in practical democracy; others put more emphasis on the ends to be sought by this means such as enlisting enthusiasm for certain programs, uncovering and

[2] See Chapter I, pp. 8-10.

developing new leadership, promoting mutual appreciation on the faculty, or enriching the curricular offerings. The general trend in the course of the study—though it cannot be called pronounced—was in the direction of greater sharing of important decisions and increased skill in cooperative action.

As far as composition is concerned, these planning committees tended from year to year to become more representative of the whole staff. Heads of divisions and departments, professors of all grades, and in some cases instructors were represented. Methods of selection differed widely. The first planning committees to appear in the colleges were usually appointed by the presidents, occasionally one was chosen by a staff committee, and in one case members were elected by general vote. Most centers, particularly those of middle size with faculties of 100 to 200 members, soon faced the question as to whether the planning body should be a temporary *ad hoc* arrangement for the cooperative study or something more or less permanent. When thinking leaned in the latter direction, as was sometimes the case, more and more emphasis was placed on rotating members and on the committee's function as a central board of strategy.

The planning committees tended to concentrate on one of three rather different but of course not mutually exclusive functions. In most of the cooperating colleges and universities this group was looked upon as a legislative body. Possibly this was a natural carryover from the traditional curriculum committee. In such cases, the planning committee was authorized to make decisions for the whole staff and to pass its actions on to others. Occasionally such decisions were taken to the faculty for discussion and approval before becoming final. Planning committees of this type operated either by trying to solve problems directly themselves or by appointing special subcommittees from their own number to study the situation. The first of these was the more prevalent procedure in the early stages and it usually did not work very well. This was at least in part because the problems tackled were frequently not truly legislative in character and were not especially well suited to the talents of the particular committee. For instance, in two institutions the

group bogged down completely over trying to draw up statements on the optimum functions of a teacher in American society and to outline the preparation he ought to have.

The second broad function that planning committees performed was that of coordinating the local enterprise for the cooperative study. A relatively small number of such bodies acted as clearinghouses for the several study groups set up (in most cases) by the administration to work on various phases of the program. On the whole this proved to be an unsatisfactory performance since it did not give committee members enough that it was worth their while to do.

The third important function discharged by planning committees in the cooperative study was that of analyzing what needed to be done and marshaling the institution's resources for appropriate action. They acted as diagnostic boards of strategy. This was a relatively late development and did not occur among the institutions of higher learning as often as among the school systems. Such committees differed radically from the other types described in that they became concerned with *planning* rather than doing. They did not try to furnish answers themselves but instead tried to get solutions from those members of the faculty most concerned and most able to give them. Planning committees of this type addressed themselves first to the matter of finding out what the staff conceived its problems to be, and then to selecting those items that were timeliest and most suited to group attack. From this point on, the job became one of devising strategy; such questions were discussed as whether to launch several broad attacks or to project one or two salients, whether to set up study groups across departmental lines or with fairly homogeneous membership, what study procedures to advocate, and how to use available talents to the best advantage.[3]

It was planning committees of this third type that made the most outstanding contribution toward organic unity or institutional group consciousness. One of their particular problems was that of finding new and satisfying roles for administrative

[3] For a discussion of the planning committees developed in the public schools, see Prall and Cushman, *Teacher Education in Service*, Chapter II.

officers who had previously handled alone matters now largely shared with bodies of this kind. No planning committee of any type could make headway, on the other hand, without the original backing and full confidence of the chief administrative officer. A fact not generally recognized as much as it deserves, yet fully substantiated by the Commission's experience, is that resistance to change and experiment seldom heads up in the president's office. Furthermore, the chief administrator had a significant part to play in the cooperative study by keeping lines of responsibility clear and defining the planning committee's proper scope—especially when it was shifting its emphasis in response to the developing situation. This meant steering clear of possible conflict with bodies already in existence such as administrative councils, curriculum committees, or the committee on committees. Some degree of coordination if not actual reconstruction was usually found to be necessary.

While significant work was done for the cooperative study by special groups in virtually all of the associated institutions, regardless of size, the consequences of their efforts in terms of all-faculty group consciousness differed widely. The critical factors here were institutional complexity and relative ease of communication. The presence of some larger mental atmosphere or point of reference—such as that provided by statewide programs or all-out purposeful self-evaluation within certain institutions—was of material assistance in stimulating and strengthening a common mind. But there were also other factors. We have selected for analysis here the attempts made by two colleges of medium size (though one is part of a state university) to attain what we have called organic unity on the campus. To a notable extent both of them have succeeded. After these presentations we shall be in a better position to discuss the impact made in this integrative direction by the cooperative study on the associated colleges and universities.

The Group Emphasis at Kalamazoo

The Western Michigan College of Education at Kalamazoo had, at the time of its formal connection with the Commission,

a staff of 208 persons. The student body varied around 2,900 with the number of women only slightly in excess of the men; all but 100 or so were undergraduates. The college is one of those we have described as responding to local pressures to become general institutions; several curricula are offered only the most important of which (numerically speaking) are for the preparation of elementary and secondary teachers. The faculty is proud of its growing reputation for scholarship and consequently anxious not to expand too fast or without careful consideration.

Organizing for the cooperative study

In Chapter III we quoted the final report to the Commission from this college on the initial highly departmentalized character of the faculty. The same document places equal emphasis, however, on the prevailing "democratic atmosphere" and describes the ordinary staff meetings as "open forums where the newest member, and the member with the lowest salary, could and did express his opinion, if he so desired, as freely as the oldest and the highest paid."[4] Prior to 1939 there existed a small advisory council to the president, nine of whose twelve members were elected by the faculty at large. The president was ambitious to improve the college program and saw in the proposed cooperative study of teacher education, when it came to his attention, an opportunity to use group methods toward this end on a comprehensive scale. After consultation with the faculty council, he accordingly laid the matter of applying to the Commission for membership in the study before the entire staff. They approved.

When the arrangements with the Commission were completed, the president appointed the head of the education department as local coordinator and designated four individuals to attend the planning conference at Bennington. The faculty council selected from its own membership a planning committee to assist the local coordinator in guiding the study. This body, together with the president and the coordinator, selected three

[4] Final report to the Commission, p. 3.

main areas for intensive work—namely student personnel, professional education, and general education—and asked the entire faculty to participate actively. Three blank sheets were posted on the bulletin board so that individual preferences could be recorded. The planning group appointed the three chairmen and determined the final makeup of the study committees; in a few cases shifts were made from one group to another after consultation with the individuals concerned. Each of the study committees was made up of approximately seventy members representing all departments of the college. After completing these arrangements the planning committee retired pretty much into the background.

The first year was given to exploring and defining the special problems of Kalamazoo in each of the three areas. The study committees worked through subcommittees whose findings and proposals were subjected to "long, frank, and bitter discussion" in the whole group before those on which the majority agreed were presented to the entire faculty in the spring months. The study methods included "unlimited" conferring in small and larger groups, reading and interviewing specialists in the several fields assigned, and securing information by correspondence. A group of five from the general education committee went on an extensive trip to see what other institutions were doing in their area. All of this took considerable time. According to the estimate of the final report, everybody spent "a minimum of three hours a week on the study" throughout 1939-40, while a majority probably gave "five to eight hours" and the leaders "may have averaged ten to twenty hours." At every stage discussion was distinctly animated; "sarcasm and emphatic language (short of profanity) were not uncommon." It quickly became clear that there was deep disagreement within the faculty between those who "desired radical innovations" and those who "wanted the *status quo* retained."[5]

The second year of the study was opened in September by a three-day conference held away from the campus at a resort on

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 7.

Lake Michigan. It was attended by some 99 percent of the faculty, twenty-one members of their families, and nineteen invited guests. Among the reasons given for arranging this meeting was the "satisfying experience" enjoyed at Bennington by the delegates the year before, the "expressed need" of the faculty for "a longer block of time for discussion and study," and the desire to "summarize achievements" and launch the "attack on the approaching second year."[6] Emphasis was placed not only on further group discussion but also on informal living and playing together. The "personal impression" of the conference, supplied by a staff member who had originally opposed the idea when it was presented to the faculty the previous spring, is worth drawing on for brief quotation:

> There are some of us who lack faith in the efficacy of "get together" meetings for the most part. . . . In this case, however, I think we overlooked an important fact which made all the difference. This was . . . that all of us had already been working for some months on one section or another of the comprehensive problem which we are trying to solve. Therefore we could meet, not as a passive crowd without special preparation or clearly defined purpose, but rather as co-workers who had . . . been studying the lesson and were ready, not only to make a recitation when called upon, but also to start an argument in the class. . . .
>
> Viewed in the abstract, betaking ourselves to a health-resort hotel fifty miles away may seem illogical not to say downright foolish. In reality, however, it was a very practical and sensible thing to do. Everyone knows how a change of environment can help us to see our everyday work in its proper perspective . . . but that was not all. This temporary transplanting, this cutting ourselves off as a body from all the entanglements . . . on the campus, gave us both a new intellectual freedom and an opportunity to share mutually in its benefits. . . . Unless I am very much mistaken, there has come into this program of study a new spirit which was not there before. It has taken on a more "human" aspect, something which can never be measured but which I am convinced is going to make our efforts much more profitable in the end.[7]

From the standpoint of group action the major event of this faculty conference was the emergence of the committee on next

[6] Final report to the Commission, appendices, p. 126.
[7] *Ibid.*, pp. 185-87, *passim*.

steps. This body of eventually fourteen members, eight of whom were elected by the faculty and two (the president and local coordinator) served *ex officio,* had been set up to take charge of the meeting and make recommendations for the next year's work. Actually it succeeded the original planning committee and developed in the direction of what we called a diagnostic board of strategy. As things turned out, the committee could not complete its assignment within the conference period and was not ready to report before the middle of November. It clearly went beyond the somewhat passive role of its predecessor in that it passed judgment on the proposals sent to it and made very specific suggestions as to the study procedure to be followed next. This is not to say, however, that the committee overstepped the general will or public opinion which had developed on the faculty. To be sure, it was criticized severely in some quarters for allowing certain proposals—especially those made by the study committee on professional education—to pass at the conference with practically no debate, when it became obvious in the course of the following year that the implications had not been properly understood. But even this charge serves to indicate how much the staff looked to the next-steps committee for leadership. The trend of the development may be seen in the fact that the group stayed in office all year and was succeeded, in 1941-42, by a new committee on next steps entirely elected by the faculty except for the two members serving *ex officio.*

Under the guidance of these committees during the last two years of the cooperative study, the emphasis shifted from exploration to the details of action. The study groups each year followed the same three headings as before but were now composed, in each case, only of representatives of those departments immediately concerned with the problem in hand. Roughly, half the total faculty served in 1940-41 and one-fourth in 1941-42. The significance of this progressive reduction in participation lies in the faculty's growing conviction that any plan of action must be developed by a relatively small and like-minded group of persons. It was accompanied, as we have noted above,

by a steadily increasing share in making all basic decisions. New chairmen were appointed every year for the study groups mainly so as to spread the work and the educational opportunity; from the standpoint of continuity this arrangement had its inconveniences. In the fall of 1941 a second all-faculty conference was held, although on this occasion only one day was set aside for the purpose.

Achievements on the side of content

From the standpoint of reaching a common mind and coming to conclusions about the curriculum, the three sets of study committees came down the home stretch in the following order: student personnel, professional education, and general education. Brief examination of the work of each group will serve to bring out some of the reasons for the variation.

The changes introduced by the committees on student personnel were quite pronounced but they did not prove to be controversial. Prior to the cooperative study guidance was carried on by the two personnel deans, the director of educational research, the registrar, and numerous individual members of the teaching staff. There was, however, no coordinating agency for this work, nor had any thorough study been made of student needs. Sentiment on the campus was in favor of an up-to-date program in this area and the study group had little difficulty in drawing up a plan that was acceptable. After the first year's intensive consideration of the needed principles and emphases, the study committee was far enough along to ask for the appointment of a personnel director. The individual selected for this position, a member of the staff, spent most of 1940-41 in Chicago at the Commission's collaboration center. He was constantly in touch, however, with the reorganized study committee in Kalamazoo. The latter addressed itself to those details of the emerging program thought to be most in need of attention, especially to developing a system of cumulative records and to guidance. During the third year of the cooperative study, the new system was actually initiated at midyears. A small study committee of seven members had spent the first semester intro-

ducing the faculty to the arrangements for advising students; approximately seventy members of the teaching staff are now responsible for this phase of the program.

The committees on professional education enjoyed a certain advantage from the beginning because this area was most naturally associated in local thinking—as widely elsewhere—with the education of teachers. Groups working in this field tended to have more than the others in the way of initial commitment. Furthermore, it was relatively easy to find stimulating suggestion from the experience of other institutions and the literature—an advantage shared by the personnel committees, of course, but not by the third group concerned with general education. By the end of the first year this study committee was ready to ask for a "free semester" or "fifteen-unit block," as they called it, during the senior year when the student was to give all of his time to directed practice teaching combined with closely integrated work in professional education. The study group proposed that these concentrated senior requirements, one for the elementary and one for the secondary curriculum, should represent the bulk of the professional work demanded. They were to be preceded in the junior year by three-hour courses each in human development and introduction to student teaching, and the prospective elementary teachers were to take an additional three-hour course in the psychology of reading.

The proposed change was startling enough to be called "radical" by some members of the faculty. It was this item in the conference agenda of 1940 that many came to feel later should not have been allowed to pass without deliberate attempt, on the part of the next-steps committee, to see that it was thoroughly understood. The new study group on professional education—composed entirely of educationists—set itself in 1940-41 to working out the details. When they reported to the entire faculty in the spring there were what the final report calls "pyrotechnics" and no decisive action. At the fall conference of 1941, however, a compromise was agreed upon: the free-semester plan was adopted with an alternative arrange-

ment allowed whereby certain students might spread the requirement over a longer period of time. This was in deference to the criticism that an inflexible senior block would make it impossible for some students to secure all of the academic work they needed. Follow-up studies made after students completed the first installment of this program, and again after they had been active a year in service, indicate that the integrated semester is meeting with very hearty response.[8]

As we noted in Chapter III, the study committee on general education definitely had difficulty. Five new terminal courses of the comprehensive or integrated kind were planned and for the most part tried out experimentally during the three years here in question. Considerable intensive study was done, other institutions were visited, and an investigation was made into the backgrounds and interests of the student body. Reading and interviewing proved far less definitive for these study groups than was true for the others, however, because of the diversity and lack of direction discovered elsewhere. It must also be recognized that the Commission staff, as a group, was less qualified to be of help in this field than in the other two emphasized at Kalamazoo. The issues simply were not clear. Individual members of the study committees, and it was true in the smaller homogeneous groups made up only of subject-matter people as well as in the larger committee representing all departments, differed profoundly among themselves as to the relative importance of the methods and objectives discussed. While working agreements were formulated at every stage of the study, to which at least a majority could subscribe, they represented the compromise of opposing viewpoints much more than the mutual adjustment that results from a true meeting of minds.

Results of the group process

The most obvious and probably also the most significant outcome of the three-year study at Kalamazoo was the jolt given to campus thinking. As the final report puts it, faculty

[8] See George H. Hilliard, "Student Appraisal of New Program," *Western Michigan College News Magazine*, II (May 1944), 5-7.

members were made "aware of the tremendous forces and problems facing the educational world" and came to see these "no longer as vague and misty" but "with clarity, terrifying or otherwise."[9] The emphasis on all-out participation the first year and the all-faculty conferences later meant that everybody was in some degree affected. The local application of the new perspective was an altered view of the college. Not only did these men and women come to know their colleagues as they had not known them before, but they saw the institution itself in a new light. The final statements from which we have already quoted earlier,[10] are full of such phrases as "this study has given a more comprehensive view of the work on the campus to individual faculty members," "I am much more intelligent about the work in other departments," "a better appreciation of the school as a whole," or "such a program helps us to become institutional minded." The testimony is worth drawing on more in detail:

> The study of the last three years has given us an opportunity to see democracy at work. People who never before listened to, or were interested in, the work of others found themselves exchanging opinions, clarifying ideas, and enjoying the process. We discovered wide gaps in understandings, great differences in beliefs, and a few evidences of distrust. The work went on, we talked, we shouted, and we laughed together. In spite of the noise, purposes were being defined and greater willingness to compromise was evident.[11]

Stimulating and invigorating as this group process was to most people, despite the unconscionable time required, it was by no means always comfortable for anybody and for some it was deeply upsetting. The exchange of views led to a meeting of minds at very different rates and in some cases even appeared to work the other way and intensify the disagreement. The fact that some groups were ready for action so much sooner than others is a measure of this important variation. The difference is not to be lightly dismissed as due to temperamental preferences

[9] Final report to the Commission, pp. 19-20.
[10] In Chapter III, pp. 64-65.
[11] Final report to the Commission, p. 34.

for doing or talking, as the case may be, nor yet attributed entirely to the baneful influence of "vested interests." As far as can be judged from the unusually full and frank reports sent to the Commission, the critical factor in moving from discussion to implementation appears to have been the degree of genuine, fully assimilated, and individually accepted joint thinking attained within each study group. Formal voting can never take the place of this essentially organic process. Since human problems have a way of differing significantly in the complexity of their causes and manifestations, there is bound to be an important difference in the rate at which they yield to treatment. As far as general education is concerned, the necessary first step of exploration and agreement on guiding principles had by no means been satisfactorily completed when the Commission's field work came to a close. Most observers of the situation agree, however, that the foundations for future action have been in large measure well laid.

In many respects the most heartening thing about the Kalamazoo experiment is the way the habit of exchange and interaction caught on. The group method of appraisal struck very real roots and is likely to continue. The sense of incompleteness with which the cooperative study closed represents good evidence of widespread appreciation of the value of the *process* itself as distinguished from the tangible results. Faculty resolutions at the close of the three-year period emphasized the need to keep this process going continuously. There is a sober note of realism, as well as response to a challenging situation, to be discerned in the testimony of individual members of the faculty. Much may be expected of any college whose staff can say with conviction that "growth and modification in the institution are necessary to meet the changing needs of students," or "the college is moving and we help to decide the direction," or that "new educational patterns or significant revision of old ones cannot be accomplished in a day; a long-time perspective (five to ten years or so) is advisable if matured and well rooted changes are going to be effected."[12]

[12] *Ibid.*, pp. 33, 38, and 26.

Teamwork at Ohio State University

Our second sketch in this chapter will deal with a similar group approach at a later stage of development since its beginings antedated the cooperative study by two years. It was initiated by the College of Education at Ohio State University. The institution consists of eleven administrative divisions of which the College of Education, with a fifth of the student enrollment, is next to the largest. At the time of the Commission's field program there were some 18,000 students on the campus and nearly 850 members of the faculty. The staff of the College of Education, the group to which we shall give particular attention, numbered approximately 200.

The setting

Certain elements in the general structure of the university are calculated to foster the group approach. To begin with, the organizational distribution of the several departments among the administrative divisions is strikingly unconventional. The principle adopted is that "each of the colleges with central professional and occupational functions shall have included in its organization the subject-matter departments that are regarded as basic" to its particular field, but the departments serve the entire university. Thus the departments of economics, sociology, and geography are in the College of Commerce; the departments of botany and zoology in the College of Agriculture; and the departments of psychology, fine arts, and music in the College of Education. All of the classwork of the Graduate School is handled through the other administrative divisions. As a result of this setup, all colleges build part of their curricula from the offerings of their sister organizations and are consequently concerned in "the relationships that necessarily arise from such interdependence."[13]

Another consequence of this arrangement is that departmental faculties are to a large extent basic units in the university structure as well as the college faculties. The same individuals

[13] Arthur J. Klein (editor), *Adventures in the Reconstruction of Education* (Columbus: Ohio State University, College of Education, 1941), pp. 14-15.

thus sit, in one capacity, as members of a heterogeneous group with a common larger interest, and in another—departmental—capacity are occupied with the functions of their professional specialty. For example, the department of fine arts is concerned with art as an element in the education of all classroom teachers and school administrators, with preparing art educators, with developing professional artists, and with offering art courses to the students of other colleges in the university who are not planning to be either teachers or artists. The first two of these interests it shares with the entire faculty of the College of Education, the third is a departmental matter, and the fourth is universitywide. The principles of vertical and horizontal organization are thus combined and appear to be working without serious friction to the advantage of each.

Furthermore, although there is a board of trustees in charge of the university, the enabling act specifically states that instruction shall be carried on "in connection with the faculty."

> Thus the principle that the faculty shall participate with the board of trustees in the administration of the instructional program is recognized in law. The faculty is further vested with legislative authority to establish rules and regulations for the "immediate government of the university and students in all that relates to the order and discipline therein . . . and other matters relating to internal policy. . . ."[14]

The faculty is composed of all professors and instructors who have served more than six academic quarters; they are "designated by the president on recommendation of the college dean." The College of Education, in dealing with its own policy and procedure, has usually included all instructors, assistants, graduate and research assistants, regardless of length of service, and called "the whole group its staff." The faculty of a department consists of all members who are on the college faculty and "such others as the chairman may designate." Departmental faculties have the responsibility of making recommendations on policy.[15]

While these administrative arrangements facilitate give and

[14] *Ibid.*, p. 243.
[15] *Ibid.*, p. 245.

take and stimulate a wide perspective, they do not by any means guarantee them automatically. In most situations the decisive factors in determining the psychological quality of an environment have to do with human personalities. At Ohio State many of the most important campus leaders, including the deans of the College of Education and the Graduate School, are men of democratic convictions and large vision; they are not only college but university minded. Furthermore, they are animated by a strong commitment of service to the state which they see as the prime consideration in determining university policy. Campus thinking tends to get much of its direction and vitality, moreover, from firsthand contact with the field and its changing needs. The cooperative enterprise described in the preceding chapter, whereby plans were made for an M.A. program for social studies teachers, is one of many examples that might be cited in substantiation. Channels of communication, both within the institution and between it and its service area, are carefully kept open. The developments which we shall describe arose within, indeed were an integral part of, this larger setting.

The committee on initiation of program

In May 1937 a new dean was inaugurated at the College of Education, a man who had been a member of the faculty for some years. The previous dean's policy had been the familiar one of strongly favoring academic individualism. The able and nationally known members of the faculty, often deliberately selected for their conflicting viewpoints, were encouraged to work independently and even competitively. The departments were highly autonomous. Consequently while much creative activity was going on, there was no coordinated educational program in existence. The new dean was proud of the caliber of his staff and proposed to continue supporting their individual research, but he was also determined to promote teamwork and institutional unity for the sake of the curriculum. It is important to note that he was unusually sensitive to human values as he set about his appointed task.

Proceeding on the assumption that the way to get people to work together is to give them something all consider important to do, the dean came to the conclusion that he would start by building on the only significant interest the whole staff appeared to have in common, namely a concern for students as persons. Early in August of the same year, accordingly, he called together everybody connected with student personnel in one way or another, some forty individuals. He told them that, in his opinion, students were not getting the benefit in practice of all that was known about counseling, that the program of instruction in this field was not coordinated, and that there was no connection between the instructional and guidance programs for undergraduates. The group rose to the implied challenge and organized themselves as the committee on initiation of program. The existence, function, and membership of this committee were made known to the whole faculty within the month.

It may possibly be objected that so important a committee should never have been constituted without specific authorization from the faculty. However, strict adherence to parliamentary procedure is not necessarily always the wisest method of democracy. In this instance, the start toward full participation as a faculty group was made with those persons who had an immediate interest and professional stake in the matter of widest common concern. As the work proceeded, more and more persons were drawn into the process as their professional interests were touched. The committee was furthermore always known to be an advisory rather than a legislative body; all of its proposals were referred to the entire faculty for action.

Moreover, the committee deliberately took steps from the beginning to enlist the thinking of the rest of the staff on its problems. The departments were asked to report on such personnel activities as they were currently sponsoring. An approach to individual faculty members was made by asking for their personal reaction to an article published by a member of the committee. It dealt with a psychology course for which students were asked to spend much time in the schools, observ-

ing, studying children, gathering test data, and the like. Comment was on the whole favorable but certain doubts were expressed about the wisdom of applying this method of direct experience throughout the college. The committee summarized all of the reports and comments it received for presentation to the faculty. It likewise used them to chart its own course. In this way the ideas of personnel and individualized off-campus activities became linked early in the minds of all concerned.

The development of the committee on initiation of program demonstrates the enlarging effect of intensive consideration of a particular problem in all of its ramifications. In the course of following out the full implications of its topic, what was originally a committee on personnel turned into a body concerned with all activities of the College of Education. The way in which this happened may be traced in the experience of its subcommittees. The area that appeared to be most ripe for action at the outset was the freshman advisory program. The subcommittee entrusted with working out improvements began by asking the faculty to help try out a new and comprehensive method with a selected group of freshmen, beginning in the fall of 1937. Eight staff members were selected from a large number of volunteers to sponsor fifteen entering students each throughout the academic year. The advisers met every week with the subcommittee to exchange experience and discuss the emerging problems. This group checked student and faculty opinion on the value of their work, drew up a statement of principles to govern the extension of the program to the whole freshman class of some 700, and ultimately recommended to the parent committee the establishment of an orientation course for the first freshman quarter to be followed by a series of group conferences with advisers during the rest of the year.

In the course of time, a series of closely coordinated subcommittees entrusted with formulating policy and practice for the entire personnel program, through the undergraduate years and on into the graduate period, came into being through the work of the original planning committee and its study groups. At every stage care was taken to secure the participation of

whatever individuals were concerned with the problem in hand. The sequence of professional courses underwent profound change in the course of the same evolution, influenced, however, by the concomitant work of other subcommittees to be described below. Three new courses were added, one was eliminated, and a general appraisal of the professional offering was initiated which is expected to lead to further reorganization in the future.

In the fall of 1937, the committee on initiation of program set up four new subcommittees to deal respectively with (1) the abilities and skills needed by beginning teachers, (2) the analysis and diagnosis of students, (3) coordinating personnel services throughout the college, and (4) the program of formal instruction in personnel. While the interplay of these four study groups with each other and with the subcommittee on the freshman program was probably the most important thing about them, the individual work of the first proved to be in some respects the most far-reaching. For the "major factors of competency for teaching," which this subcommittee was the first to formulate in rough draft, have since come to function as the integrating and direction-giving agent for the entire educational program of the college. The first version was tried out in practice in 1939-40, as we noted in Chapter VII, revised at the statewide workshop of 1940, and subsequently revised again after another year's trial. It will be recalled that the "factors" were officially adopted by the Ohio state department of education in 1941.

Through the work of these crossfertilizing subcommittees, shared in by increasing numbers and always officially acted upon by the entire staff, the foundations were laid for a coordinated program throughout the college. During 1938-39, the second year of the committee's life, special efforts were made to speed up the rate of wider participation. Invitations were extended to the faculty to attend certain sessions of the group and these met with encouraging response. When matters of interest to particular individuals and departments were up for discussion, the persons concerned were specifically asked to be present. As the scope of the committee grew additional sub-

committees (on publications and field services) were organized to function in the same comprehensive way as the others. Terms of reference were always broadly conceived in this development. It will be noted that the methods explored had the effect of focusing resources on individual students and the problems incident to meeting their needs as persons and as prospective teachers. The cooperative process was extended to undergraduate as well as graduate students almost from the outset. Thus the dean's original diagnosis of the integrating power of a great interest held in common was fully justified by the events.

The college policy committee

After two years' work on this basis, the dean and certain key members of the committee on initiation of program judged that the time had come for a more regularly constituted organization. Accordingly, in May 1939, they recommended to the faculty the establishment of two college committees of an advisory character, to be charged respectively with college policy and the college curriculum. Favorable action was taken and the two new bodies entered upon their duties in July; it is with the former committee, as the larger and more important one, that we shall next be concerned. The curriculum committee was composed of four members and worked very closely with the other group, to some extent as a junior partner.

The original committee on college policy consisted of twenty-one persons representing each of the departments and bureaus. It was made up of sixteen full professors, two associate and two assistant professors, and one instructor. A third were appointed each to serve for terms respectively of one, two, and three years to allow for rotating membership. The committee was selected by the dean from a panel of thirty-two nominated by election in the various departments on a pro rata basis. It may be worth emphasizing that no department heads were included in the membership; this was for the stated reason that the individuals concerned were already serving on the dean's executive committee and thus thought to be carrying enough responsibility. The dean himself made a point of not sitting on the policy

committee since he wanted it to develop as an instrument of strictly faculty thinking. When the group took office it voted to assume responsibility for the unfinished business of the committee on initiation of program. It likewise drafted regulations for its own guidance which were approved by the faculty at large. It was in this way officially defined as an "advisory committee concerning all matters of policy touching the College of Education and its parts."[16]

By and large the new committee carried on along the lines established by its predecessor. Primary emphasis was still on the students and on developing a program whereby the resources of all sections of the college could be brought to bear on their educational needs. The principle of sharing deliberations as much as possible with the rest of the staff was likewise adhered to. In some respects, however, the policy committee was confronted with problems which the earlier committee had not been called upon to deal with quite so much. They were inherent in the fact that the new committee's scope was literally all-inclusive. The matter of communication was a case in point. Now that the entire staff had come to recognize something of a stake in virtually every important decision, the need to keep everybody fully informed was widely expressed. The committee tried a number of things. It began by distributing the minutes of all meetings to all concerned; when these documents were criticized as meaningless without more data, summaries were added of all important discussions and relevant information. The committee also tried an annual report. None of these attempts were conspicuously successful. As a matter of fact, the entire experience of the cooperative study underlines the inadequacy of trying to communicate primarily by written means. There does not appear to be any acceptable substitute for active participation in working groups of one kind or another.

A second problem was that of relations with certain parts of the college that were less immediately affected by the main stream of developments. As the committee structure, and with it the outlook of the faculty, were transformed into something

[16] *Ibid.*, p. 258.

approaching organic group functioning, it became difficult to know how far to let the pressure of the situation develop without guidance. Research and other minority groups, for instance, may actually need some protection from the activities that legitimately absorb their colleagues. On the other hand, the best usefulness even of research bodies is dependent on worthwhile contacts with the groups they are supposed to serve. There is no easy solution for this problem nor any answer at all apart from a specific situation. It is largely a matter of careful timing, regard for human values, and of balancing the needs and purposes at stake. While definite progress in this area is to be noted at Ohio State, the question is still on the active agenda.

The policy committee was especially skillful in matters of procedure. Recognizing that it was too large a group for specific planning, it selected three of its members to act as a steering committee with responsibility for preparing agenda and appointing subcommittees. This small group functioned more like a board of strategy than like an executive committee of the usual sort. It never spoke for the whole body nor suggested appropriate recommendations for it to make. Instead, it planned the business for each meeting and assembled the information required for deliberation. The importance of placing data in the hands of committee members, on which they are expected to base action, cannot easily be overemphasized.

At times the policy committee was confronted with a number of questions for whose treatment no precedent had been set in the institution. As a result it was sometimes confused at the outset between policy making and implementation. At one period it asked for too many details and bordered on developing as a board to appraise course offerings. But as the committee grew with experience it confined its attention increasingly to matters of broad policy. For instance, it was not concerned at all with the specifics when it recommended to the faculty a requirement in direct experience off campus for all students, nor yet when it suggested that the college faculty should provide field service to teachers in the public schools through conferences, workshops, and extension courses. The same was true

when it recommended a policy of assigning staff members to the field on part time as the college enrollment declined after 1941. In other words, the committee developed considerable ability in distinguishing a true policy question from one relating largely to the details of putting policy into practice.

In the course of its development the policy committee became increasingly sensitive to what may be called its educational responsibility to the rest of the staff. As late as July 1942 the minutes record a discussion of this issue. At that time the view was expressed that certain questions should be taken to the faculty for deliberation rather than simply reported to them with recommendations. That is to say, the committee was coming to believe that alternate solutions of particular problems should be explored by the whole staff before they voted. The chief advantages of such a procedure include the obviously excellent opportunity to keep the faculty informed about and intelligently committed to the proposals in question; the method likewise gives the staff a chance to criticize any suggested policy without any sense of challenging the committee itself.

Review and appraisal

In the above account we have suggested the process whereby a faculty of some 200 individuals came rather quickly to shift from the departmentalized method of thinking and doing to a broadly institutional outlook. The precipitating factor was clearly the leadership provided by the college dean, although the favorable atmosphere on the campus should not be underrated. But what kept the process growing and expanding was the fact that all concerned did find something important and satisfying to do. Students and their needs were no theoretical abstraction but a living reality. What made them so clear and direction giving, furthermore, was the firsthand contact insisted upon throughout. The opinion of undergraduates as well as faculty members was canvassed from the outset, as we noted especially in connection with the freshman advisory program. And the thinking of active teachers was drawn upon continuously to shape the emerging program, as we illustrated in the

preceding chapter over the "factors of competency" and the M.A. for social studies teachers. It is no mere accident that faculty interest in field services of all kinds, as well as in such contacts for students, developed concomitantly with the reorientation of the program for undergraduates.

The essential features of the dean's leadership that appear to have been most significant were his keen sense of timing and his ability to let the process continue on its own steam once he had supplied the initial push. He seems to have known when to use informal methods and when it was time to call for official action, when to inject a challenge and when to rely on the initiative of his colleagues. His own college and indeed university outlook, shared in by other prestige persons on the campus, proved to be infectious. The give and take it promoted was not bargaining compromise but rather the interaction of a higher synthesis. The best evidence of this claim lies in the fact that faculty morale advanced as the group process widened; it brought with it not only solidarity but the release of energy derived from a clear sense of function.

Some General Conclusions

The stories presented above of progress toward institutional unity on two rather different campuses have much in common as well as significant points of contrast. It is to be noted that both were distinctly successful and, at the close of the cooperative study, appeared to be securely established on the road to further gains. The most striking divergence is in the matter of initial strategy. At Kalamazoo a comprehensive, all-out attack was launched on the entire program. At Ohio State an intensive thrust was made at the point thought most likely to yield returns.

In general, the experience of most centers associated with the Commission was in favor of the latter or spearhead approach. There can be no doubt that such successes as were attained in the direction of organic unity, so far as the cooperative study is concerned, resulted in most cases from concentration on fairly limited objectives at the outset—objectives nevertheless that

always contained within their natural scope the means of wider growth. But these successes were also associated with other factors on the campus, notably with the readiness of the faculty for what we described in Chapter II as the personnel point of view. When an interest in student needs was actively held in common to begin with, then almost any aspect of the program devised to serve them could be counted on as a precipitating agent. In no instance in the Commission's experience did an initially neutral situation, with faculty thinking in large measure mutually out of touch, make as much progress toward exchange and joint effort as did Kalamazoo. This finding deserves some emphasis. There are occasions when a severe jolt is the most educative device imaginable.

While the experience of Kalamazoo and Ohio State represents a definitely more advanced stage of group development than we could describe for most institutions in the cooperative study, it is by no means utterly unique. Strong tendencies in the same direction were noted in practically all of the colleges of similar size and smaller. In the late fall of 1940, by agreement between the Commission and the American Association of Teachers Colleges, two persons not officially connected with the cooperative study visited the seven teachers colleges actively engaged in it. The individuals were a college president and a professor of education. Their object was not to appraise developments or find fault but rather to note progress for the benefit of educators in general. They spent three days at each institution and met with the fullest cooperation and frankness everywhere. Contacts were arranged through the Commission on Teacher Education.

Among the conclusions published in the visitors' report, prominence is given to the "abundant evidence" noted for "decided shifts toward more democratic procedures in the administration" of the colleges in question. The authors thought more and more problems were being taken to the staffs for their advice and commented on a "growing feeling of *weness* in the institutions." As a result students were being invited to share deliberations and a tendency was seen coming to the fore

to "respect processes as fundamental to temporary or ultimate achievement."

> There is a growing feeling that it is important for one to have the experience of helping to evolve a plan before one can help to put it into operation in the most effective manner. . . . There is a tendency to increase the mutual respect between staff members within departments and between departments and between staff and administration. . . . Recognition of the unique features of local culture, student needs and characteristics, public school demands, and college resources is beginning to be made . . . there is distinct evidence that they [the teachers colleges] are shifting from standardizing agencies and other institutions for determining their patterns to more security in their own cooperative efforts.[17]

If these visitors could have made the complete rounds they would have been able to record, in the course of the study, very similar observations in both Negro institutions associated with the Commission and two of the colleges of liberal arts. In most of the universities, on the other hand, little more than the surface had been scratched in the best of cases, even when the field program came to a close. Size was a critical factor, however, only in the sense that it restricted ease of communication and set a limit to faculty participation. The study groups in the large institutions were almost invariably crossdepartmental in structure and they used the direct method of analyzing student needs. Wherever this method was applied it developed the realistically comprehensive and functional viewpoint as far as the participants were concerned. Problems arose at the point of mediating the experience to colleagues. And the cooperative study discovered no satisfactory substitute for personal, active sharing.[18]

On the basis of the Commission's experience we may offer the generalization that organic unity, or the widespread habit of thinking and acting with the entire institution in mind—the capacity to see things whole, is directly dependent on two

[17] F. E. Engleman and J. C. Matthews, "Progress Report on Seven Teachers Colleges Participating in the Cooperative Study of Teacher Education," *Twentieth Yearbook* (1941) of the American Association of Teachers Colleges, pp. 99-100.

[18] See Chapter IV.

factors: the adequacy of the channels of communication and the vitality of a synthesizing purpose held in common. This does not mean, of course, that all members of a faculty should be serving on some study committee all of the time. It does mean, on the other hand, that enough members of the staff should engage in such activities sufficiently often to understand the viewpoint of colleagues when expressed orally or in reports. A significant working majority needs to acquire the comprehensive outlook at firsthand. In our observation, at least four major agents were noted in operation by means of which the above two factors were kept in what may be called working condition.

In the first place, no trend toward organic unity got started anywhere or was kept moving without active leadership. Such direction was invariably supplied in the first instance by one of the chief executive officers of the institution concerned. But in every case able members of the staff were very soon in a position to take over, and it is seriously to be doubted if headway could have been maintained on any other basis. As we noted in the narratives about Kalamazoo and Ohio State, it was the function of leadership to take the initiative and to set the tone. Progress depended in large measure on the administrator's knowledge of people, responsiveness to human values, awareness of the unfolding situation, and sense of timing. If the initial setup had outlived its usefulness, or new problems were developing, or the scope of a given committee were changing, it was his job to see that appropriate adjustments were made. On the other hand, no administrator was able to force the situation or move any faster than his capacity to convince his staff. College faculties are particularly suspicious of administrative pressure, as became evident more than once in the course of the cooperative study. The distinction between applying a stimulus and driving for action is as critical as it is subtle. All educative and organic processes take time. (Parenthetically, we may add that time seems to move in academic circles at a particularly dignified pace.)

While some initiative and guidance of the emerging group

process by the institution's administrator was thus found to be a necessary part of the development, in the cooperative study, a second agent of equal importance was the genuine satisfaction of the participating staff. Unless the individuals concerned really felt that what they were doing had meaning for them professionally and personally, the mere appointment of committees—no matter how carefully selected for "representativeness"—did not get the organic process under way. This is not to say that all phases of the procedure were necessarily pleasurable. Much hard work and strenuous conferring was done in many quarters and there was considerable interference with private life. Furthermore, the challenge to formerly accepted theories and habits of work was often actually painful. The discovery of unsuspected differences of opinion and even of values among colleagues was quite as disturbing as the opposite discovery of shared enthusiasms was gratifying. But regardless of emotional byproducts, if the new preoccupation with student needs and schools as they really are got under people's skins, then—and only then—did the reorientation take place which we have chosen to call institutional group consciousness or organic unity.

A third agent worth emphasizing, though it was not found to be indispensable in the same sense as the first two mentioned, was the collegewide or all-faculty conference. It will be recalled that the fall gathering of the Kalamazoo staff in 1940, at the beginning of the second year of the cooperative study, did something for general morale that had not been obtained by the preceding year's work in the cross-sectional study committees. On the other hand, as was emphasized by the faculty commentator we quoted, the success of the three-day conference in turn resulted in large measure from the intensive ground-breaking activities carried on by the entire faculty in those earlier committees. The system of all-institute conferences at Tuskegee, described in Chapter II, is another case in point. Those annual meetings served to check the preceding year's work, in each case after the first, and to lay plans for the next. The fact that everybody worked, dined, and played together on these occa-

sions was apparently of inestimable value in promoting a sense of solidarity. A very similar series of all-faculty conferences at Prairie View, five in all, served to give direction to that institution's educational program in a way that was both more realistic and more cooperative than had been true on the campus before. One of the major obstacles to the spirit we are talking about is the simple fact that most faculty members are just not well enough acquainted to know how much they can give each other.

Finally, and in some respects the most powerful agent of all for maintaining both adequate communication and the vitality of a synthesizing common interest, was the presence on a particular campus of some effective manifestation of concerns larger than those of departmental or even institutional scope. The cooperative study of teacher education, with its nationwide contacts and conferences, performed a significant service of this kind. But the most telling influences were considerably nearer home. The president's vision or lack of it was extremely important in this connection. Evaluation programs undertaken for the institution as a whole, like those at Milwaukee or the Stanford School of Education, contributed enormously especially whenever they were accompanied by intensive study of the service area. Perhaps the most far-reaching and productive influence of this sort was exerted by statewide cooperative programs that happened to be simultaneously under way. Troy and the College of Education at Ohio State were in particularly strategic positions, from the standpoint of organic group work, because their chief administrators were likewise among the moving spirits concerned with state efforts. But whatever the form it took, some firsthand contact with larger issues and other viewpoints was usually necessary before the faculty fully caught the vision of its own place in the scheme of things.

IX

Reflections and Conclusions

WE HAVE now laid before the reader to the best of our abilities the essential story of the cooperative study of teacher education as far as the colleges and universities are concerned. In this final chapter we shall accordingly attempt to pull together the main threads, as we see the situation, and offer more in the way of personal conclusion than we have done up to this point. Since the basis for our thinking has been presented in the sketches and discussions of the bulk of this report, we shall not need to be very detailed or expository at this stage. We have no blueprint to offer on how institutions of higher learning should prepare teachers for their professional duties because we believe, in all sincerity, that there is more than one "best" way. But, as a result of our work for the Commission, we have been led to form certain opinions which we think may have value for other colleges and universities if they should wish to experiment with curricular revision along the lines we have described. What we have to say will be presented under three main headings, respectively on problems of the group approach, the elements of teacher education, and the emerging responsibility of collegiate institutions as far as teacher education is concerned.

PROBLEMS OF THE GROUP APPROACH

It is our considered judgment that rather basic reorientation is called for in typical campus thinking if colleges and universities are to succeed in educating teachers adequate to the demands of our times. On the other hand, we do not wish to be understood as advocating change simply for its own sake or without due appreciation of the values inherent in traditional procedures. Far too much educational experiment has been

done on the spur of the moment, in fairly thoughtless response to fortuitous circumstance, and without the discipline of social purpose. In view of the whole discussion of Chapter VIII, we do not need to repeat our reasons for maintaining that this necessary reorientation is a group matter, dependent on personal interaction and joint thinking. We believe that the drive and aim of the cooperative study were emphatically in the right direction. Furthermore, we wish to record our faith in the average college professor's capacity to catch the vision and make the required adjustments once he is given the proper opportunity. He may need some stirring up at the outset but there is usually no holding him once he is thoroughly convinced. The record of the working groups in the cooperative study can be matched by similar groups elsewhere.

The problem of faculty readiness

If the success of curricular revision in the cooperative study was critically dependent in the early stages on the vision and statesmanship of some administrative officer, it was equally dependent for final acceptance on the public opinion or general mindset of the faculty at large. Indeed this latter was by far the more serious problem. In most instances, the move from half-hearted tinkering to vital reconstruction took place only as the social vision of the participants, their alertness to contemporary issues of everyday life, was increased. This was true first within the several study groups and later within the faculty as a whole. The answer lies in some such attempt at eventual total participation, carried out in the way and at the time and pace locally found to be best, as we described in the preceding chapter for Kalamazoo and Ohio State. In other words, we echo and wish to reinforce the Harvard committee's emphasis upon living contacts between faculty members and the public schools.[1]

We have already commented on the significance of some larger frame of reference, such as is provided by state or national studies, to lay the foundations for the necessary local

[1] See Chapter IV, pp. 122-25.

receptivity. Even such an initial advantage must, however, be carefully exploited. For the most part, the readiness we mean cannot be generated apart from actual work on program changes. It is a product of that personal exchange and mutual acquaintance of which we have made so much throughout this volume. A great many devices can and are being used effectively to bring college professors in touch with the undiminished impact of cultural forces. Among those tried out in the co-operative study we can heartily recommend two, especially if they are carried out *concurrently*: a study of the backgrounds, aptitudes, and interests of prospective teachers, and the comprehensive examination of school practice in selected communities of the state or other service area. We are thus suggesting that the content and orientation of professional education may best be derived from the continuous interaction of student needs and the demands of the profession.

It should perhaps go without saying that no approach may be trusted to produce the desired effect automatically. The spirit in which any enterprise is undertaken is the chief determinant of the quality of the results. It is always possible to discover evidence in support of a given theory or established procedure if such is the original intention. But our sketches, particularly in Chapter III, should establish the fact that to all but the consciously closed mind, firsthand contact with present-day conditions in American schools means something of a revelation. At the same time, we are certainly not saying that the uncritical acceptance of prevailing school practice is a mark of the readiness we are discussing. Professors completely lacking in personal conviction or awareness of their own potential contribution could accommodate themselves to preparing teachers for a fascist state quite as easily as for American democracy. We have no reason to think there are many such on our college campuses. What we are advocating is that questing mental attitude that will not be satisfied with anything less than the best possible application of scientific knowledge and social vision to contemporary problems as they really are.

While extensive revision of educational goals is often most

worthwhile in developing group thinking and a higher common standard, our experience suggests that this process is best carried out as part and parcel of the two main study approaches we have suggested. Much time and energy can be dissipated if the precise wording of curricular objectives is allowed to become an end in itself. The danger of excessive talk diminishes with the faculty's general conviction as to the urgency of what is being done. As a first step in the process of reorientation we suggest beginning with the study of student backgrounds and interests. Preoccupation with the initial findings can lead very naturally to experiment with selective admissions, to the introduction of new facilities for social life, and to extensive counseling. Continuous responsibility for guiding undergraduates through four years of college can go far in opening the average staff member's eyes to gaps and shortcomings in the curriculum. This often leads to individual experimentation with instructional material or classroom procedure. Some of the newer teaching methods may then put in an appearance on the campus, such as student-teacher planning, workshops, curriculum laboratories, audio-visual aids, field trips, and the like. It is at this stage that the reconsideration of objectives becomes of particular value. As the personnel point of view spreads and takes hold, a situation is created similar to that which the dean of the College of Education at Ohio State University found ready to his purpose.

But along with this increasing concern about students as persons as well as prospective teachers we should like to see ever widening contacts established with the service area. At the outset these had best be simply exploratory in order to find out the facts and analyze the pressures. Even this preliminary step cannot be satisfactorily negotiated, however, except on a cooperative basis. In the course of time, and preferably sooner than later, this should lead to an exchange of services between college folk and schoolmen. We have found no better way of reaching agreement on the basic preparation needed by elementary and secondary teachers than joint consideration of the matter by school administrators, classroom teachers, educational

laymen, and college professors (subject-matter specialists as well as educationists) working together on equal terms. By this we mean a situation in which nobody patronizes or is subservient to anybody else, and where each participant can forget academic status in the larger interest to which all are presumably contributing. This represents a fairly advanced stage of development, of course, comparable to the general acceptance of the personnel point of view resulting from the study of undergraduate needs.

The current demands made on teacher competence in the nation's schools originated outside of the academic world in the everyday lives of the people. Most new materials and methods of instruction represent an attempt to adjust to the pressure thus exerted; they have their roots in some vital aspect of American culture. We believe that any competent individual who gives serious attention to these matters, motivated by his interest in helping specific students and by his firsthand knowledge of school problems, will not be long in discovering the implications for teacher education. Our experience indicates that once a faculty begins to see the curriculum through the eyes of undergraduates, the great difficulty is to keep its members from revising the program exclusively in terms of student needs without waiting to find out what the situation looks like to the people in charge of operating the schools in which the students will teach. Hence our recommendation that the two lines of study be carried out for the most part concurrently and, we need hardly add, in constant communication.

This brief description of a way to start the process whereby college faculties may be oriented to the basic problem of teacher education is not meant to be exhaustive, of course. There are other equally fruitful methods, no doubt, especially when handled by persons who know how to use them. We have simply outlined a procedure in which we personally have confidence and about which we feel qualified by experience to talk. Orientation, however, is only the first step toward curricular revision. The effective reorganization of programs for the preparation of teachers calls for more than an understand-

ing of college students as human beings and more than an acquaintance with the demands that will be made upon these young people when they enter the profession. It is similarly dependent on a knowledge of relationships both within the home institution and between it and its fellow colleges of the state or region. It requires active leadership and popular confidence at every stage of development, even as do all human enterprises based on the contribution of more than one or two individuals. It is to such matters that we shall next turn our attention.

The problem of statesmanship

After enough general readiness has been established on the campus, the matter of developing specific program suggestions may be entrusted to as many study groups as may seem called for, under the general supervision of a central planning committee. In the cooperative study most of these groups, the working as well as the steering committees, were made up of individuals representing both education and subject-matter fields. The composition of the central body is particularly important. The most effective ones in our experience were made up of representatives of different departments or (in the universities) faculties, a majority of whom had been nominated by the faculty at large, and all of whom had been appointed by the president. When the chief administrative officer or his representative was actively interested, the advantage was substantial. These arrangements made for maximum support of the proposals or policies developed by the planning committee and its working groups, and gave the committee the degree of prestige and administrative backing needed to perform its duties.

We have already discussed the planning committees of the cooperative study and indicated our preference for those that developed as diagnostic boards of strategy.[2] A word may be in order about the local coordinators that were appointed in each participating institution to act as this committee's executive officer and head up the work done for the national study. This

[2] In Chapter VIII, pp. 263-66.

job proved to be not only arduous but one requiring wisdom and patience. Other institutions would do well to use for this function the best available talent whether the individual concerned be president, dean, department head, or plain professor; only the faculty in question can determine by its own methods which of its members is best suited for the role. In one situation the president may be the best selection and in another the very worst. Whoever the person eventually chosen, however, he must have the confidence and respect of his colleagues and he must be able to secure and maintain the cooperation of the administration. The most successful coordinators in the cooperative study were ranking members of the faculty appointed by the president or dean, who in turn was enthusiastically committed to the project from the beginning.

We may assert with some conviction that planning committees and coordinators made headway, both toward curricular revision and institutional unity (the two processes were in many respects identical), in proportion as they developed some overall strategy. Hence our great preference for diagnostic boards as distinguished from purely coordinating agencies. Valuable as conferences, workshops, study periods at the collaboration center in Chicago, or trips to other institutions virtually always were for the individuals participating, such experiences seldom benefited the rest of the institution proportionately unless they were integral parts of a larger scheme. We have learned that faculty members given such opportunities are most useful to their colleagues afterwards when there is agreement ahead of time on the nature of the work to be done, and when the report has a place in the study activities of the faculty as a whole.

Similarly, and perhaps to an even greater extent, the central planners must take responsibility for the use of any visiting consultant's time if adequate returns on the investment are to be secured. The faculty must be prepared for his visit and have some definite service in mind when the invitation is extended. The consultant himself needs to have the same information in advance and should likewise be furnished with as much relevant factual material as it is possible to assemble for him. The local

coordinator should then arrange for individual and group conferences in view of the service to be rendered, and take responsibility for following up any agreements afterwards. Without careful planning of this sort the consultant may discover himself making a series of speeches to large gatherings on all sorts of topics, not necessarily his specialty, and using more time than he has got in being shown the local sights. In fairness to all parties this sort of thing should not be tolerated.

We have consistently maintained in our treatment of all narratives that teacher education can be adequately handled only by the entire institution acting as one organic group. We have also tried to emphasize the importance of adapting to local conditions. There is a special application of this second principle when it comes to introducing significant program changes. It is useless and a waste of time not to proceed through the existing channels and procedures. It is never wise to try and revise institutional structure before there is widespread understanding of and demand for the contemplated change. The critical importance of faculty readiness, as just discussed, at once becomes apparent. The whole process of reorientation, together with the activities and contacts we suggested for bringing it about, thus obviously must be shared as widely as possible if the proposed or emerging program of teacher education is ever to be implemented.

That institutional complexity is an obstacle of major proportions is a point we need not labor. On large campuses there is no comprehensive organic structure through which proposals may be introduced and administered on an institutionwide basis; there is accordingly very little in the way of integrated program to serve as the nucleus for new developments. Frankly, our experience has contributed little in a positive way toward the amelioration of this basic and knotty problem in university and large-college administration, despite the success of individual committees. It is indeed a question whether any genuine solution can be looked for until university administration has followed the lead of modern social developments and shifted from the atomistic to the organic pattern. Even then, sheer size,

with its restriction on interaction, is bound to offer difficulties that will not be disposed of without effort and statesmanship.

We have definitely learned that existing arrangements cannot simply be bypassed. If the regular academic machinery through which proposals are authorized, developed, approved, and administered is thought to be too cumbersome, there is little to be gained in the long run by setting up a special *ad hoc* organization in which only those staff members participate who are interested in revising the program in teacher education. This may be a hard saying. But our experience indicates that those groups that tried to take short cuts by presenting the entire faculty with finished proposals for which adequate educational preparation had not been made, found that their success was largely on paper and that they were still at the very beginning of their task. There is little point in developing interdepartmental courses, say on human development or the social foundations of education, unless the departmental structure can be reorganized to give the professors in question a chance to function happily. The effort needed to try and buck the system is usually just as great as that necessary to limber up and democratize the organization in the first place. Nor are those committees likely to be any better off that have secured a majority vote without real conviction. We repeat, the whole drive to construct a curriculum of teacher education adequate to our times is a thing of the spirit. There is no substitute for what we have called organizational group consciousness or organic unity.

Program proposals, even among intellectuals on collegiate faculties, are not ordinarily accepted or rejected on their logical merits alone. Professors, like other human beings, have their biases and predilections as well as their ambitions and sometimes rivalries. The most salutary of program changes must be weighed for their effect on the balance of psychological factors that exists on every campus. Staff members cannot be expected to enter heartily into projects that appear to threaten their academic prestige, jeopardize their means of livelihood, or

undermine their pleasure or sense of security in the assignments they have successfully carried in the past. On the other hand, the curricular changes introduced through the cooperative study offered compensating, indeed often enhanced, satisfactions to by far the great majority on the faculties concerned. Most college professors can be trusted to make the transition if the whole institution is moving with them. But our point here is that the leadership should be aware of the human factors and try to use them to constructive purpose. This is clearly not a matter of manipulating persons or maneuvering human relationships. Statesmanship cannot be exercised without great qualities of mind and spirit: unswerving appreciation of the worth of the individual, devotion to the democratic process, and a wise understanding of practical realities in the college world.

Just as special committees find it impossible to get very far without the sympathetic backing of the entire faculty, so an individual college or university cannot afford to ignore other institutions of higher learning in the region or state. From the purely practical standpoint, only the exceptionally endowed private institution can permit itself to disregard its competitive standing among other colleges, or to move too quickly for its normal "public." Under ordinary conditions, however, a college group of moderate prestige can start the ball rolling among themselves. Local circumstances are usually such as to allow an individual college to induce at least some of its neighbors to join in a cooperative venture for bringing about an atmosphere favorable to change, which no one of them could produce independently. A college in such a situation will have to proceed, however, in roughly the same fashion as the special committee interested in change within an institution. It will need to establish contacts through which interaction and mutual education are furthered, it will not be able to move significantly beyond the reach of public opinion, and it will do well to get important institutions and the state department of education in on the project from the very beginning.

The Elements of Teacher Education

So much, then, for the conclusions on method that have been suggested to us by the experience of the cooperative study. Turning to the matter of content, our central or direction-giving finding is that the typical school, functioning as an organism in its particular environment, must occupy the forefront of attention if teacher education is to be truly meaningful. More specifically, we believe that the teacher of tomorrow will need to do more than master a given subject matter and direct the learning of a specific group of young people. He will have to be prepared for work with other teachers in the same building or in the same school system to the end that the children of the community may be given the richest educational experience permitted by local resources. He will also need the ability to work effectively with other community agencies and organizations in devising and carrying out programs that will tend to raise the quality of living in that community. He will very much need to develop the capacity to see things whole—whether it be the growing child, his own system of values, his field of concentration, the curriculum, the school unit, or the social environment of which the school is a part.

We shall begin with four generalizations that have, in our opinion, special implications for the education of teachers who are to perform the functions we have in mind. We believe them to hold true regardless of the particular pattern—and more than one is defensible—an institution may develop for the education of teachers. First, we maintain that students will need to share much more actively than they ordinarily have in the past in planning and appraising their education as they go along. Second, breadth of view and grasp are best furthered by an alternation of direct experience with theoretical discussion and intensive outside reading. While we put great stock in this method for all learning, we consider it quite indispensable for the subjects pertaining to professional education. Third, particular emphasis is called for on understanding the nature of human growth and motivation, and the process of social change. Fourth, group action of the comprehensive type described in

the preceding chapter will become increasingly important in the years immediately ahead. The rest of this section will be given to discussing the first three of these points. In view of our treatment in Chapter VIII, all we need to emphasize here about the fourth is the urgency of getting students actively engaged in the process we have asserted to be essential for the institution as a whole.

A good curriculum cannot realize its full potentiality unless the learner knows where he is going, why he is going there, what he may expect on arrival, how well equipped he is to start with, and what resources he may draw on at every stage. This is to say that the course of study should be supported at all points by a personnel program, the two together being conceived as one educational process. The prospective teacher needs to have the experience of sharing in his own development, as advocated by modern personnel practice, not only for the effect on his own poise and maturity, but also in order to discover at firsthand for his later teaching what intelligent participation of this sort does for the learner. The person who has never done anything more than carry out other people's instructions, record lectures in notebooks, and write the expected answers (as far as he can) on examination papers devised by his instructors, is not very well prepared to assist the pupils assigned to him to tackle their problems with initiative and intelligence. Nor are matters helped much if, as is often the custom, responsibility for extra-curricular activities is given to students while control over all academic matters is retained by the faculty. What we are calling for here is the joint planning by the student and his advisers, of *all* educational activities with a view to making them contribute as much as possible to the student's purposes in life.[3]

Some readers may object that students are not competent or ambitious enough to make this approach feasible. Such has not been the experience of the colleges and universities associated with the Commission. True, frequently nothing does happen the first time an institution decides to operate on this basis, especially if the move is made from giving students no respon-

[3] Compare Troyer and Pace, *Evaluation in Teacher Education.*

sibility to taking them in as full partners at a single stroke. Nobody is very surprised when young people fail at their first attempt to speak in public, play the piano, handle a baseball, or drive an automobile. Yet educators frequently seem to expect students to exercise initiative and intelligent self-direction in curricular matters without any previous experience or guidance whatsoever.

This emphasis on responsible participation by students leads very naturally to our second generalization stressing the interaction of direct and theoretical learning. Firsthand contacts and practical observation have been shown in our narratives to have had significant effects on student motivation and on their ability to organize for themselves, and thus assimilate course content. It is with the latter phase of the subject that we are concerned at this point. We have already commented on the drive toward synthesis and integration that is beginning to permeate much of contemporary life. Modern scholarship, along with most expressions of the culture, has in too many fields lost its way in the arid paths of overspecialization. It may be worth repeating that this situation, including the incipient countertrend to correct it, confronts the learned professions as a whole and not by any means only teacher education. The integration of related branches of knowledge, to some extent indeed new principles of organizing factual information, are being clamored for in many quarters by alert practitioners in the physical and biological sciences as well as by forward-looking social scientists and educationists. We are in need of something like the vertical or "total" pattern in the arrangement of scientific data.

But it will be a weary while before any such synthesizing shift takes place in academic circles, although the predisposition may be more widely prevalent than is often realized. In the meantime the best integrating principle at our disposal in matters of education is the vocational interest of students aroused, guided, and disciplined by direct contact with real problems. This provides a good reason for trying to get undergraduates to decide on their life's work—at least provisionally—as soon as possible after entering college. Equipped with an organizing

interest of this sort, young men and women are in a position to use appropriately selected firsthand experiences as the focus and point of interaction for what they can discover from several at present still independent disciplines. However, because learning by direct observation and participation must, in the nature of the case, lose in perspective what it gains in vividness and wholeness, we insist that it must be combined with thorough class discussion and as much supplementary reading of scientific materials as can be fitted into the undergraduate's schedule.

It is at once clear that this approach to learning takes time. It tends to function best when the student has at his disposal longer periods for each area on his program than can be accommodated in the traditional pattern of two or three hours a week. We should like to see the entire curriculum made up of relatively few major emphases, each handled for the most part on the principles we have been describing. This should however not be understood as substituting wide-ranging and thus superficial breadth for intensive work in some chosen field. Our point is that true depth depends as much nowadays as general grasp on the contributions of several disciplines brought together by concentration on some problem seen in its entirety. The two methods differ when it comes to the scope and complexity of the focusing topic but not in kind. We believe that specialization should develop naturally, indeed inevitably, from within the fused or integrated pattern of courses.

The reader will not be surprised, after this discussion, to hear that we do not find it easy to distinguish between general and strictly professional education, or in any absolute sense between either and concentration on some particular subject matter. There are differences, to be sure, but the lines between them are blurred and not too important. Using these terms as they are commonly understood, however, we should like to see some 80 to 85 percent of the undergraduate's whole time in college given to general education and subject concentration. We have already suggested that the student should be invited from the start to share in directing and appraising his whole college experience. Once the main pattern has been agreed

upon, however, we think that elective courses should be handled warily so that the educational advantages of sequence and balance may not be lost. We advocate requiring of all prospective teachers, early in their program, integrated courses of some kind in the biological sciences, the physical sciences and mathematics, the humanities, and the social studies. We also propose that at least the informal or extracurricular activities arranged for prospective teachers be planned for their contribution to physical and mental health, the individual's personal sense of values, and appreciation of the arts and music.

The 15 to 20 percent of the entire program we have reserved for professional education should begin in the freshman or sophomore year and lead up to the main emphasis, student teaching, not later than the first semester of the final year. It will be recalled that the third generalization with which we opened this section had to do with the special emphasis we feel is needed for prospective teachers on understanding child behavior and social process. Ideally we should like to see such courses come early in the student's career, beginning not later than the second or third semester. Child study is the more natural with which to start. Whether the blocks of time given to these two subjects should be part of the integrated courses we described in the preceding paragraph, or provided in addition, will depend largely on local circumstances. They should obviously grow from the courses in the biological and social sciences, if these are presented on a one-semester basis, and the total amount of time given to them might well be double that allotted to the other blocks included by way of general background to modern living.

We should like to break sharply with tradition by recommending that the professional education of teachers should consist only of these two concentrated areas (that many will classify as general education anyway) and a coordinated sequence as follows: an orienting course on methods and materials, a period of responsible practice teaching on full time away from the campus, and a concluding seminar. We are ready to suggest abolishing as separate and autonomous courses

such subjects as general psychology, principles of secondary or elementary education, organization and administration, or classroom management. It should be clear that what we are rejecting is the usual organization, not the content of such offerings. We advocate doing this at least as far as the preparatory program is concerned; some courses of the above type can be very useful to teachers who have had experience through which to profit from the material. The orienting course following child study and social (or community) understanding we conceive as an introduction to practice teaching. It is best taken care of, in our opinion, through observation and limited participation in the work of a campus school, supplemented as in all the courses we are talking about by class discussion and reading. The final seminar should offer students the opportunity to summarize and appraise their entire college experience in the light of their chosen vocation and their own fitness for it.

The Emerging Responsibility of Collegiate Institutions

We have insisted that responsibility for teacher education rests with the institution as a whole; it cannot be taken care of adequately by a department or school of education alone. This is not to say, of course, that the preparation of teachers is the only responsibility a given college or university should undertake to discharge, nor yet that other curricula—education for similar professions, for instance—are any less comprehensive or institutionwide in scope. We question very seriously whether any field of professional education can be neatly cut up into sections to be handled respectively by liberal arts faculties and technical experts without much reference to each other.

The role of the subject-matter specialist

Under existing conditions this basic approach poses problems of relationships and administrative coordination that are not easy of solution. The situation will never be satisfactorily adjusted until subject-matter specialists and educationists learn to speak the same language and share the same values. Current efforts to bring the two groups together include what is called

the professionalization of subject matter, assigning subject specialists to teach part time in campus schools or to supervise practice teaching, and establishing liaison professorships. These arrangements sometimes work rather well and at others only complicate campus life. We can think of distinct advantages but also very real liabilities in connection with each. On the whole, their best usefulness to date probably lies in the circumstance that they often tend to bring subject specialists and educationists in touch with one another. They may function as important agents in softening up and undermining academic isolationism.

The phrase "professionalization of subject matter" is used in the main to cover two procedures. In certain teachers colleges or other situations in which everybody in the class is a prospective teacher, the professor pauses in the presentation or discussion of his specialty to point out how the same topic might be handled for school children. This approach assumes that the main difference in teaching youngsters of any age or college undergraduates lies in the degree of complexity of course content. The second meaning attached to the phrase covers an attempt to include in the treatment all uses to which the material is likely to be put by the teacher in service. Thus prospective teachers of high school English, for example, may be offered courses that aim to prepare them for teaching composition and literature, coaching debates, and directing school plays. The strength of both procedures lies in their making clear to students the relationship between what they are doing in college and what they will be called on to do later in active service. On the other hand, the basic weakness of such methods from our point of view is that they disregard the needs or problem approach.

The purpose of asking subject-matter people to carry some teaching assignment in campus schools, or to supervise practice teaching, is both to offer the young people in question the most competent service available and to keep the professors in touch with educational realities. In the case of some individuals under favorable conditions, these practices appear to be working

out in the desired direction. This is particularly the case in connection with practice teaching and when the supervision is allowed to become a cooperative enterprise among subject specialists, educationists, and the regular classroom teachers. We are distinctly in favor of the custom developing among sociologists and psychologists (following the lead of biologists and geologists) to accompany their students on field trips and observation visits of various kinds. But the values of direct experience can be very greatly diminished if the element of give and take is shortchanged. Professors who go to a classroom simply to watch their students in action and to appraise their efforts without reference to the rest of the school, to the social backgrounds of the youngsters, or to what their colleagues in the department of education are emphasizing, might in most cases just as well stay at home.

A number of universities and colleges of liberal arts have been experimenting in recent years with dual or liaison professors. Such individuals are commonly expected to perform three functions: teach methods and integrating courses accompanied by intensive counseling of students, assist subject-matter specialists in reorganizing their courses to meet the needs of prospective teachers, and foster public relations between the campus and the schools of the service area. There is evidence to indicate that many dual professors are contributing materially to the vitalizing interaction of which we have made so much. The danger we see in this arrangement is that the dual professor may become a substitute rather than a facilitating agent for those firsthand contacts which we covet for the bulk of the faculty, subject-matter specialists and educationists alike. The dual professor has, to our way of thinking, outlived his usefulness as soon as he becomes an end in himself.

We return then to our original statement that the only satisfactory way out lies in the direction of organic unity. Everybody in any way concerned with teacher education must learn to think and speak and act from the same basis of experience and with the same guiding values in mind. For this reason we reiterate the vital necessity of seeing that curricular revision,

and all study procedures undertaken for it, are carried out by subject specialists and educationists together, working and planning continuously side by side and as equals.

The full scope of teacher education

It follows from the comprehensive or total approach we have been discussing throughout this book that the legitimate concern of teacher education covers everything about the individual student from the day he decides to try for the profession, through all phases of his pre-service development, and on into active work until retirement. This means in the first place that the college cannot afford to neglect any aspect of each undergraduate's personality. Provision must be made for his optimum growth as a physical, social, mental—in short, as a *human* being. The pattern will and obviously should be different from student to student, but the education must in each case include all of the undergraduate's being. It is the responsibility primarily of the personnel office to keep this organic approach in the forefront of attention. It should likewise see that the conditions of individual and group living on the campus are such as to stimulate, foster, and enrich the development described. The same office is charged with offering students the chance to grow in poise and capacity for self-direction through the arrangements for counseling and evaluation. But the work of the personnel office is inseparable from that of the rest of the college; it is best discharged in our opinion when the main job of counseling is carried by the faculty at large.

The comprehensive view of teacher education further means that all aspects of pre-service preparation—general and professional education along with subject concentration—are equally important. Despite great variation in the time allotment we consider essential for each, they are nonetheless all indispensable. Since the elements that go to make up this phase of a teacher's development, as we see things, were summarized in the preceding main section of this chapter, we need not repeat them here. Our viewpoint means, in the third place, that the college's responsibility for teacher education does not end with

graduation. We incline to the view that in-service education will gain in importance during the years immediately ahead. Social pressures have been forcing schools and colleges into closer contact steadily since the depression years, and we see no prospect of a reversal in the trend despite the current dislocation of all aspects of civilian life.

From everything we have said it should be clear that in-service education must center on living problems that teachers themselves acknowledge. A great deal of this service, perhaps most of it once transportation returns to prewar conditions, should be rendered on the spot, in the environment where the problems arise. The college's concern with in-service education must, however, obviously cover more than the individual teacher's expressed difficulties. Institutions of higher learning should be out in the forefront, challenging as well as aiding, mediating the experience of pioneer schools so that others may learn to follow similar lines. This means that college educators need to have a realistic but for all that forward-looking vision of the rightful function of schools fully adequate to our times.

We have said that the typical school in its particular setting should serve as the guiding principle or basic criterion in the development of plans for the education of teachers. By this we mean not only the school as it is but as it can and ought to be if alive to its opportunities. We see the American elementary and high school and the American college in a wider sphere of influence, serving as the rallying point for the mobilization of local resources toward the general improvement of living. We are not saying that the educational world should take on the work of other agencies or the coordinating functions of local government. Ability to see things whole entails seeing oneself and one's institution in proper perspective within the total social environment. We are however advocating that the educational world put its accumulated resources fully to work and take the initiative about bringing them to bear on problems of human living. We should like to count the country's colleges and universities among the most efficient and devoted of the servants of the people.

THE AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION

GEORGE F. ZOOK, *President*

The American Council on Education is a *council* of national educational associations; organizations having related interests; approved universities, colleges, and technological schools; state departments of education; city school systems; selected private secondary schools; and selected educational departments of business and industrial companies. It is a center of cooperation and coordination whose influence has been apparent in the shaping of American educational policies as well as in the formulation of American educational practices during the past twenty-six years. Many leaders in American education and public life serve on the commissions and committees through which the Council operates.

Established by the Council in 1938, the Commission on Teacher Education consists of the persons whose names appear on a front page of this publication. It operates through a staff under the supervision and control of a director responsible to the Commission.