DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 051 082 SP 004 856

AUTHOR	Greenleaf, Warren T.; Griffin, Gary A.
TITLE	Schools for the 70's and Beyond: A Call to Action.
INSTITUTION	National Education Association, Washington, D.C. Center for the Study of Instruction.
PUB DATE	71
NOTE	149p.
AVAILABLE FROM	NEA Publication-Sales Section, 1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036 (Stock No. 381-11962; $2.25 paper); (Stock No. 381-11964; $4.00 cloth. Quantity discounts)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*Classroom Environment, *Curriculum Development, Educational Finance, *Educational Policy, *Educational Principles, Evaluation, Student Attitudes, *Teacher Attitudes, Teacher Responsibility

ABSTRACT

This is a comprehensive report to the teaching profession as one basis for a series of town meetings to improve America's schools. Beginning with a survey of the American scene in the 1960's, it considers the role played by the schools in producing a society in which technology has outdistanced humanity. The need to make schools humane institutions was the major goal recommended by NEA's Center for the Study of Instruction in 1969, and barriers to this goal are considered--the system, the instructional program, the teachers, the students, and school finance. The humanistic school calls for greater community involvement and political decentralization in spite of the problems involved. The curriculum should be reformed to develop the full range of human capacities, with evaluation which is designed to improve instruction rather than compare children. School organization should free the children and teacher to focus on learning, not the clock. Differentiated staffing should free teachers from administrative and housekeeping tasks and enable them to be more fully professional. Teacher education also needs to be reformed. The problems facing students includes cultural and ethnic differences, the wide variations between the states in educational expenditure, and the individual differences in learning styles. The report calls for a nationwide dialogue at all levels of the profession to prepare a set of principles and plans for action. (MBM)

SCHOOLS FOR THE 70's AND BEYOND: A CALL TO ACTION

A Staff Report

SCHOOLS FOR THE 70'S

MAIN REPORT

Published by the National Education Association
Center for the Study of Instruction (CSI)

Written primarily by
Warren T. Greenleaf and
Gary A. Griffin.

Library of Congress Catalog Card No. 70-152558

Single copy: paper, $2.25 (Stock No. 381-11962); cloth, $4.00 (Stock No. 381-11964). Quantity discounts: 2-9 copies, 10 percent; 10 or more copies, 20 percent. All orders must be prepaid except for those on your official purchase order forms. Shipping and handling charges will be added to billed purchase orders. Make checks payable to the National Education Association. Order from the NEA Publications-Sales Section, 1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20036.

CONTENTS

FOREWORD

SCHOOLS FOR THE 70's is more than just a series of books. It is a beginning, not an end. It is a call to action.

This volume is a comprehensive staff report addressed to the United Teaching Profession as the basis for a series of town meetings to improve America's schools. As president of the National Education Association, my challenge to each of our 9,000 locals is to use their power to make things happen. In just five years we will be celebrating our bicentennial as a nation. Well before that time, I expect an official policy document to grow out of local experimentation and implementation, and I challenge you to make every school in this country a showplace of excellence by 1976.

Beginning with the gathering of 43 educators in Philadelphia in 1857, the organized profession has always given a high priority to making schools better. The problems our nation has faced in the past decades have led to what is often called a crisis in the classroom. More than ever the public is looking to the schools for solutions. While we are well aware that education is not a panacea for society's problems, we cannot fail to take our proper share of the responsibility to alleviate the crisis through a revitalized commitment to rejuvenating American education. The job is not ours alone, though we must take the lead. Our role is central, and we must start right now through our town meetings to involve the students and the parents in education. If we will work together, we can make schools truly humane, and scholastically excellent as well. This is the theme of the staff report entitled *Schools for the 70's and Beyond: A Call to Action*. You will note that no firm recommendations are made but that we suggest many options for action to be tested before we write our bicentennial report. You will be the real authors of that report.

This volume identifies problems in several areas—the system, the instructional program, the teachers, the students, and school finance. The central theme is that we in the organized profession need to change the system, and the local association is the place to begin this change. The ones to take the initiative are the teachers of America. We will no longer be the victims of change; we will be the agents of change. And the time to get started is now.

In addition to this volume, there also are four Preliminary and four Auxiliary publications which can be helpful in initiating our dialogue and action programs. Also, there are accompanying multimedia materials to help us in our task. The officers and staff of the National Education Association stand ready to help each and every one of you in your local associations to get the job done.

Helen Bain
President
National Education Association
February 1971

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This staff report, intended to serve as background material for a series of town meetings across the country, was made possible by the cooperation of many people. The officers of the National Education Association underlined their commitment to instructional improvement by providing staff and funds for the program. The executive secretary and his cabinet, particularly Lawrence G. Derthick, assistant executive secretary for professional development and instructional services, offered encouragement and continuous assistance. The CSI staff worked long and hard in conducting the dialogues with teachers, students, and representatives of the public. Particular credit should go to Gary Griffin who took main responsibility for the final manuscript, along with Warren T. Greenleaf, who joined the staff temporarily to take the lead in the writing. Lois Karasik, as coordinator of the entire SCHOOLS FOR THE 70's series, helped us put it all together. By her own example, she made the rest of us unaware of the limitations of human energy.

As continuing consultants to CSI, the staff had invaluable advice and support from Lois Edinger, Sidney Marland, John Fischer, Dorothy Meyer, Elbie Gann, and Steele Gow. John I. Goodlad and Ralph Tyler commented on the drafts with sensitive judgment and wisdom. The writers of the Auxiliary and Preliminary volumes, which also serve as bases for the nationwide dialogue, were helpful in many ways in addition to the documents they produced: Arlene Payne, Joseph Schwab, Louise Tyler, William G. Carr, William Pharis, Mario D. Fantini, Arthur W. Foshay, Lloyd Robison, and John Walden.

Special appreciation must go to our publisher, Sidney Dorros, director of the NEA Publications Division, who not only led us through the SCHOOLS FOR THE 60's program but again mobilized

his staff to bring the new 70's series to the teachers of America for use in their own communities. His unflagging patience when deadlines were not always promptly met, his professional competence, and his friendship and encouragement have been invaluable. Also, Sherry Loftus of the NEA Publications Division and Eunice von Ende gave painstaking attention to the preparation of the final manuscript. Jean Flanigan of the NEA Research Division contributed thoughtfully to the "School Finance" section of the report. Most important of all are the teachers, other educators, students, and all those who have talked and worked with us and who are continuing to promote dialogue and action in the field.

Ole Sand
Director
Center for the Study of Instruction
National Education Association
February 1971

SECTION I

The Setting

A Note of Urgency

It was a turbulent decade for the United States, one during which the new wine turned to gall. Not everyone felt a surge of spring when the nation's oldest President gave way to its youngest, nor experienced sudden winter as his shattered head stained his wife's lap with the lees of grace and wit and style. Not everyone shared Martin Luther King's vision from the summit of his personal mountain, nor mourned his second-story passing on the balcony of a Memphis motel. Not everyone applauded Robert Francis Kennedy's electoral victory in California, nor sorrowed at his shabby defeat beneath the ladles and kettles of a Los Angeles kitchen. These were all men of the left, and it would be empty rhetoric and romantic politics to argue that every American died a little when these Americans died entire.

Yet the bell that tolled for them tolled, in a way, for all of us: for Democrats and Republicans, for radicals and reactionaries, for Kiwanis in Wednesday-noon congress assembled, and for manufacturers' reps swirling a Playboy Club scotch, one eye on a plane schedule and the other on a Bunny. This was the decade when the United States of America—once the exuberant, feisty, bicep-flexing adolescent among nations—fingered its receding hairline, probed its more than adequate stomach, and anxiously passed from youth into middle age.

We had arrived. In the course of human events, one people had found it necessary to dissolve the bands that had connected them with another, and to assume among the powers of the earth that separate and equal station to which the laws of nature and of nature's God entitled them. Our revolution was behind us; we had cleared the timber, salted the venison, chased off the British, and corralled the Cheyenne. George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln, and Teddy Roosevelt speaking from his bully pulpit had furnished our teens; it was time now to draw back from drama and start paneling the rec room. Our fathers had pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor; thank heaven the necessity for such extravagant promises had passed

and we could now turn to the more predictable providence of Green Stamps. The spires of Camelot had looked attractive there for a while, seducing at least some of us with misty recollections of a time when problems ended with the dragon's death and the maiden's rescue and the tale told to an admiring sovereign—but this was the twentieth century, not the sixth; the round tables were plexiglass, not oak; and a responsible man ought to forget about questing and put up the storm windows. The decade that opened with one President's proclamation that the torch had passed to a new generation closed with another President's asking us to lower our voices—and whatever the 1969 Inaugural Address lacked in eloquence, it made up for in the accurate perception of a common mood.

We were tired. A dozen great enterprises launched in Sunday-morning optimism had foundered on Monday-afternoon routine. We had mounted an Alliance for Progress, a War on Poverty, a New Frontier, a Great Society, a crusade for Equal Opportunity—and then tried to explain the Bay of Pigs, Watts, Detroit, and the brain damage of undernourished children in one part of the country while angry men in another poured milk into the dirt and plowed under market-ready hogs to protest low prices. So many high hopes, so many brave plans had come to low ends that it seemed wise, for at least a while, to turn away from visionary government and seek sober competence instead. It was as much an emotional fatigue as an intellectual set which the country had come to—a sense of exhaustion captured well in about 30 seconds on television: Lyndon Johnson, who had gathered up the slack reins of government in a moment of tragedy and made them his own a year later in the most stunning electoral victory any President had ever enjoyed, surrendered them again after five years that had brought him from dazzling, aggressive, often arrogant but always confident leadership, to the bitterness, petulance, and overnight age of a rejected grandfather.

It was interesting, in retrospect, to note how much of the social history of the decade could be suggested by initials alone: VC, DMZ, ABM, LSD, YIP, SST, OEO, SNCC, CORE, IUD, IBM, PPBS. In this admittedly ephemeral respect, the 1960's resembled the 1930's, when the Roosevelt Administration set about putting the nation back together again with a host of "alphabet agencies." But this decade resembled that in another, more significant respect. The 1940's and 1950's had been outward-looking decades, years when the nation's eyes were trained beyond the seas at the hot

and cold conflicts of international relations. The greatest single problem of our time, Vietnam, was rooted in foreign policy, too; but it was such a large problem mainly because of changes at home—changes in attitude, changes in the age distribution of our population, changes in the political and social weather. As in the 1930's, so in the 1960's we worried and wondered about other nations—and there were more of them than ever before—but the major task as we approach our 200th anniversary is not to help straighten out the world, but to put our own house in order. These are some of the items that need urgent attention:

- *Vietnam:* By December 31, 1969, the war in Vietnam had cost more than 40,000 American lives and was consuming 500 million American dollars weekly. The spiritual expenditures—a bitterly divided citizenry increasingly skeptical of its elected leaders no matter what their party, a tarnished reputation among the family of nations, and a profound questioning of a national purpose that had once seemed as obvious and solid as Gibraltar—exceeded the economic. The problem, on January 1, 1970, was not only to get out of Vietnam, but to fashion a new foreign policy that recognized both our obligations as a major power and our limitations as a people who did not want their sons constantly being asked to win other peoples' battles. The possibility of nuclear warfare took the dilemma beyond even foreign policy. As John Gardner put it, "We are in trouble as a species." Robert Heilbroner added that we must not only be concerned with survival "as a nation-state, but as a decent nation-state."
- *Population:* A world that required 1,500 years—from Christ to Columbus—to add 200 million to its population promised, at the beginning of the 1970's, to add another 200 million in only seven years. In 1960, birth control was a political hot potato in the United States, partially because of the opposition of the Roman Catholic Church; by 1970, the Church itself was sharply divided, birth control seemed an imperative for human survival, people talked about a "zero growth rate"—no couple bearing more than two children—and a U.S. senator introduced tax legislation that would penalize couples with more than three children.
- *Environment:* During the 1960's, an American river became so polluted that it actually caught fire. A U.S. commissioner of education, citing the 142 million tons of pollutants discharged into our air each year, the 8 million junked automobiles, the 26

billion discarded bottles and 48 billion cans, and the 2,100 communities dumping billions of gallons of raw sewage into our waterways, advocated curriculums on ecology which he characterized as "education for survival."[1]

- *The Cities:* During the decade, the 212 metropolitan areas selected by the Bureau of the Census for analysis indicated central-city growth in population from 57.8 million to about 58.0 million—a modest rate of increase that should not have strained the resources of our cities. A closer analysis pointed up the problem: middle-income (mostly white) residents left the cities at the rate of nearly 200,000 per year, their places taken by approximately 2 million low-income or even destitute whites, blacks, and Spanish-surname Americans who frequently brought neither skills nor taxable income to the cities, but made disproportionate demands on municipal services. Commuters depended on the cities to build parking lots, guard their cars, regulate traffic, clean up their litter, and design expressways through the center of town to speed their journey from suburbia —but fought city-use taxes that would have defrayed the cost of these services. And just when the Supreme Court's "one-man–one-vote" ruling promised to deliver the cities from the apathy of rural-dominated state legislatures, the population balance shifted to the suburbs. The Urban Coalition adopted as its slogan, "Give a damn." But more and more exurbanites didn't.
- *Minorities:* The happy, docile darky—consumer of watermelon. dancer, boxer, Pullman porter, entertainer to the white folks—became a proud, aggressive American. Journalists of the decade wrote "Negro," pondered the word, backed up their typewriters, and self-consciously substituted "black." Mexican-Americans became chicanos, repudiated Tío Tomas (the southwestern version of Uncle Tom), and argued for "Brown Power." White Americans learned that, statistically speaking, a young Navaho had a better chance of committing suicide than he had of obtaining a master's degree. Yet a crusade for equal opportunity that began with Lyndon Johnson's characteristic optimism seemed, by the end of the decade, to be losing steam as we realized how much time and money justice would require; Americans of all colors have been brought up to believe that any problem can be solved in a hurry.
- *Poverty:* Closely tied to the minority problem but yet distin-

guishable from it was the fact that 22 percent of Americans had incomes below the amount required to maintain a family in "reasonable comfort." The nation mounted programs with names such as Head Start and Upward Bound and VISTA—a domestic version of the Peace Corps. Cynics pasted "I fight poverty—I work" bumper stickers on their cars. Yet the obstinacy of the problem had done something to modify our conviction that the poor are that way because they won't work: President Nixon submitted to Congress the first major reform of welfare laws in a generation, most conspicuously a provision that allowed marginal-income workers the right to retain a percentage of their welfare payments as they made the transition to adequate earned income.

- *Generation Gap:* Many Americans pooh-poohed the "gap" as simply the 1960's manifestation of a maturing process that had always gone on: the realization that Mom and Dad didn't know everything, and the suspicion that some things they *did* know weren't really so. But many others became convinced that there was something genuinely new here—a much more profound questioning of traditional values of marriage, sex, patriotism, career, authority, and the "good life" in general than the young of other generations had ever engaged in. The "gap," moreover, opened up in other nations: government and university officials had violent clashes with youth in Japan, Mexico, France, and Germany. Adults differed on the significance of the phenomenon and its cure, some demanding less permissiveness by parents and the schools, others arguing that the young deserved a larger voice in decisions that affected them. Four months after the decade ended, the student who first advised "Don't trust anyone over thirty" turned thirty himself; his surrender to the melancholy processes of time still left us with 45 percent of our population below the age of 25—and they were still asking their disturbing questions.

These, then, are some of the components of the domestic turmoil that face America as it enters the 1970's—with a much less confident, less exuberant outlook than it brought to the 1960's.

ARE SCHOOLS TO BLAME?

Predictably, the schools came in for a large share of the blame for the decade's ills, and were assigned a major share of the

responsibility for curing them. However, we learned from the heady days of the 60's that schools could not solve all of America's problems—NOW. As John Goodlad has said:

> Only some human ailments can be taken care of by education right now. One of the mistakes of the Johnson Administration with its great concern for education was its failure to differentiate between education and social engineering. Schooling will provide better employment in the long run. Education may, indeed, eradicate the slums. And certainly education is the long-term answer to prejudice and injustice. But if you want to really eliminate unemployment, you create jobs. If you want to eliminate the slums, you clear up the slums, but you don't hold education responsible for getting it done. This is the mistake the Johnson Administration made. When President Johnson said, "if you look deeply enough into any problem, education is at its heart," he was partly right, and he was partly wrong. One of the unfortunate consequences is that we have become disillusioned about education without really looking at its real capabilities. Because education is a long-term answer to mankind's problems and not a short-term one, we must very carefully, at all levels of educational decision making, differentiate between what education can do in the long run and what human engineering can do in the short run.[2]

For example, though the peace movement cut across boundaries of age, color, and social station, its earliest and most conspicuous members were college students—with their high school brothers and sisters close behind. To some adults, this meant that the schools had failed to instill in the younger generation the basic American virtues of patriotism and respect for governmental decisions; to others it meant that, as Norman Cousins wrote, the young are not so weighed down by "the profusion of encumbrances that appear to keep their elders from standing erect and thinking straight."[3]

The USOE's report, *Equality of Educational Opportunity*—also called the Coleman Report after one of its principal authors—was one of the most comprehensive analyses ever developed of American schools and their clients. It indicated that minority children entered first grade at a discernibly lower level of scholastic readiness than their white, middle-class peers, and they receded each year thereafter, so that by the eighth grade they were even further behind than they had been in the first. Some minority parents blamed this on teacher incompetence, and others on the white education establishment's indifference to black and

brown children and its ingrained racism. In any case, parents began demanding performance in place of explanation, asking for relevant curriculum and community control, and showing at decade's end a growing disenchantment with integration as a means to better education. Poverty, unemployment, restrictive hiring practices, inferior housing and medical care, urban decay—all these were reinforced, according to the critics, by social attitudes learned in school by majority and minority children alike.

The schools were charged with changing these attitudes—and on a broader scale, with responding to the needs of society in solving its problems—and that meant that the schools themselves had to change. But in precisely what ways? And how was change to be brought about?

The Traditional Role of Education

Indeed, it became fashionable during the 1960's to damn the schools, without inquiring as to whether society is expecting them to perform a new function than had earlier been assigned to them. Since 1900, Ralph W. Tyler points out, our economy has shifted from one in which 5 percent of the population was needed in professional or highly skilled occupations and 60 percent in unskilled work to the reverse; today, 60 percent of the work force earns its living in professional and skilled occupations, and the economy can absorb only 5 percent of the work force in unskilled jobs.[4]

At the turn of the century, therefore, the schools were not expected to develop every youngster's abilities to the utmost. Had they done so, they would have produced more educated persons than society could assimilate; they would have created a large corps of well-trained people for whom no appropriate work could be found. Germany experienced this after World War I; its many thousands of unemployed, disgruntled university graduates formed a revolution-prone force that helped bring down the Weimar Republic. Goebbels was not the only enthusiastic recruit that Hitler found among the ranks of idle Ph.D.'s.

America in the early 1900's needed youth, strength, energy, and adaptability. It did not, however, need many trained minds. The schools were to act as sorting-out agencies: to select a few outstanding youngsters for higher education, and to encourage the others to leave school and enter the work force as early as possible. This function was never stated in so many words, of course, and none but a few cynics—probably economists, the practitioners of

what was early dubbed "the dismal science"—would have accepted such a formulation of American educational purpose. But in a slowly changing, early industrial society, it did not require much perception on the part of parents or teachers to see that the future for most youngsters lay in the fields and factories, and that there was little point in prolonging one's formal education when the real training for a livelihood could best be found beyond the school.

Today, by contrast, economic survival depends heavily on formal education. Just as in the early twentieth century, much if not most job training—whether for machine operators or corporate vice-presidents—is received on the job. The level of educational preparation required for getting a job in the first place, however, has risen sharply—most sharply and most quickly in the years since World War II. Much of this rise is attributable to (a) the increased number of college graduates as millions of American young men went to school under the GI Bill, and (b) the accelerated American technical advance with a massive injection of human skill just at the point when our postwar economy—ministering to the needs of war-battered Europe and Asia, as well as to our own—could put those skills to work. It is worth remembering, however, that the GI Bill was more a reward for military services than part of a comprehensive plan for social progress.

The affluent society, with its two-car families, its proliferating suburbs, and its circular need to encourage more and more consumption so that more and more people could earn more and more money to consume more and more, was a happening, not an intention. If U.S. presidents and congressmen, governors and mayors have been developing ulcers ever since, because they did not foresee the banes as well as the benefits of the new economy, it is not particularly surprising that educators should have been somewhat slow in perceiving their own altered responsibilities.

Despite its obvious failures, it is foolish to deny American education's success in the task assigned it by society. Prior to the last 15 years, the years of radical social change, the schools, colleges, and universities kept pace with the nation, supplying human talent as needed and powering the most abundant society known to man. The nation is now engaged in putting that abundance within reach of American citizens to whom it was previously denied, and the schools—like most other agencies of society—are finding it difficult to fulfill their new role as quickly as justice warrants.

The Fruits of Success

For all the criticism properly directed at public education, it is worth considering the thesis that school *excellence* narrowly defined, not school *failure* narrowly defined, has given us most of the problems that divide our nation in 1970 and shake the old American confidence that we can lick anybody or anything that opposes us:

- It was not illiterate, backward men who spiked our residential skylines with steel forests of television antennas, spoiled our rivers with the defecations of a hundred "growth" industries, fouled our air with the sooty contrails of a thousand jet planes taking off daily, or choked our cities with automobiles that cost as much to park as to buy. That work was accomplished by men whose schooling enabled them to develop transistors, no-deposit–no-return bottles, pressurized cabins, and a 36-months-to-pay economy.
- It was not ignorant men who designed a rifle bullet that could spin end over end to increase its flesh-tearing capacity, fashioned temperature-controlled laboratories where plague could be safely cultivated in test tubes, or coined the term "aerial interdiction" to replace the old-fashioned "bombing," shielding themselves and their fellow citizens from the ugly truth that napalm works by setting people on fire. That work was done by men whose schooling in the far regions of physics, chemistry, biology (one of the "life sciences"), and semantics enabled them to develop a military technology and a war ethic the grasp of which far exceeds the reach of our political morality.
- It was not back-country bumpkins who juggled school boundaries in the South to keep black children separate from white, perpetuated inequitable allocations of educational resources to predominantly minority schools in the North, devised "massive resistance," contrived aptitude tests for union apprenticeships that minority applicants invariably failed, or wrote history books that detected advantages in being a slave. That was accomplished by men sufficiently well educated to cite precedents from 200 years of American law, manipulate city ordinances, take advantage of the assumptions underlying the concept of IQ, and contrast the perils of independence with the comforts of security.

All these are the achievements of educated men, graduates of our best schools; the very failure of American education may be

that it has been such a thumping success, at the expense of virtues that have nothing to do with final examinations. This is not to suggest that mathematics, history, or literature must be downgraded in favor of Being a Nice Guy 101; however, much in our present concept of schooling suggests that we have equated sheer competence in manipulating information with education—and now we reap the frightening harvest sown by a million A students, each pursuing his own specialty without reference to any unifying concept of a common humanity.

As the Reverend Edward Thring, headmaster of Uppingham School in England, wrote during the last half of the nineteenth century:

> "Supposing the due proportion between two great principles is lost—intellect versus character, for example. And the intellect is fed at the expense of the body and feeling, and the nation becomes all head, like a dwarf, and its leaders do incalculable mischief by having their humanity thus stunted and distorted with much power and little sympathy to make that power kindly." [5]

At least some Americans think that we need no longer suppose what would happen if the "due proportion" between man's intellect and his other qualities—emotional, social, aesthetic, spiritual, and physical—were lost. It has been lost, and not only by our leaders, but by so many of us who choose those leaders—not only in our common, national life, but in our personal lives. Our power has distracted us from our purpose.

That purpose is man, and the central problem facing American society appears to be man's inhumanity to others—and to himself. We have allowed the clear connections that once tied means to ends to become unraveled. Our technology, our productivity, our military strength have outdistanced the political, economic, and social philosophies that once regulated these inherently good things and made them servants of man. Now they threaten to become our masters, Frankenstein creations which are already going out of control but must be made to go still faster. By definition, faster is better than slower—isn't it? Bigger, higher, easier, and, above all, *more;* the American story may end neither with a bang nor a whimper, but with a plus sign.

"The situation I have described," wrote Charles Frankel, in a discussion of the matters with which this section has been largely concerned, is, "a situation in which we know all about how to do

a thousand and one things, but we haven't quite yet decided what things are worth doing. What is our machinery for?" [6]

We all know, of course, what it's for. Machinery is to serve man. And a liberal education, goes the old formula, does not teach a man how to make a living, but how to live. We all accepted this and a dozen other right-sounding maxims until the relentless pressure for making a living drove such curious academic souvenirs from our heads. The point, we soon discovered, was to keep at it, not to reason why. The leisurely contemplation of man's highest aims was important, we all agreed—but do it on your lunch hour, Jack, the client needs these proofs by 11:30. So most of us defer life for one more day, one more week, one more year. . . .

But now, perhaps for the first time in human history, a society has built the machinery to place enough—enough food, enough clothing, enough shelter—within the reach of all its citizens, to put making a living in second place and living in first.

THE NEW FOCUS OF CHANGE

Humaneness in Education

In December 1969, the NEA's Center for the Study of Instruction gathered about sixty educators from a variety of backgrounds—from classrooms and central administrations, from universities and educational consulting firms, from big cities and boondocks—to discuss "Schools for the 70's and Beyond." As a stimulus for the discussion, CSI had previously sent each participant a background paper setting forth possible issues to be considered: educational change, the proper environment for schooling, the changing role of the teacher, and so on. Considering the variety of issues possible (in addition to those proposed by CSI), it was little short of astonishing that within four hours after the SCHOOLS FOR THE 70's Seminar began, each of the six discussion groups concluded independently that the major goal for educational reform in the coming decade was that of *making the schools humane institutions*—the same conclusion resulting from a three-year study conducted by Charles E. Silberman and financed by the Carnegie Corporation.[7]

Such a goal is subject to gross misinterpretation—seeming to gloss over the hard core of learning that must underlie any genuine form of education in favor of a kind of institutional air

conditioning that would waft sweetness and sympathy through the school classrooms, corridors, and "learning resource centers." Two and two are four, and no amount of "humaneness" will absolve a school which fails to convey this fundamental fact to its students, or to introduce them to the reasoning that branches out from arithmetic to the most lofty reaches of mathematical logic.

The Seminar participants found themselves arguing that humaneness—the development of each student as an individual—is not just a desirable option added to the basic process of education—not merely a pleasant "extra" to have, such as a swimming pool, or an aquarium in every classroom—but is somehow tied in with the very essence of education itself. One view of the failure of the schools due to the lack of recognition of this intimate relationship is presented by Arthur W. Foshay:

> The 19th Century American school sought to make people literate so that they could enter more fully into the duties of citizenship. But man is more than a literate animal, and more than a social creature. The reforms of the Twenties sought to make the schools more even-handed. Fairness is a virtue, but it is not to be equated with making people more fully human. The progressive reforms of the Thirties sought to make people more fully responsive to society's needs and nature—but again, man is more than a social animal. The curriculum-reform movements of the past ten or fifteen years are not centered on the human condition, but rather on the needs of the system on the one hand (I refer here to the proposals for re-organizing the schools) and on the requirements of the disciplines on the other.[8]

It is evident that Foshay feels an immediate change in the focus of the schools is necessary.

> That the school as we know it is in a state of profound change, even collapse, can scarcely be doubted by any thoughtful observer. I shall argue here that it has reached the present state of profound transition because it has consistently failed to confront its own central proposition—that is, that *the primary function of education is to make people more fully human.*[9]

In sum, Foshay argues that the principal reforms and innovations of the 1960's—team teaching, flexible scheduling, new math and new physics, and so on—are "value-neutral"; they are not so much concerned with the fundamental need for constant reexamination of society's assumptions about *what* should be taught and *why*, as with teaching a standardized curriculum more *effectively* and more *efficiently*. The question has been, "How can we teach

plane geometry better and faster?" rather than, "Should we teach plane geometry at all?"

In 1963 the NEA made a massive effort to improve the quality of schooling through its SCHOOLS FOR THE 60's program. Twelve decision areas were discussed and thirty-three recommendations made. The intent of that program was to reform the schools by helping to cause a thoughtful dialogue by the profession and the public. It was then visualized that the quality of schooling should be vastly improved through an updating of the institution as it existed at that time. The intent of this program differs from that of the 60's in some important respects which should be revealed to the reader in Sections II and III of this volume. Most important is the idea expressed here—one that is growing in acceptance by the public and the profession—that the institution known as the school too often serves inappropriate ends.

A few people confront these issues in every age, of course, and the century-long dialogue (frequently a monologue) about what should be taught can become tedious . . . partially because we keep entering the same doors we just came out of. But the widespread failure of the schools to confront this question—to consider the central proposition that education must serve individual human beings before attempting to serve the state by "developing its human resources"—has placed them in danger of losing their value, to the state and to the individual.

> We have avoided the problem of humaneness and the human qualities until there are some groups of people who will no longer listen to our proposals, for they do not hear what they need from us. Alternatives to formal schooling, such as the Job Corps and the street academies, are growing up all around us. Teachers, finding that their humaneness is not enhanced by their participation in school, are becoming both cynical and militant. In that crucible of education, the Black slum, educational plans are being developed which, despite their flaws, have the human qualities of students as their main meaning. And these are being developed in spite of the established schools, not because of them. . . .
>
> Perhaps, if we are unwilling to face the meaning of our own humaneness, the schools ought to collapse, to be replaced by some institution that will recognize the people in it.[10]

This may seem a drastic, overdrawn indictment—but it is the thesis of this book that the mission of the American school has changed. It was designed to help white, middle-class children

become economically self-sufficient through the performance of tasks that society needed done. In the last half of the 1960's, the schools began emphasizing—in a faltering way, no doubt, but they began—the same economic self-sufficiency for nonwhite children.

While not losing sight of this valid purpose, the schools must now go beyond their previous role of preparing children for social functions, whether these functions are traditional or in line with our changing society, to preparing children to become totally realized *individuals*—humane, self-renewing, self-directed individuals—who will not only survive in society, but will take a conscious role in shaping it for the better, as George Counts asked us to do years ago in *Dare the School Build a New Social Order?* [11]

One might ask at this point, What does a school dedicated to humane ends promote? The temptation is to not define such a school because there is a great deal to be said for the process by which an individual or a faculty can arrive at its own definitions. Nevertheless, some summing up of what has been said and what will follow this section may be in order—if only to provide a point of departure. *A school that draws its energy from humanistic values is one that celebrates personal differences and, also, emphasizes human commonalities; helps the student to understand his antecedents, to grow from them, and finally, to not be restricted by them; encourages superior scholarship which allows the inquirer to contribute to his society and to strengthen his own personality; provides the resources for the individual to examine his own life so that he can enlarge his maturity and help to cause growth in others.*

Barriers to a Humane School

This is a new agenda for American education, one based on a new concept of education's purposes and procedures. We have termed those purposes and procedures "humanizing education"—and because a relatively new and evolving concept can often be best grasped by examining its opposite, this book is organized around the problems of education that prevent the schools from being humane institutions. Each discussion of a problem is followed by a description of various attempted solutions—options for action which, judging from the experience of the 1960's, seem worth trying.

Education in every age has had problems—large or small monkey wrenches in the machinery that prevent schools from functioning as efficiently as they might. However, some people now feel these

go beyond the normal category of "problems." There are those who claim that the school is genuinely sick and suggest that there is a brace of symptoms to support such an indictment. Probably, it is more correct to say that the school is rapidly becoming a social institution which is inappropriate for too many youngsters in this age. Those who are contending that major surgery and therapy are the answers are implying that the school can and should be restored to its old healthy self. That is not the path to educational excellence. The schools must be reconstructed to work *differently*—using different assumptions and different techniques for different purposes.

Here are the components which have contributed to that educational inappropriateness. The problems necessarily overlap. One cannot talk about students' attitudes toward the school without considering the educational program and the teachers on which those attitudes are based. Though the following categories do not represent the neatest classification of school problems that might be devised, they do at least offer a method of attack:

- *The System:* Local control of education, with appropriate supervision by the states, is a hallowed American tenet. Yet the increasing urbanization of the nation, the increasing size of urban school systems, and the centralization of educational decision making in single school boards and administrations have conspired to make local control largely a fiction. The dissatisfaction of inner-city parents with school performance and the more frequent failures of school bond issues point to the necessity of loosening up an obsolescent, rigid system of educational governance.
- *The Instructional Program:* Curriculum—the answer to the ancient question, What is to be taught? Also, *how* is it to be taught? How are schools to be organized? How is student performance to be measured, and for what purposes?
- *The Teachers:* Teachers during the 1960's abandoned their former docility and seemed at times to compete with students in their militance. Bread-and-butter issues such as salary received most public attention during strikes and work stoppages, but most teachers' demands went beyond money to include the teaching environment itself—to bring about reform of the school as an institution. It seems self-evident that teachers cannot develop the humaneness of students unless they are permitted to function as humane individuals themselves.

- *The Students:* Who shall be educated? For how long? In what setting? The decade's various confrontations with segregation, unemployment, adult illiteracy, and disparities in educational readiness among first-graders from varied socioeconomic backgrounds force new attention to early childhood education, desegregation, adult and continuing education—as well as to the valuable perceptions and disappointing excesses of a new generation.
- *School Finance:* The 1960's was a period of dramatically increased expenditures for education—yet educators kept insisting that more was needed, while taxpayers began demonstrating a reluctance to provide it. More money obviously is needed for humanizing the schools. One-third of the total funds must be federal.

These barriers to a humane school were not selected quixotically for inclusion in this report. Nor were they chosen either because they are fashionable or, at the other end of the scale, because they reflect the thinking of a handful of educational theorists. They appear here because of their immediacy, their potential for solution by the organized profession, the economic feasibility of their solution—and because they forcefully prevent a concept of educational humanism from coming to fruition in the tens of thousands of schools in this country. Further, they appear to be problem areas which, if attacked systematically and energetically, will cause the dialogue necessary in coming to grips with other important issues both related to and separate from the ones discussed here.

Perhaps the greatest barrier to educational improvement is the tendency of educational reformers to say, "That's wrong; do it this way." Any method of educating, even the much-maligned self-contained classroom, is right as long as some teacher and some group of students can make it work. Rather than prescribing a single solution for every educational malady, a wise teacher considers every option available to him—what John Goodlad once referred to as "the entire pharmacy of educational alternatives." In this spirit, the Center for the Study of Instruction chooses not to dictate solutions but to present alternatives—all of which are designed to bring about the dramatic changes necessary in education's goal—to create competent, self-directed individuals who can then work to help cure the ills of society as a whole. The challenge to all of us—teacher, student, parent, and administrator—is to discuss the issues, try out solutions, and finally come up with the answers.

FOOTNOTES

1. Allen, James E., Jr. "Education for Survival." Address given at the annual meeting of the American Council of Learned Societies, Washington, D.C., January 23, 1970. (Mimeo.)

2. Goodlad, John I. "Who Should Be In Charge: What Decisions, by Whom?" Address given at Linton High School, Schenectady, New York, April 27, 1970. (Mimeo.)

3. Cousins, Norman. "What Are Young People Telling Us?" (Editorial) *Saturday Review* 51:28; May 18, 1968.

4. Tyler, Ralph W. Remarks made during a meeting with CSI staff, Washington, D.C., May 14, 1970.

5. Clegg, Sir Alec. "The Revolution in the English Elementary Schools." *National Elementary Principal* 49:32; September 1969.

6. Frankel, Charles. "Toward a Humanistic Revolution in Education." *National Elementary Principal* 49:9; November 1969.

7. Silberman, Charles E. *Crisis in the Classroom*. New York: Random House, 1970.

8. Foshay, Arthur W. "Schools for People." Paper prepared for the Teachers College Curriculum Conference, Columbia University, New York City, October 23-25, 1969. p. 1. (Unpublished)

9. *Ibid.*

10. *Ibid.*, pp. 1-2.

11. Counts, George. *Dare the School Build a New Social Order?* New York: John Day, 1932.

SECTION II

The Humanistic School

The System

The minister of education in one European country used to tell visitors, with great satisfaction, that he knew exactly what every youngster in his nation was doing at any moment of the school day. Curriculums, class exercises, lesson plans, and perhaps even recesses were prescribed by his office.

The American system of governing education is not nearly so neat. Whereas change can be decreed from the top in some other nations, innovations aimed at humanizing our schools must work their way through a labyrinth of state regulations, local policies and prejudices, and widely varying community sentiment which respects no central direction. During the 1960's, this already loose "system" of governance threatened to pull apart as individual citizens throughout the country demanded more direct representation in the conduct of the schools in which they had invested their children and their taxes. Or—depending on one's point of view—the clamor for participation in school decision making from several new constituencies promised to return education to the local control which for two centuries has been a basic American principle.

PROBLEMS

Who's In Charge Here?

During the 1960's, virtually everybody in education and some outside asked the old question, Who's in charge here? But they refused to accept the old answer. By being totally silent on the subject of education, the Constitution vested its control with the states. Relatively few of them, however, took the responsibility seriously enough; by and large, state departments of education have been underfinanced, understaffed, and overignored except by publishers anxious to get their texts on the approved list. Recently, however, these departments are becoming "innovation foundations" as ESEA Title III funds are disbursed by states—a function previously performed by the federal government.

The Reaction to Centralization

The nation's shift from rural to urban concentrated more and more children in a smaller number of large school districts—but the shift brought with it no diffusion of educational responsibility to reflect the increasing heterogeneity of the schools' clientele. In the name of "local control," American parents have come to tolerate a striking amount of authoritarian absurdity. Whether the school enrollment was 20 or 200,000, whether children came from a single ethnic background or mirrored the diversity of the globe itself, American communities had a single board of education charged with reflecting the citizens' interest in education.

In 1968, for example, Los Angeles had a population of about 2,500,000 and a school board composed of seven members; neighboring Santa Monica, with a population of about 90,000, also had a seven-man board. Detroit's 1,700,000 people until recently were represented in school affairs by a board of seven; nearby Ann Arbor, with a population about 1/25 that of Detroit's, had a school board of nine members.

Viewing this numerical imbalance and the failure to select board members from the ethnic groups involved, particularly on the small boards of large American cities, the HEW Urban Education Task Force concluded in 1970 that:

> School boards in our urban centers are not representative of the people they serve. Members are generally of upper- and middle-class cultures with attitudes that reflect such cultures. In many cities where a large majority of the school children are Negro or Spanish-speaking, the boards are composed of nearly all whites or Anglos. Where school boards do have minority group members, the latter are generally middle-class men and women who have escaped from the slums and often have as little in common with the ghetto dweller as the rest of the board. As a result, the boards are infrequently responsive to the needs of the ghetto schools.[1]

School boards themselves are not necessarily responsible for this situation; they have been overtaken by changes, the educational implications of which did not become clear until the last decade. The arrangement of power in American schools evolved rather slowly—beginning with a kind of town-meeting structure in New England in which all parents participated in the choice of a teacher, the determination of salary, if any, and the selection of subject matter to be taught. As towns grew into cities, enrollments increased, and subject matter moved from the 3 R's and

morality-by-rote—"In Adam's fall/We sinned all"—to encompass a more complex content; direct participation by all parents and taxpayers became an unwieldy solution. There were too many people to be heard, and the problems too abstruse to be reconciled by nonprofessionals. The professionals started to take over, and the layman's interest in and control of education were delegated to appointed or elected school boards.

The centralization process continued—indeed, it picked up speed—during the 1960's as small school districts merged or were simply eliminated. In 1960, we had about 40,000 school districts; in 1970, that number has been reduced to 19,000, and more consolidations seem in the offing.

Most of these school mergers probably made sense, permitting parents in the less populous communities to pool modest resources and thus derive more educational benefit from them. In the densely populated communities, however, more and more parents began to question whether the centralization process might not have gone too far. They felt out of touch with the school board members supposedly chosen to represent them, and some felt, too, that the layers of school bureaucracy made it virtually impossible for them to obtain prompt and effective responses to their grievances.

Reemerging Constituencies

Parental Demand for Accountability. This sense of powerlessness was mainly restricted to the parents of those children termed "disadvantaged." As has often been pointed out, American schools were designed to serve the white middle class, and they have never outgrown this orientation. But as school children continued to fail in disastrous proportions, some parents who had accepted "disadvantaged" as an explanation in years past began to wonder who was failing, namely, their children or the institution known as the school—the "system."

This is probably the central notion behind "accountability," a relatively new term used in the context of school governance, meaning that schools and their professional staffs share the responsibility traditionally given to children to take advantage of educational opportunities.

The failure of the system is the major source of the new demand for accountability. However, another important source has been the increase in federal aid-to-education programs passed during the 1960's. Most of these legislative programs had built into them

requirements for subsequent reports to Congress as to what had been achieved with federal funds; those requirements—passed on through state departments of education which had to approve projects and later to obtain data as to their success—created a new demand for more sophisticated tools to measure the results of new expenditures for education.

A final source of the drive for accountability is the heightened importance of education per se in our society. Fifty years ago, even thirty years ago, school failures were concealed by what Grant Venn[2] used to refer to as a "parallel education system"—the job market. If a youngster did poorly in school and his parents lacked the money or the motivation to push him through at all costs, he could drop out and still get a job. Employment requiring little formal schooling was available to absorb dropouts, and this delayed any recognition by parents, or by society in general, that the schools were failing with a large proportion of American children.

That type of employment is disappearing; today obtaining a good job—one that offers a measure of security and economic promise, as well as personal fulfillment—requires formal education credentials. It may be, as has been charged, that many personnel managers use high school diplomas and bachelor's degrees as screening devices to reduce the number of job applicants whom they must interview. But it is also true that advancing technological sophistication leads industry to seek recruits who will require a minimum of training before they can contribute to an organization's profitability—and school credentials are a handy rule of thumb for judging such preparedness.

The upshot of these three factors—parents' resentment of high rates of school failure, legislative requirements for educational appraisal, and the importance of education in a changing employment market—has been the reemergence of one constituency of education: parents.

Yet not all parents are dissatisfied with their schools or the board members who represent them. In fact, a 1969 Gallup Poll found that of those interviewed three times as many gave school boards an "excellent" rating as gave them a "poor" rating. However, the same poll revealed that the greatest complaint parents have about their schools is discipline: while 44 percent of those polled felt present school discipline was "just about right," 49 percent felt it was "not strict enough"—as opposed to only 2 percent who felt it was too strict. Those who felt that schools

should exercise greater regulation over student dress outnumbered those who felt there should be less regulation by almost eight to one.[3]

Whatever the difficulties that school governance poses for instituting the changes we consider "humanizing," an equally large or even larger barrier is the *unrealistic expectations on the part of parents*. Considering such adult focus on items that are really peripheral to the central purposes of education, it is questionable whether the humanizing concept—one in which students are encouraged to develop and express their individuality, rather than to conform—has much of a chance for acceptance.

Teacher and Student Militance. The problem of accommodating parental expectations within the framework of our presently overcentralized system of school governance is further complicated by the new aggressiveness of two formerly docile constituencies in education: teachers and students.

Once upon a time, a teacher would no more think of going on strike than a nun would consider winking at a left tackle. Ever since Calvin Coolidge came to fame by routing a police walkout in Boston on the grounds that "there is no strike against the public welfare," the courts, the public, and the teachers themselves have acquiesced to the view that striking was professionally unacceptable.

Perhaps spurred by the growing percentage of males entering the profession after World War II, by the steady erosion of his economic position, and by his general sense of impotence in a bureaucracy that hands out a modicum of praise but no power, the American teacher has begun to exhibit some white-collar belligerence. A "declaratory judgment" from a Norwalk, Connecticut, court nipped an imminent teacher strike in the late 1940's, but during the 1960's the barriers collapsed. During the 1961-62 school year, there was a single strike; in 1965-66, there were 18; by 1968-69, the annual figure had zoomed to a record 131 strikes and work stoppages; and an NEA survey recorded 425 more during the 1969-70 school year.[4]

Strikes were only part of teacher militance. Working through their NEA and AFT locals, teachers in many communities won important concessions without striking—and the concessions frequently went beyond salary concerns. Teachers received affirmative responses to demands for lower pupil-teacher ratios and better facilities in ghetto schools, for a voice in shaping curriculum, and for board of education action to halt drug abuse and

student disruption of classes. And sometimes, to the great pleasure of teachers who were having their own troubles coping with the generation gap, they found students joining them on the picket line. "The teacher," summarized Sidney Marland, former superintendent of schools in Pittsburgh,[5] "is no longer regarded as a selfless, submissive, child-centered, loving symbol of the American do-good missionary folk-ethic. The teacher is now viewed as a militant, demanding . . . professional practitioner with some skills and talent—and possibly some commitments--for sale, and a considerable political force to be reckoned with at all levels."[6]

Student militance dates back at least to 1823, when half the Harvard senior class was expelled shortly before graduation for "disruptive activity." Our contemporary version of it probably began with the Free Speech Movement at Berkeley, and at first it centered on the war in Vietnam. But student dissent soon spread to the high schools and embraced a number of other concerns: dress codes, grading procedures, civil rights, course requirements, quality of the faculty, and adult control of an entire environment the stated purpose of which was to serve students. Initial adult reaction was uniformly hostile, but as the decade wore on, more and more superintendents, principals, parents, and teachers began seeing some sense in what the kids were saying.

However, among the barriers to a deeper and more widespread understanding were the aggressive ways in which students registered their protests, ranging from peaceful picketing to violence. During 1969, the nation's public high schools were disrupted by 6,000 "incidents"—from racial strife to political protests to arson attempts.[7] A Congressional survey of the nation's 29,000 public and private high schools indicated that 18 percent experienced some form of student protest during 1968-69. Dress codes and general disciplinary rules were the major issues leading to demonstrations; racial issues were involved in one-third of the protests nationwide, and in 59 percent of those which occurred in big-city public schools. In 40 percent of the schools where there were demonstrations, school rules were altered as a result, and in more than 90 percent of the protests, no one was injured and there was less than $100 damage to property.[8]

By 1970, a widespread public reaction to student militance had set in, mainly due to such excesses as the bombing of a research center at the University of Wisconsin that killed a graduate student and destroyed property worth about $2 million. Even so, the death of four students at Kent State University during the con-

frontation with the National Guard, and the melee at Jackson State College, in which Mississippi State Police were later judged to have used their weapons without due cause, troubled many adult consciences. The tragedy and violence of these and other campus incidents obscured the central motivation behind responsible student dissent: learners wanted some voice in decisions that affected them.

Thus the American system of educational governance was tested by three groups—parents, teachers, and students—asserting new rights as well as trying to reclaim those that had been lost to a central bureaucracy. Could the system respond?

ACTION TOWARD SOLUTION

Diffusion of Governance

It became increasingly clear during the 1960's that school boards and administrators, particularly in the cities, had to find some way to decentralize their authority and permit more of the people who were investing both taxes and children in the schools to have a larger voice in school operation.

The Community-Controlled School. One vehicle for the diffusion of school governance has been the *community-controlled school,* an extension of the traditional board of education concept and, in some ways, a throwback to the one-room schoolhouse with its governing body of local parents. Community-controlled schools are an expression of *political decentralization.* This is to be distinguished from *administrative decentralization,* which is essentially a sharing of power among *professionals:* the city school officials—recognizing that the superintendent cannot give the full attention required for all decisions in a system embracing hundreds of thousands of students, thousands of administrators and teachers, hundreds of buildings, and constituents with half a dozen different cultural backgrounds—divide the schools into two, three, or more subdistricts, and entrust deputies with their management. This form of decentralization is already in operation in a number of cities. In essence, it represents an attempt at more intelligent management, similar to the efforts of large American corporations during the 1950's and 1960's.

Political decentralization, on the other hand, entrusts to more than one group of citizens all or some portion of decision-making

responsibilities formerly reserved for the professional administration: decisions on curriculum, promotion and retention of teachers, and allocation of the school budget.

At decade's end, the job of political decentralization had just begun. One of the first attempts to renew local community control—an experiment with a "community school board," financed by the Ford Foundation in the Ocean Hill-Brownsville section of Harlem—ran into trouble, not only because of the central school board's resistance to any diminution of its own authority, but primarily because of conflicts between the community governing board and the United Federation of Teachers over the choice and tenure of teachers. Such conflicts are probably inevitable; as the National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards states, "... trustees and administrators of schools and ... the teachers must simply accept the existence of continuing and basic role conflict." But it is also pointed out that "in the realm of ideas, conflict and tension are essential precursors to growth."[9]

As a result of this stormy beginning, New York City's Board of Education drew back from decentralization; however, it later acquiesced as the State Legislature divided the city school system into 32 districts—though the power of the purse and most other substantive decisions remained firmly in the hands of the central administration.

Chicago established three subdistricts, each with a deputy superintendent, and other urban school systems edged warily toward dispersing central control. But because the demand for the inclusion of parents, teachers, and students in educational decision making is relatively new and has been concentrated in a few urban centers, not too many examples of action are available. Most have been experimental and have yet to be replicated on any broad basis, but some can be cited. These concern the inclusion of parents and students in substantive policy-making roles—greater participation for teachers is considered separately (see p. 75).

- The Syracuse, New York, Board of Education approved the operation of the city's Madison Junior High School, in a typical urban ghetto area, as a "subsystem" with near-total autonomy in curriculum planning, teacher selection, and allocation of budget resources. The Madison Area Project (MAP) received additional financing from the Ford Foundation and the New York State Department of Education. Running from 1962 to

1965, MAP heavily emphasized parent and student participation in school operation; the project director set the tone for the experiment in an early address to the parents: " 'If we do not produce superior education for your children, you have the right and responsibility to replace us with others who can. We are accountable to you.' "[10] At one point, when students complained that school texts were "phony," a teacher engaged in an extended dialogue with them about the meaning of *phony*, thus developing with them a set of criteria for appraising reading materials—as a result the students were put to work evaluating new texts submitted by publishers.[11]

- In 1967, the Massachusetts State Legislature approved an act enabling the State Department of Education to sponsor experimental school systems to be planned, developed, and operated by private, nonprofit corporations. The first of these—the Committee for Community Educational Development—has already established a school in Dorchester.
- The "street academies" of New York City do not literally represent an example of broader governance; they really represent a flight *from* central governance by the City. Yet there are signs of growing cooperation between the academies and the New York City schools, even though on an informal basis: Principal Bernard V. Deutchman of Haaren High School regards the McGraw-Hill Street Academy a few blocks away as an invaluable experience in making teachers aware of dropouts' problems, and sees the day when such academies might—without losing their identity as alternatives to the traditional school program—be located within the regular public high schools.[12]
- In Dallas, a citywide Student Advisory Council (informally dubbed "Supersac") was established to advise the administration on instruction. One of the Council's first acts was to conduct a poll of a cross-section of the city's high school students, obtaining their opinions of the present curriculum and their suggestions for additions to it.
- Santa Barbara, California, has a student board of education to complement its regular "senior" board—and the students' recommendations have been effective. The student board, composed of 14 members elected by classmates in the city's four high schools, meets twice a month, one day before the senior board meets; its actions are covered by the local newspaper and are presented to the senior board as part of its regular agenda.

One result is that the senior board adopted a new dress code formulated by the students to replace an earlier set of highly controversial rules. The new code, in its entirety, reads: "Cleanliness, health and safety are the guidelines to acceptable school attire."

- John Adams High School in Portland, Oregon, an experimental school established by four young graduates of the Harvard School of Education at the request of Superintendent Melvin Barnes,[13] has a three-man committee to interview all prospective teachers; one committee member is a student.
- Formal communications programs and PTA meetings aren't the only ways to strengthen home-school ties and involve parents in the educational program. The teachers at Madrid Elementary School in Tucson, Arizona, help students check out library materials—not just books, but movie projectors, films, recordings, art prints, encyclopedias, and educational games—for periods ranging from one day to one week. As a result, "As many as 12 in one family enjoyed the school materials; cousins, friends, and neighbors were invited in to share them. Some parents, for the first time, played educational games with their children; some homes, for the first time, had pictures on the walls."[14]
- In Washington, D. C., while still retaining the right to final decisions, the school board approved a "screening board" of parents to interview principal-candidates at Woodrow Wilson High School.

The Voucher Plan. One of the most attention-getting ideas proposed in education as the decade closed was the "voucher plan." Advocated by conservative economist Milton Friedman and liberal social critic Christopher Jencks, among others, it would give parents a voucher for the sum of money that would normally be invested in their child's education by the city school system. Parents would be allowed to "shop around" among private and public schools if they were dissatisfied with the instruction provided by their neighborhood school. Thus schools would have to pay more attention to parental concerns and grievances or their students would go elsewhere. However, both NEA and the American Federation of Teachers opposed voucher plans on the basis that they would stimulate the opening of private schools, leading to "hucksterism" among competing educators and a decline of the public school system.

The Problems of Power Sharing

Recognizing the Benefits. It is understandable that both educators and politicians should view these new demands for power sharing as threatening, if only because they are new. It is important, however, that both these bureaucratic groups recognize that accountability is an idea whose time has come, and that the diffusion of governance holds promise for improving education. As Mario Fantini expresses it, "The elements of dissent in this country have provided the educator with an enormous resource for understanding the failures and possibilities of American schools."[15] Dissent represents energy and—like any other form of energy—dissent can be blindly challenged or intelligently channeled.

Educators have for years bemoaned the slow pace of innovation in the schools; it appears likely that the twin drives for accountability and for sharing power over education can be a more potent force for accelerating change than any number of seminars or "demonstration schools." Whether they achieve their potential or not may depend on the willingness of school administrators to view the new constituents in education not as competitors for a limited, static amount of power, but as hitherto untapped sources of leadership in the expanding field of education, in which both power and possibility are virtually limitless.

Perhaps the key factor in achieving a more democratic system of educational governance is the recognition, as Fantini states, that:

> . . . the realignment of the participants in public education promises to produce richer yields for all:
>
> 1. For learners, a school system responsive to their needs, resonant with their personal style, and affirmative in its expectations of them.
> 2. For parents, a tangible grasp of the destiny of their children and the beginnings of richer meaning for their own lives.
> 3. For professionals, surcease from an increasingly negative community climate and, even more positively, new allies in their task.[16]

Who Will Decide? Largely because this form of decentralization is so new and nobody has had much experience with a genuinely community-controlled school, it is difficult to determine who should control what, or whether a community governing board should have an advisory role as opposed to, say, a decisive vote of its own or a veto over school board decisions.[17] As the 1970's

opened, public schools were just getting accustomed to the *idea* of broader governance, and few people inside the schools or out claimed to have any patterns for balancing the claims of one new constituency against those of another.

Goodlad conceptualizes decision making about curriculum and instruction as occurring on three levels in the school system. Societal-level decisions are primarily the function of boards of education and are generally concerned with the broad aims for all students; institutional-level decisions guide the school system's and individual schools' selection of educational objectives, materials, and methods of evaluation, and are made by groups of teachers, administrators, and others; and instructional-level decisions regarding instructional objectives, materials, learning opportunities, and evaluation are made by individual teachers for specific students.[18] With appropriate involvement of people in the process at the three levels, Goodlad's concept of responsibility is a promising one in a plan to broaden the governance base of schools.

"Listen to us"; that is probably the central problem in broadening the governance of American education—listening and then doing something about what the "system" is told. Considering present state laws that frequently dictate a portion of curriculum, policies sometimes laid down by central school administrations, and other constraints within which school personnel must operate, it is frequently difficult for individual schools to respond to the demands for wider participation in decision making.

Also, many valid questions can be raised regarding the concept of community-controlled schools: What qualifications do parents have for determining a teacher's right to retention or promotion? What expertise do parents possess that will enable them to choose between the Biological Sciences Curriculum Study and the "old" biology, or to shift funds allocated to their school from one instructional category to another? These are all good questions, and professionals have a right to demand answers. But professionals also have the obligation to answer the criticism of parents who might counter, "You're supposed to know how to teach, but look what's happened to our kids. Now we want you to listen to us."

The School Must Respond

The fate of the new politics of education seems to hang on a single point: whether the participants will engage in a continuing,

raucous power struggle which will harm the schools, or whether they will instead change the concept of power—the command over problems—to allow cooperative decision making.

However the game develops, accountability is essential to keep all the players honest—to help them match responsibility with authority and to gauge the value of promises for the future against performance in the past. It is clear, too, that governance in schools for the 70's will depart from the authoritarian, "Big Daddy knows best" model that has existed ever since schools outgrew the town meeting, and will approach the democratic "grass roots-based" structure which our nation was designed to represent. The major points of concern for educators, perhaps, are that a public interest in alternatives available to the monolithic educational systems does exist—and that if schoolmen do not give parents and community residents a larger policy-making voice in education, they might simply be bypassed.

Yet education is not wholly a matter of democracy: we do not determine the square root of two by taking a vote on it. The essential process of democracy is as much a matter of checks and balances as of counting ballots, and if the professional minority is to be asked to share its power, it has a right to demand that the lay majority protect the professional's rights. The governance of our schools, like that of our nation, will at any given moment represent a tug-of-war, its direction to be determined by the constantly shifting superiority of one set of forces over another. A large number of American parents have been ignored until this decade, and it is expected that they will pull with more enthusiasm now that they have suddenly gotten a better grip on the rope.

FOOTNOTES

1. HEW Urban Education Task Force. *Urban School Crisis: The Problem and Solutions Proposed by the HEW Urban Education Task Force.* Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, National School Public Relations Association, 1970. p. 51. (Reprint from the *Congressional Record*, January 19 and 20, 1970.)

2. Grant Venn, formerly associate commissioner for vocational education, U.S. Office of Education, is now director, National Academy for School Executives, American Association of School Administrators, Washington, D.C.

3. Gallup, George. *How the Nation Views the Public Schools: A Study of the Public Schools of the United States.* Princeton, N.J.: Charles F. Kettering, Ltd., 1969. p. 14.

4. National Education Association, Research Division. *Teacher Strikes, Work Stoppages, and Interruptions of Service, 1969-70.* Research Memo 1970-19. Washington, D.C.: the Association, August 1970. pp. 1-3. (Mimeo.)

5. Dr. Marland is now U.S. Commissioner of Education.

6. Marland, Sidney P., Jr. Remarks made at CSI SCHOOLS FOR THE 70's Seminar, Washington, D.C., December 13-14, 1969.

7. Newsweek. "What's Wrong with the High Schools?" *Newsweek* 75:65; February 16, 1970.

8. Syracuse University Research Corporation. *Disruption in Urban Public Secondary Schools.* Syracuse, N.Y.: the Corporation, 1970.

9. National Education Association, National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards. "The Context and Purpose of Professional Self-Determination." Working paper prepared for 1969-70 regional TEPS conferences on "Professional Self-Determination: Substance and Strategy." pp. 6-7. (Mimeo.)

10. Fantini, Mario D. *The Reform of Urban Schools.* Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, Center for the Study of Instruction, 1970. p. 88.

11. For a more complete discussion of the MAP Project, see: *Ibid.*, pp. 71-90.

12. Black, Jonathan. "Street Academies: One Step off the Sidewalk." *Saturday Review* 52:100; November 15, 1969.

13. Melvin W. Barnes, now vice-president of *Scholastic*, was chairman of the NEA Project on the Instructional Program of the Public Schools.

14. Elementary Curriculum Letter. "Those Expensive Curriculum Materials." *Elementary Curriculum L ter* 9:3; October 1969.

15. Fantini, Mario D., *op. cit.*, p. 21.

16. *Ibid.*, p. 13.

17. For illustrations and recommendations about decision making, see: National Education Association, Project on Instruction. *Schools for the Sixties: A Report of the NEA Project on Instruction.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1963.

18. See: Goodlad, John I., and Richter, Maurice N. *A Conceptual System for Dealing with the Problems of Curriculum and Instruction.* Los Angeles: UCLA and IDEA, 1966.

The Instructional Program

> Lately, we've been running case histories in this publication about teachers who turned duplicating equipment into creative teaching resources. One teacher made *Silas Marner* more interesting by having students publish a newspaper about the characters and happenings in the book. . . .
>
> —Advertisement in *Today's Education*, April 1970

> Young people are intensely curious to know about the nature of their environment, to find out what it is. Outside of school they try to tell it, in the current expression, "like it is." But in the school room they don't get it "like it is." They don't if . . . for example, one of the most popular books still on the reading list in American schools after all these years is George Eliot's *Silas Marner*. How can one, if he's bright and young and eager, look on the school with respect if that's the kind of thing that the school presents as vital and exciting?
>
> —Charles Frankel in *The National Elementary Principal*, November 1969

PROBLEM: AN IRRELEVANT CURRICULUM

Neanderthal man knew what his son had to know to survive: how to catch a fish, to thwart a tiger, to shape an arrowhead. Since then the process of relating knowledge to life—the process of designing an instructional program—has become considerably more complicated. In the most primitive ages of man, it might have taken 2,000 or 5,000 years for a genuinely different idea or kind of skill to emerge; today such skills and bits of knowledge—new ways of making a living, new ways of deciding what kind of a life

is worth living—emerge on the order of once every five years or less.

The problem of selecting what is necessary for an education from an ever-increasing body of knowledge has been the basis for the hundred-year-old tussle between the liberal-education and the utilitarian-education people. The terms of the argument become confused: few skills are more liberating than the ability to make more money than one needs, and few possessions are more utilitarian than an education that allows one to distill from life some interior joy despite a boring job, a tedious marriage, or the sudden advent of tragedy.

The argument itself is confused by specialists whose professional lives and self-esteem are threatened by obsolescence. They contrive lofty rationales for the continuance of their subjects: Latin teaches you to think precisely, a dozen generations of Latinists have argued; however, a substantial amount of research has failed to divine this putative benefit. Euclid designed his geometry as an exercise in logical problem solving in an age when there weren't many interesting problems to solve; ever since, youngsters living in an utterly fascinating world, youngsters who know more at 15 than Euclid did at his death, have struggled to make triangles congruent.

Who came first, Abraham Lincoln or Millard Fillmore? Most adults don't know and most students don't care—though they might if both men had been related to some inquiry into the historical process, such as whether great men shape their times or hard times create great men. Rarely, however, do the every-other-year landings on Plymouth Rock and the exhortations to commit a hundred dates to memory indicate that history is anything more than a nation's scrapbook. Vocational education, the poor relative of "academic" education, falls farther behind every year as the schools continue trying to update a 1910 view of the world of work, using "skills" classes as detention centers for disciplinary problems, and maintaining their isolation from business, government, and social agencies which can and should accept their responsibility for a share of the educational endeavor.

It used to be relatively easy for any institution of higher learning to determine how "excellent" it was: divide the number of Ph.D.'s by the total number of faculty members. No more. Students told the schools and the colleges that they would have to do better. *Change or perish*, they said. But there was a reasonable question whether the American educational system—a stately old dame

who traced her lineage back to the Middle Ages by way of English colleges and German graduate schools, and had ever since suffered from an overdose of quadrivium—could hasten her pace from evolutionary to revolutionary.

Student Needs

Students began complaining during the 1960's that the traditional school curriculum did not serve their needs and interests; they asked for a bewildering range of subjects—Swahili, computer programing, nonviolent protest, the history of revolution, black studies, and brown studies—as well as for the freedom not to take courses at all. It may be that any society's young have lodged similar complaints since time immemorial ("So who wants to make a flint arrowhead?"), but our young have more right to gripe than any other set of progeny. The increase of knowledge, the social and geographic mobility, the rejection of "what Daddy does" as the noblest end of man—all diminish the age-old conception of education as passing the practices of one generation on to another. Every parent wants his children to have the best chance possible for a happy life, but to a greater degree than any previous generation of parents, we are separated from our children by forces that we ourselves have created.

Hippies don't just wear love beads and long hair; they don't just burn grass and lie down in front of railroad trains bearing phosphorous grenades. The best of them have decided that whatever turned their fathers into somewhat overweight, somewhat ulcer- and alcoholism-prone, somewhat fearful individuals isn't worth duplicating; the best of them regret that their fathers have fallen prey to such scavengers, but are determined that their own children shall not have such apologetic, defensive, or harassed parents—and their views are shared by many well-dressed, button-down peers who do not see the necessity for any dramatic action or demonstration.

Parental Concerns

An adult generation retorts, "You didn't have to survive a depression"; "You didn't have your career interrupted by a recall for the Korean War"; "You don't know what it is to meet a payroll or a mortgage payment. . . ." Every one of these statements has justice if not perception to recommend it—but isn't part of parenthood the desire that one's children will not have to relive one's

own sufferings and mistakes? Ideally, every generation stands on the shoulders of its forebears; in the real world, few parents stand so tall—but the good ones want to give their kids at least a leg up. Why should we resent our children's taking the best we have to offer and wanting more?

In an analogous way, students—the parents of one's future grandchildren—are saying that they don't want to learn what their parents learned, no matter how cleverly the old is dressed up in new garb. To some extent, they are right; to some extent, they are probably wrong. The point is to develop criteria that will help us decide when the old retains its validity, when the new is little more than a sensation of the moment, and when the lasting parts of the traditional can be blended with desirable aspects of the contemporary.

ACTION TOWARD SOLUTION: A RELEVANT PROGRAM

The Purpose of Instruction

Before considering new possibilities for the *content* of instruction, it is worth making the point that much of the irrelevance which students complain of stems as much from the purposes for which a subject is taught as from *what* is taught. The Pythagorean theorem, for example—$a^2 + b^2 = c^2$—is literally a method for determining the length of one side of a right triangle when the other two sides are known. Rarely does any student or adult have any need for such a formula; at its most obvious level of meaning, therefore, any student might question the relevance of learning it.

At a higher level of meaning, however, the Pythagorean theorem concerns *the interrelationship of three variables and the possibility of deriving a law from their behavior.* Deriving the law requires measurement and observation; the theorem might be made the subject of a fascinating intellectual exercise if students were told that a relationship does exist—and were then asked to find it themselves, through the analysis of a dozen right triangles of varying hypotenuses and sides, rather than having it simply presented to them for memorization. In this fashion, the student exercise would imitate the mental process that Pythagoras himself must have gone through; they would—as the "inquiry-directed" school of curric-

ular reform advocates—learn about mathematical logic and mathematical problem solving by acting as mathematicians.

And at an even higher level of meaning—or relevance, or whatever one chooses to call it—an imaginative teacher could ask his students to consider other trios of interrelated variables for the purpose of forming generalizations:

- The amount of gasoline in an auto's tank, the speed at which the operator drives, and the distance he can cover before running out of gas
- The degree to which a congressman votes according to his own convictions, the strength of his constituents' sentiments when the majority differs with him on an issue, and the intensity of his desire to be reelected
- The evidence against a person charged with a crime, and the respective skills of his defense attorney and the prosecutor
- The rate of a chemical reaction in the presence and in the absence of a catalyst
- The 4-4-4-2 arrangement of Shakespeare's sonnets, the 8-6 arrangement of Edna St. Vincent Millay's sonnets, and the success each poet achieved within those self-imposed formats.

Some of these matters are quantifiable, some are not—and that itself is a useful lesson in learning to draw inferences and make judgments. But all involve observation, comparison, measurement according to objective or subjective criteria, and the development of a critical sense in the solution of large or small problems with which humans have been concerned.

This is not entirely a function of the individual teacher's ingenuity in seeing new relationships between traditional items of instruction; no mass enterprise can successfully be made to depend on the brilliance or energy of a few. Relevant teaching, regardless of the subject matter, also depends on clearly specified instructional goals, as Tyler states:

> Many educational programs do not have clearly defined purposes. In some cases one may ask a teacher of science, of English, of social studies, or of some other subject what objectives are being aimed at and get no satisfactory reply. The teacher may say in effect that he aims to develop a well-rounded person and that he is teaching English or social studies or some other subject because it is essential to a well-rounded education. No doubt some excellent educational work is being done by artistic teachers who do not have a clear conception of goals

but do have an intuitive sense of what is good teaching, what materials are significant, what topics are worth dealing with and how to present material and develop topics effectively with students. Nevertheless, if an educational program is to be planned and if efforts for continued improvement are to be made, it is very necessary to have some conception of the goals that are being aimed at. These educational objectives become the criteria by which materials are selected, content is outlined, instructional procedures are developed and tests and examinations are prepared. All aspects of the educational program are really means to accomplish basic educational purposes. Hence, if we are to study an educational program systematically and intelligently we must first be sure as to the educational objectives aimed at.[1]

Relating Subject to Student

Educational objectives are often logically determined by considering the second aspect of curricular relevance, which is the objective relationship between a student's course of study and his present and future life. What content is important to him now? What content will be important to him in the future?

There are few lasting answers to any of these questions. Indeed, much of student, teacher, and parent dissatisfaction with curriculum stems from the schools' and colleges' clinging to the answers that earlier decades offered. Curricular revision, especially in a society as fast-paced as ours, must be constant; it will never be completed.

However, it is somewhat paradoxical that students and others should complain so much about the lack of "curricular relevance" after a decade that saw so many excellent experiments to achieve it: the new math, the new physics, the Biological Sciences Curriculum Study, the attempts to make the humanities more pertinent to contemporary life by making them "problem-oriented" and "inquiry-directed." It is difficult to gauge the success of these experiments because, in many cases, their objectives were mixed or—when they were clearly stated—the focus of student interest had shifted elsewhere just as the new curriculums were introduced.

The new physics, for example, emerged out of an effort not only to update the obsolescent high school treatment of this subject, but to make physics itself more interesting and thus attract more students to a discipline regarded as essential to national interests. Yet during the 1960's, high school enrollments in physics continued their decline, from 28 to 18 percent.

Several curriculum experiments represented the work of some of the finest minds in the country, provocative collaborations with schoolmen by world-famous scholars such as Jerome Bruner and Jerrold Zacharias. This new concern with school instruction on the part of senior university faculty members outside the education departments was itself one of the most heartening developments of the decade.

A New Emphasis for Curricular Reform. By 1969, however, the whole thrust of curricular reform had taken a different direction. Gone from it were the alarm at Russia's early lead in the space race in 1957 and the frantic demands for the schools to churn out physicists, mathematicians, and technicians quick, before the Communists dumped a cobalt bomb on us God-fearing folk. The focus of American educational concern remained excellence, but it had shifted from an extreme emphasis on the quality of college- and graduate-level study, on the "able," "college-bound youth," to a broader concern with the lower levels of schooling.

Plain old reading, writing, and arithmetic came back into their own in the public mind—especially in the schools attended by youngsters with little prospect of ever taking a Graduate Record Examination. The traditional indices of academic quality came into question as college students reacted sharply to the publish-or-perish research orientation of the universities and demanded more attention to the unglamorous work of teaching. High school students disputed the validity of curriculums the *raison d'etre* of which was preparation for college; does school have a purpose of its own, or is it to be defined entirely by the nature of someplace else?

With this new concern for all students, college-bound or not, more emphasis was placed on vocational education, supplemented by the experience and resources of another group that has not generally been included in educational councils: industry.

"Business-Industry-Education" days have been a fixture in many school systems for years, but they were more of a public relations effort for corporations than a genuine educational tool. Students and teachers trooped dutifully from one plant to another, ate box lunches or cafeteria meals, and—the program planners hoped—learned enough about free enterprise, widget making, and the contentment of American labor to counteract Communist propaganda.

In the 1960's, businessmen moved from this interest in telling students about business to helping schools do their own job better. In part, this interest was motivated by industry's need for

continually better-educated workers, and by the dissatisfaction of many companies with the applicants whom the schools were turning out. It was also motivated in part by the "long, hot summers" in many of our cities, which brought home to corporate executives the seriousness of our urban crisis. And, finally, it was motivated by the inability of the schools to keep pace with industrial advances, especially in their vocational training programs; too many students were being trained for jobs that no longer existed.

> Vocational training: the very phrase calls up the smell of plastic ashtrays, the clink of copper trinkets, the ennui of workshops crowded with delinquents manning lathes and squirting grease into crankcases. Vocational training should be a major source of steady employment for U.S. youths. Instead, it has become an educational junkyard for rejects from a college-geared society....
>
> In Chicago's Lake View, shop classes in printing set type in letterpress instead of the more advanced offset technique. In Newton (Mass.) High School, electronics students learn radio repair with vacuum tubes instead of solid-state sets. And in classrooms from Bangor, Me., to Beverly Hills, Calif., future auto mechanics finish their courses without scraping a knuckle inside an automatic transmission (though 80 percent of U.S. cars are shiftless). One-half of all shop students in the U.S. are plugging away at home economics and agriculture—hardly critical crafts—while only 15 percent practice more pertinent skills such as industrial design, medical technology, and visual communications.[2]

Such deficiencies pointed up the absolute necessity of bringing industry into education to share a training task that clearly exceeds the finances and competence of local schools. By 1970, there were plenty of examples of what could be done:

- In 1968, General Electric donated a three-story factory to the Cleveland school system. GE and other local industries leased office and manufacturing space there, and hired ghetto teenagers to work part-time in one section of the factory while they continued classes in another.
- In Phoenix, Western Electric and the Urban League teamed up to develop the Skill Level Improvement Program. Management and staff people from both organizations designed and conducted classes in shorthand, typing, business math, English, work attitudes, and grooming.

- In Detroit, the Michigan Bell Telephone Company "adopted" Northern High School, located in a predominantly black, low-income area. In doing so, Michigan Bell pledged to do more than recruit linemen and switchboard operators from the student body; it is also keeping an eye out for those who are college material, but who need guidance on such matters as scholarships and student-aid programs.

Such examples could be multiplied, in city after city. Every type and size of firm was involved, from the corporation employing thousands to the neighborhood business employing less than a dozen; sponsors included not only individual corporations, but associations such as the National Alliance of Businessmen, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and the Urban C alition. Programs varied with the size of the local school system, the special needs of its clientele, and the ingenuity of local businessmen and educators in matching industry's abilities to local problems. The question, then, was not whether industry power could be beneficial to education, but whether educators and businessmen would continue to enlarge their new partnership without the goad of periodic riots.

But, whatever the nature of the subject matter, one thing is certain: we have overemphasized the intellectual development of students at the expense of other capacities. To the intellectual, Foshay adds five other categories of human possibility—emotional, social, aesthetic, spiritual, and physical—which suggest other directions for curricular reform.[3] None of these capacities exists in isolation, of course: scientists testify that there is an aesthetic appeal to a perfectly developed, rigorous proof of a theory, and one's appreciation of medieval art may be enhanced by one's religious beliefs. Thus curricular material devised to nurture one capacity may in fact touch on two or more. Foshay's categories do at least minimize the chances of our ignoring any aspect of human nature.

Can we, in fact, develop curriculums to stimulate the growth of all these traits? Unquestionably, we do not know as much about the last five as we do about intellectual development. But considering how much we have learned about cognitive growth by directing attention to it, it seems probable that we can learn as much about the others. "We are not short of means," Foshay writes. "We are short of nerve."[4]

Learning as Performance. The suggestion that students can learn about mathematics by acting as mathematicians—as in the refer-

ence to the Pythagorean theorem—can be extended to most other areas of the curriculum—though Foshay believes that the schools have employed this very simple technique only in the arts:

> The crucial difference between learning in the arts and learning in the academic fields is this: in the arts, performance is the learning. If we taught art the way we teach math, children would begin by studying paper, then tempera, then crayon, then stick figures—and so on. By the time they finished elementary school, they would be ready to try putting together an art object under the teacher's careful surveillance. The notion that they might some day make their own art object would be withheld until late in high school, and then only the most able would be invited to dream about this prospect.
>
> Thank heaven, nobody has thought of the arts that way in fifty years. The art program begins with the attempt to make art objects, and never leaves that strategy. New skills are added at need, and the teacher is a peripheral figure in the learning situation.
>
> We could do the same thing, possibly with similar effect, throughout the school's offering. Children could write (and edit their writings) in order to be read—not in order to complete an assignment. They would make math to be criticized by peer mathematicians. They would make history the way historians make it—by interpreting records of events. They would, in effect, make all their academic work.[5]

The Problem-Oriented Curriculum. The most direct way to ensure the relevance of instruction to students' lives is to select a topic which they see as a genuine problem in their own lives—and the times offer manifold examples of such problems: war, peace, race, the economy, population, the environment. The analysis of such subjects—while none of them fits neatly into the departmental organization of schools—requires the techniques of mathematics, history, science, and communications. Students will learn to seek information they need, rather than to memorize the facts as digested and presented in their textbooks (the results of someone else's investigations of a problem), and to distinguish between the relevant and the merely interesting.

Focusing on genuine problems that have a personal importance to learners reverses the usual school procedure, which is to make up problems whose solutions require the use of a technique assigned for the day, e.g., Farmer Jones can fill trough A in 3½ hours and trough B in 5 hours, etc. There are plenty of problems that even the youngest children face; indeed, Neil Postman and Charles

Weingartner suggest that all syllabi, curriculums, and textbooks could be replaced with a "What's-Worth-Knowing Questions Curriculum." Here are a few of the questions which, the authors point out, are "a metaphor of our sense of relevance," not a catechism for every teacher to adopt:

—What do you worry about most?
—What are the causes of your worries?
—Can any of your worries be eliminated? How?
—Which of them might you deal with first? How?
—Are there other people with the same problems? How do you know? How can you find out?[6]

Other questions might be preferred. The point is to ask honestly what interests students in their present lives, and—to prevent such a procedure's degenerating into little more than an amiable bull session—to ask of the Questions Curriculum itself such questions as:

—Will these questions increase the learner's *will* as well as his capacity to learn?
—In order to get answers, will the learner be required to make inquiries?
—Does each question allow for alternative answers (which implies alternative modes of inquiry)?

These approaches can supplement the normal process of curricular revision, and all are being tried in various schools around the nation. A few samples:

- Burlington High School in Burlington, Vermont, has made the educational process itself a subject for inquiry through "talk-ins" at which students and teachers consider such questions as, What is the responsibility of the public school? If you set up a class just the way you wanted it, what would it be like? Who should evaluate teachers?
- Educational relevance differs with the clientele; here's how a teacher in one of the Harlem "store-front" schools explains it: "How do you get these kids to college? I tell 'em, dig me. You want money, you want to talk black power, you want to make it in the system? You gotta have that degree. . . . These cats are bored. Everyone's bored. You gotta excite 'em. You give them pride. You make them think black is worth something."[7]
- In McLean, Virginia, 5 ninth- and tenth-grade teachers, certified in both English and social studies, organized a humanities course around "man's efforts to find answers to life's basic questions"—

What is my relationship to God? To myself? To my fellow men? To the state? Course materials drew upon the responses of other civilizations (ancient Near East, Renaissance Italy and England, China) as exemplified not only in literature, political thought, religion, and philosophy, but also in art and music.

- Teachers at Philadelphia's Advancement School seem to specialize in developing curriculums that require "action and movement" on the grounds that 12- and 13-year-olds find it difficult to concentrate on abstract ideas, and must use their hands and bodies as much as possible. A physical education and a reading teacher teamed up to develop a "boxing-reading" unit that explored the appeal of boxing to minority groups today and in the 1920's; interviews with professional fighters, forays into ring literature, the staging of fights, and *constant writing* about their experiences raised the reading comprehension of 90 percent of the youngsters in one class by eight months within a three-month period. Another teacher invented "Stud Spelling," a poker game (which the youngsters, he noted, loved to play in their spare time) that substitutes words of varying difficulty for each of the 52 cards: a deuce was easiest to spell, an ace hardest, etc.

A Curriculum for the "Whole" Student

Put every subject on trial, with teachers *and* students testifying for the defense or the prosecution. Should every required subject *be* required? Should the curriculum be opened up to allow more electives for students? Are the major concerns of the day reflected in the curriculum? Bring alumni who graduated one, five, and twenty years earlier back to testify on the relevance of what they learned; stress, however, that you're not after a testimonial but the truth, and include those who graduated at the bottom of their class as well as those who came out on top.

The curriculum *must* move away from an emphasis on the retention of facts to an emphasis on the processes of inquiry, comparison, interpretation, and synthesis. A student in whom the desire or the need to know has been developed can learn to go after the information he needs; a student to whom knowledge has been presented as a grab bag of names, numbers, and dates will have little trouble forgetting all of them as soon as the final exam is over.

In addition to purely intellectual growth, the curriculum should regard emotions, attitudes, ideals, ambitions, and values as legitimate areas of concern for the educational process, and should emphasize the student's need to develop a sense of respect for self and others. How would you go about it? How did you go about it in your own life? What major mistakes did you make? The history of individual lives can become a part of curriculum, and every school is full of young and adult humans who contend daily with hope and fear, ambition and self-doubt, disappointment and pleasure.

Isn't it possible to design a curriculum that has as its central core the exploration, revitalization, and sympathetic consideration of the learner's sense of himself as a self-directed human? The submersion of the eternal verities of the 3 R's—and their bedfellow, science—need not result in lack of concerted attention to these bodies of content. Rather, they would take their rightful places as tools with which a person can be more rational, more understanding of people and things, more responsive to the needs of his fellows and his environment, and more capable of living fully and effectively in a world such as will be his. Such a curriculum demands a reordering of the priorities of the school, and the instructional program must be reflective of the new order.

PROBLEM: CLASSROOM ORGANIZATION

Curriculum may be the most important single part of the instructional program, if there is such a thing. But closely related to curriculum is what you do with it—how you organize instruction and how you evaluate students' achievement to determine whether they are attaining the desired ends.

Individual Differences

Any parent recognizes differences in his children that have nothing to do with age: products of the same genes and environment nevertheless vary widely in their dispositions, personalities, and interests—and in their aptitudes for various school subjects. In a single family, one child may excel at math, another at reading, a third at nothing discernible at all.

Every teacher knows this and yet many classrooms are organized as if such differences do not exist, or at least hold no

implications for instruction. Eight-year-olds are generally in third grade, ten-year-olds in fifth—even though some eight-year-olds are capable of fifth-grade math and some ten-year-olds are still shaky on third-grade reading.

The Uniform Environment

In most cases, too, classes run a uniform number of minutes, with a few exceptions for such purposes as a science laboratory. Regardless of the difficulty of what is to be learned that day—no matter whether some students can absorb it in 10 minutes while others might require hours—all sit for 50 minutes, obedient to the dictates of the "magic number." Some students are ready to learn on their own, in a laboratory or a library or lying down on a couch at home with a book; they would, too, if they weren't kept in their seats in deference to a hazy morality that equates learning with sitting still and keeping quiet, and proves the virtue of attendance by making it compulsory. Other students need 20 minutes of the teacher's time all to themselves. Take one 50-minute class period; subtract time for taking attendance, for the teacher's lecture (even though some kids don't need it, and the others may not understand it anyhow), for grave silence while the principal plays with his new P.A. system; divide what is left of the teacher's time by 25 students; and the average time for individual attention to each student works out to be about 15 seconds.

The entire system reflects a distrust of children, a conviction that learning is so repugnant that no one will do it voluntarily. This implies that the teacher must monitor every moment of the learning process—though for decades learning theory has stressed that knowledge and skills are best retained when the student makes them his own through some personal *act* of cognition. Aristotle and Thomas Aquinas both taught that to learn something is to *become* it in a way. Hearing is not enough; the learner must participate in his learning. It is something he must do for himself, not something that can be done to him.

Yet present classroom organization too often frustrates as many opportunities for self-directed learning as it opens, minimizes the possibilities for the teacher to exercise his professional competence, and ultimately bores learners by aiming all instruction at a nonexistent "average" student. Most students, by definition, are average—but it is a rare student who is average in English *and* math *and* social studies *and* science *and* music.

The school's administrative need to classify students in some fashion stems from the *real* needs—to assign teachers to their appropriate fields of competence, to purchase instructional materials, and to monitor the learning process to ensure that it is achieving its aims. The problem is that many schools have classified students using only the age criterion; programs must now be devised employing other modes of classroom organization which, while not impeding the orderly management of education, give a higher priority to its basic purposes.

ACTION TOWARD SOLUTION: THE FLEXIBLE CLASSROOM

New Applications of Existing Methods

Experiments with classroom organization were able to retain their "relevance" despite the changing thrust of curricular reform because they were largely independent of curriculum. One can teach the new physics more effectively through the use of such innovative organizational schemes as team teaching, provided the concept is thoroughly understood and properly applied—but one can teach the old physics more effectively through team teaching, too. In fact, the major need in classroom organization by 1970 was not to develop more ideas, but to use those that had already been tested and refined. Some of the "new" ideas, indeed, have been around for more than a decade, and deserve wider application in humanizing the classroom.

Team Teaching. Two or more professional staff members (ordinarily four or five) assume the responsibility for all or most of the learning activities for a group of students. The arrangement calls both for planning together and teaching together in the learning setting. Sometimes all are peers, and the arrangement is referred to as cooperative teaching. Sometimes there is a leader and the rest of the team are peers. Sometimes there is a leader, several peer teachers, and a teacher aide or aides.

Differentiated Staffing. A broad range of manpower, including teachers, interns, technicians, members of other professions, parents, retirees, and students themselves as teachers, is used to provide instruction. Such teams both plan and teach together. Within the professional teacher ranks there is differentiation of

assignment depending on staff members' interests, talents, and commitments.

Cross-Age Teaching. Grouping for instruction is based on some characteristic other than age. Achievement and emotional maturity are common criteria. Others include interest, special talent, and unique background and experience outside the school. Cross-age teaching is often a part of or leads to nongraded schools.

Nongraded School. Students are organized for learning on some basis other than age-grade placement. In the fullest implementation of nongrading, students progress through several years of schooling accomplishing increasingly complex learning tasks as their learning rates dictate. This is without reference to age and without a grade-level designation.

Individually Prescribed Instruction. A separate content, methodology, and timetable for accomplishment are provided for each student based on his interests, needs, abilities, and learning rate. (In less sophisticated versions, the only individualization is in terms of the timetables for mastery of content; all students are exposed to the same methodology and content.)

Programed Instruction. Sequenced learning experiences are provided in which there is high correspondence among the parts and through which inductive processes are carefully regularized and frequently based on reinforcement techniques such as exact repetition and adapted repetition. Programing may involve books and other printed material, learning machines, and simulation.

Open Space Schools. Physical facilities are designed for carrying on learning activities requiring a broad range of group sizes, instructional settings, media, equipment, and materials.

Modular or *Flexible Scheduling.* Learning experiences are organized in time blocks of varying lengths depending on purpose and extent of the learning activity. Sometimes it entails combining two or more time units (modules) of the same length in order to provide the student with enough time to adequately complete his task.[8]

Abundant professional literature describes how these innovations can be applied, and the experiences of schools around the country—unfortunately still small in number—prove that alternate modes of grouping learners do work.

- Bushard Elementary School in Fountain Valley, California, initiated its fifth-graders into the mysteries of group communication by establishing "fishbowl" seminars. Six children sat in a circle discussing a problem of common interest—ranging from environmental pollution to why girls shouldn't play football—while the rest of the class listened. Another chair was left vacant for any outsider who wanted to join temporarily. The "fishbowl" is intended to give students a chance to express their opinions, make decisions, examine alternate solutions, and choose the most likely answer. Equally important, each session is followed by a general class evaluation of the interruptions, those who talked all the time, those who said nothing, and those who looked as if they wanted to say something, but didn't.
- A linguistics-oriented English curriculum, now in its third year in the Avon, Connecticut, public schools, embodies a philosophy of continuous progress through 28 nongraded levels of increasing difficulty in grammar, reading, and composition. All three topics are in sequence and interrelated, so that the individual may move as quickly as he can or as slowly as he must.
- The Lulu Walker Elementary School in Tucson, Arizona, has noticeably increased student interest in schooling by giving everyone a different schedule every day. Each student is assigned to large groups for part of his instruction, to small groups for part, and to independent study or individualized work for part. This daily variety, utilizing facilities designed to accommodate dozens of learners or just one, enables the school to provide a more stimulating learning climate for children and to better use teacher time and talent. Teachers can specialize by choosing the areas in which they feel most competent: some teach only small groups, while others elect to meet with all the children at one time for certain instructional purposes.

Performance Contracting. Performance contracts came into vogue about 1969, when the U.S. Office of Education underwrote a remedial reading project in the public schools of Texarkana—a city shared by Texas and Arkansas. Under the terms of the project, Dorsett Educational Systems, Inc.—a profit-making corporation—would bring selected "underachievers" up to the reading norms for their grade level, or would not be paid. If the company achieved its goal in a shorter length of time than that specified, or if it produced more than the agreed-upon gains in student performance, it would receive a bonus.

Early results of the project were clouded by indications that at least some of the students had seen items from the final evaluation test during the regular instructional program. Despite this question as to the validity of the results, the school system indicated satisfaction with the program. In the meantime, performance contracting caught on around the country; by July 1970, about 150 school systems had begun planning similar programs with private contractors, and the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity announced that it would finance experiments in 18 school districts.[9]

The NEA and the AFT were critical of the use of federal funds to finance performance contracting, for the involvement of private corporations in public education would probably not reflect the best thinking available about the ends and means of schooling. However, as 1970 drew to a close, it appeared that performance contracting had caught the public imagination.

Organization Follows Intent

The principal point to be made about adopting any innovative form of classroom organization (or even retaining, for some purposes, the self-contained classroom) is that *organization follows from instructional intent*. That is, there is no point in attempting to determine how a class or a school should be organized until specific learning objectives have been determined. After that, class and school organization can be tailored to facilitate the learning task.

Experiment with ways of grouping learners other than by their age—for example, by their varying capacities in each subject. Try letting students decide for themselves which level of difficulty they are capable of in each subject; they'll be upset for a while, because it has seldom been suggested to students that they are capable of making some decisions about their own education—even though *every* educator professes to believe that one purpose of education *is* to help learners develop a sense of responsibility for their own choices. It might be educational to allow them to make a few.

Reject the doctrine that each grade must be attended for precisely one school year; establish levels of mastery for each unit of instruction, and let each student move through the levels as quickly as he can or as slowly as he must.

Take a new look at compulsory attendance. If the only thing a school system had to teach in eight years of elementary school were the multiplication tables, some curriculum expert would

figure out how to spread the work over eight years. Much the same process occurs now, only in smaller segments. Let students absent themselves from school when their progress warrants it, so that they will not clutter up the cafeteria line and reduce the amount of individual attention that teachers can spare for youngsters who need one-to-one help. Theodore Roszak told the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development in March 1970, "at least between ourselves and the young, we might begin talking up the natural rights of truancy and the education possibilities of hooky—which is after all only matriculation into the school-without-walls that the world itself has always normally been for the inquisitive youth." [10]

Eliminate the 50-minute rule; using Title III funds, buy every student a Timex and disconnect the damn bell. Neither *Hamlet* nor the art of baking a lemon meringue pie should be chopped up into 50-minute segments. Post learning objectives at the beginning of a period of instruction so that every student is aware of the performance expected of him and the assignment designed to prove it, and then let him leave class as soon as he is confident he can carry out the assignment on his own. Let the others stay in class for one hour, two, or all day, if they need more instruction; why does everybody have to study algebra or geography every day?

Convert the school into a kind of lazy susan, beginning by renaming each classroom; instead of making 205 the sophomore social studies room, make it "Mr. Reilly's room." That's where he is all day, giving a certain unit of instruction (which he's posted on the door, like the title of a movie on a theater marquee) at 10 and again at 2; at other times he's there (sitting in the old Morris chair he brought in to replace the desk whose drawers he never needed) to answer questions, to work with students, and to advise shy boys on lines of conversation they might pursue during dates. And if a student misses the lecture because he's spending that entire week following a chemistry experiment through to its conclusion, it's all right; that lecture will be repeated in two weeks, and anyhow it's in the library, on tape.

Each week set aside an afternoon (as the Princeton, New Jersey, Regional Schools have done) or even a full day for teachers to play a professional version of hooky. Such "Thursdays for Thinking" could, as an evaluation committee wrote of the Princeton program, provide "an unusual emphasis on the professional's need to look at himself anew; to explore new patterns of education; to try new

modes of behavior; to rethink the art and humanity of teaching; and to involve citizens in the educational process. It is based on the simple notion that professionals need time if they are to improve their performance fundamentally." [11]

PROBLEM: THE USES OF EVALUATION

Common personal experiences, as well as a number of research studies, have shown that high grades in school are poor predictors of success in life, whether "success" be defined in terms of income, fame, or personal happiness. On the whole, grades predict primarily one thing: grades. The youngster who received an A in third-grade reading is likely to receive an A in fourth-grade reading, and the sophomore who gets a C in algebra is likely to get a C the next year in plane geometry. In neither case does the grade consistently predict success in life nor augur failure.

The Grade as a Verdict

What, then, is the purpose of the grade system? In the hands of a wise, competent, and compassionate teacher, grades and the tests on which they are based can be helpful diagnostic tools, as a stethoscope and a thermometer are to a doctor. But a complex of classroom conditions makes it difficult for a teacher to use the grading system as a diagnostic tool. Instead it becomes a judgment. Faced with 25 children of varying abilities, told by a school board to "cover" the multiplication tables or Jacksonian Democracy in four weeks, and prevented by school rules from releasing some children for independent or group study so that he can concentrate on helping the slow learners, the teacher has no choice except to apply the same yardstick to all his charges and to record for someone's benefit—the school board's? the parents'? the glee club's? God's?—the fact that some children didn't measure up.

Didn't measure up to what? To the school system's judgment of what constitutes scholastic success. And on what is that judgment based? Sir Alec Clegg of Yorkshire, England, comments on the absurdity of much school curriculum:

> The old bogey of the body of knowledge still rears its stupid head from time to time. This is extremely odd when we know that the sum of knowledge is doubling every few years and that it is thus becoming more and more difficult to identify which

knowledge is to constitute the "body" that every child should possess. Furthermore, how do we vary this body to meet the varying abilities of the child? Must he know that Paris is the capital of France and Ottawa of Canada? If so, must he also know the capital of Botswana? Must he know where Botswana is? Must he know equally about George Washington and King John and Hitler? Or whether Milan is north or south of New York? It is because this is such obvious nonsense that subjects and lessons as we used to know them seem to have disappeared from those schools that have most successfully resolved their behavior problems.[12]

"When a child feels failure," writes William Glasser, author of *Reality Therapy* and *Schools Without Failure*, and consulting psychiatrist to the Los Angeles City and Palo Alto school systems,

he doesn't just feel failure here, there or some place else; it pervades his whole system. Ask a child, and I've asked plenty of them in the schools where I work, "What happens when you get a low grade on your report card? What does it mean?" The kids all say, "I'm a bad person." Invariably they say that. When you [teachers] give the grade, to you it was just a low grade; but to the child it means that he is a bad person—somebody who is no good.[13]

The grading system can make enormous sense—but only if its users hold hard and fast to the fundamental truth that education and schools, grades and examinations, diplomas and chalk exist to help create human beings, not to pass a verdict on them.

The wint is saying the wimter is cumeing and all the squirrels abawt thrling with friyt the trees get rid of theer onley bytey the niyt lovs impasele across its glomey medows winters coming cots and and scars the old wold is come dacto use the winte movs sloley pist snow flos lily fethers of an engel.

Ossian? Chaucer? No—a nine-year-old English boy, writing in 1969, who cannot spell:

The wind is saying the winter is coming and all the squirrels about thrilling with fright. The trees get rid of their only beauty. The night moves impatiently across its gloomy meadows. Winter is coming. Coats and scarves. The old world has come back to us. Winter moves slowly past. Snow falls like the feathers of an eagle.[14]

How many people of any age who can spell can write like that? Yet this paragraph, measured by the usual indices of school performance, would merit a failing grade. Lacking a teacher who has

the wit *and the time* to recognize an extraordinary talent, the future of this boy can be predicted: either he will accept the idea that he is not intelligent and withdraw into the protective stance of obvious stupidity, or he will stop gambling with distinctive expression, stop chancing words he cannot spell, and stick to those he can. *Here* comes Sue. *See the* Queen. "Your son is making wonderful progress with his spelling."

Having been expelled from West Point for flunking a chemistry examination, James Whistler cast about for an alternate career and decided to try painting; " 'If silicon had been a gas,' he later remarked, 'I'd have been a major general.' "[15] Whistler's work lives; how many major generals can say this? Thomas Edison was rejected by his first-grade teacher as "unable" after only three months of attendance; not knowing how else to occupy her son, Edison's mother gave him an elementary text on physics and found, to her surprise, that he didn't require much help in learning to read it. Gregor Mendel failed the Austrian teacher's examination four times and finally gave up trying; prevented from spending his days in a classroom, he devoted himself to experimenting with sweet peas in the garden of his monastery and cracked the genetic code which Charles Darwin—another poor student, a dropout from both medical school and divinity school—had known must exist but could not decipher. Harrow, the exclusive English boys' school, used to parade its students on parents' visiting day in a single line according to scholastic standing; the brightest boy would march first, and the last boy would be forced to straggle by under the indignant gaze of his parents—but Winston Churchill got over it.

But these men are exceptions. How many poor scholars never do get over it? For every example of magnificent human achievement following school failure, there must be countless cases of human failure largely traceable to a man's or woman's childhood conviction that an F in school inevitably leads to an F in life. It is a high price to pay for not knowing that Ottawa is the capital of Canada or that $(a+b)^2 = a^2 + 2ab + b^2$.

And it is possible that A students pay an equally high price, though at a different stage of their careers. Encouraged by the schools' ecstatic pronouncements to think highly of themselves and thus motivated to proceed from school success to college success, many make the disconcerting discovery that academic achievement does not readily translate into success in life; they face the melancholy realization that former school classmates,

consigned to the "average" or "slow" category, may suddenly blossom into fulfillment as adults.

The Effects of Grading on Curriculum

During the 1960's not nearly as much experimentation was conducted in evaluation as in curriculum planning and classroom organization. There was much more criticism than experiment; more people complained about evaluation than offered creative alternatives. The IQ and standardized reading tests were attacked as being "culture-bound," i.e., biased in favor of youngsters whose socioeconomic background approximated that of the white, middle-class, "typical" American.

As we have seen earlier, grading itself came in for criticism in that it frequently measured achievement by comparing youngsters to each other, rather than comparing each individual's achievement with his capacities. Equally insidious but much more subtle, grading tended to shape the curriculum: those aspects of learning which could be easily measured, such as reading speed and comprehension, dominated both tests and instruction, to the detriment of such other qualities as the ability to appreciate and create beauty. Understanding and nurturing creativity in writing, painting, sculpture, and the performing arts has generally eluded education. The Commission on Tests appointed by the College Entrance Examination Board recommends these dimensions as important considerations for schooling:

> . . . musical and artistic talent; sensitivity and commitment to social responsibility; political and social leadership; athletic, political and mechanical skills; styles of analysis and synthesis; ability to express oneself through artistic, oral, nonverbal or graphic means; ability to organize and manage information; ability to adapt to new situations; characteristics of temperament; "sources and status of motivation," and "work habits under varying conditions of demand." [16]

ACTION TOWARD SOLUTION: EVALUATION FOR DIAGNOSIS

Evaluation vs. Grading

The first step toward any improvement is to distinguish between evaluation, as commonly practiced in the schools, and grading.

Grading—the process of appraising youngsters in relation to one another, ranking them on a ladder from best to worst—is not only unnecessary to instruction but is often positively harmful. Evaluation, on the other hand—appraising a youngster's progress toward the achievement of goals considered important to him, so that he can be allowed to move toward higher levels of complexity if successful, and so that instructional techniques can be varied if past methods do not enable him to succeed—is essential to good education. Grading can be incorporated *within* a system of evaluation, provided that teachers and schools regard low grades as an indication that change is needed in the instructional process, rather than as a final judgment on a youngster's performance.

New Concepts for Evaluation

Despite the general lack of experimentation with new ways of evaluating student performance, some important new concepts about it emerged during the last decade. Among these, two might be cited as particularly provocative: *operationally stated objectives* and *evaluation on the basis of performance, not time.* Though developed independently, these ideas are not alternative ways of evaluating; rather, in a complete scheme of evaluation, they can be used together within the instructional framework to diagnose—based on the concept that schools exist not to judge children, but to enable them to succeed.

Operationally Stated Objectives. The goals of most educational programs, if they are stated anywhere, are generally expressed in vague terms that make evaluation impossible. In the passage cited earlier, Tyler writes of teachers who claim to teach their subject because "it is essential to a well-rounded education." [17] Similarly, the objectives of individual courses or lesson units are stated in some such fashion as this: " 'the teaching of the concept of the electron orbits surrounding the atom as an explanation of valence.' "[18]

Neither of these is an objective that can be evaluated. An operationally stated objective, by contrast, expresses more than an ideal ("a well-rounded education") or a description of the course; it states what the student will be able to do as a consequence of having learned the unit. The chemistry unit about valences, for example, might be rephrased in these terms: " 'Learning the concept of electron orbits surrounding the atom as an explanation for valence, so that *at least* 85% of students can correctly associate

the electron configuration in the first four orbits with the valence state of the atom, as measured by a diagrammatic quiz.' " [19]

Not all learning objectives can be stated in such quantitative terms. Particularly in the humanities and social sciences, teachers and other curriculum planners will have to exercise a considerable degree of ingenuity in trying to state what a student shall be able to do—to describe the change that should occur in him—upon the completion of a learning unit. And some of these evaluations will inevitably require a certain amount of subjectivity.

The objectives of a unit on poetry, for example, might be stated as, "Given four brief poems of varying merit on a single theme, the student shall select the one he considers best, the one he considers worst, and the reasons for his choice." On history: "Given 20 facts about two unnamed European societies separated 100 years in time, the student shall correctly assign not less than 15 of these facts to the society of which they were characteristic." In social science: "The student shall choose any 2 of the 50 states and explain why at least one city in each exceeds the state capital in population."

Difficult as this effort to state learning goals in operational terms may be, it serves a secondary objective in that it forces teachers and other curriculum specialists to ask themselves whether a certain course or lesson should be included in an educational program at all. Is it important for a student to be able to identify the valence of an electron configuration, to distinguish between a good poem and a poor one, to understand why one community becomes a major city while another goes into decline? *Why* is it important? Too many courses or parts of them have been defended by rhetoric such as "well-rounded education." Emphasizing student performance rather than the content of a lesson subjects the rhetoric to analysis, thus placing some traditional content in fresh perspective and exposing some as antiquarian nonsense. Viewing an entire curriculum in terms of operationally stated objectives, therefore, can stimulate among the faculty a dialogue that will teach them as much as they can ever hope to teach their students.

And, finally, such precisely defined performance objectives give teachers a means of appraising their own performance—indications of the points at which their teaching succeeded and at which it failed, and clues to the ingredients of that elusive art-science called "good teaching."

Evaluation on the Basis of Performance, Not Time. Evaluating anyone's performance requires clearly stated criteria, so this con-

cept is related to operationally stated objectives. It is distinct from present methods of evaluation in that the student's performance is rated in terms of his progress toward achieving an objective, that the instruction will continue until the student achieves satisfactorily (though it should be varied if repeated failure indicates that a change is needed), and that the time it takes him to achieve that objective is irrelevant or, at least, of secondary importance.

This concept differs from traditional classroom practice in that most learning units—the multiplication tables; the Thirty Years' War; the inspection, diagnosis, and repair of a faulty fuel pump—are assigned a definite time period. The student is expected to master the unit within that time period; after that, he receives a grade on his achievement so far, because the class must move on to new material.

Yet in any well-designed curriculum, the understanding of one unit of instruction is related to what has gone before. It is folly to push a slow student into differential equations when he has yet to comprehend simple equations; if it is important for him to understand simple equations, the teacher must find a way to develop that understanding, no matter how much time it takes. All that grading on the basis of time does in this case is to guarantee that, if a student received a D in a unit on simple equations, he will most assuredly receive another D or worse on differential equations.

Perhaps the most provocative use of this performance concept has been made by Benjamin Bloom in his writing on "curriculum mastery." Bloom believes that about 90 percent of any student body can completely master all the concepts and skills required in a course; he views aptitude not as a measure of a student's intellectual ability in a subject, but as a function of the time each student requires to achieve a desired level of skill. For Bloom, in essence, every student (excluding those who are genuinely handicapped in some sense) can get an A in every subject; but some will require more time than others, a different teaching technique, or a different choice of curricular materials. In Bloom's scheme, evaluation serves these functions:

1. It indicates when a student has mastered a concept or skill and is ready to move on.
2. It indicates that another student has not yet mastered a unit, and requires more time.
3. It indicates to the teacher that the mode of presentation and/or curricular materials must be varied.[20]

In both the operationally-stated-objectives and the performance-not-time concepts, then, evaluation functions as a diagnostic tool, indicating symptoms of learning difficulty and stimulating the teacher's search for alternatives. These diagnostic functions of evaluation can be seen in the diagram on the following page, adapted from a publication of the Kettering Foundation's Institute for the Development of Educational Activities, Inc.[21]

Implications of Diagnostic Evaluation for the Schools

It is important to note that this use of evaluation to guide instructional technique has profound implications for school organization. In the flow chart on page 68, for example, one can see that the solution to Johnny's problem, as well as the proper management of the learning program for his classmates, implies a school organization that permits the use of these techniques:

- *Team teaching:* As far as Johnny is concerned, Mr. Smith has a magic that the other teachers don't; in a self-contained classroom, he would have no chance to benefit from Mr. Smith's distinctive ability—nor would his regular teacher be able to extend his distinctive abilities to Johnny's classmates in other rooms.
- *Continuous progress:* Johnny and five of his classmates are having trouble with unlike fractions—but most of the others apparently aren't, and should be free to go on to new material. The self-contained classroom typically forces all children to proceed at one pace, holding up the fast learners and ignoring the difficulties of the slow ones.
- *Flexible grouping:* In a typical classroom, one teacher supervises 25 to 30 children. Grouping on the bases of learning task, teacher specialty, and individual progress rather than on the basis of age enables one teacher to handle 60 or even 75 youngsters for some units of instruction, while the others on the teaching team take small groups of 10 or less.
- *Flexible facilities:* To allow for flexible grouping you need teaching areas that can be adapted to accommodate frequently changing numbers of learners. The 5 children who are having trouble should be able to work with Mr. Smith in a quiet place—but the other 75 should not have to crowd into two classrooms so that the 5 can have the third room to themselves.

The purpose of schools is to help young humans succeed, in the broadest, most expansive sense. To perform that task, schools

Assessment: What has Johnny learned?

1/4 + 1/4 = 2/4
2/3 + 1/3 = 3/3
1/8 + 3/8 = 4/8
1/4 + 1/2 = 2/6
1/3 + 5/6 = 6/6

Objectives: What does Johnny need to learn?

To demonstrate his ability to add unlike fractions.

Diagnosis: Johnny works well with small groups, he likes to manipulate things, and he responds well to Mr. Smith.

Instructional Problem: How can we select and manage teaching resources—teacher/learner activities, materials, media, time, space, equipment, personnel, and grouping—to accommodate his learning style and help him meet his objectives?

Instructional Strategy: Place Johnny with five other children who need to learn how to add unlike fractions; Mr. Smith will use Cuisenaire rods to help them learn.

Reassessment: Has Johnny achieved his objectives?

2/8 + 2/4 = 3/4
2/3 + 4/6 = 8/6
3/8 + 1/4 = 5/8

must evaluate student progress—not only as a gauge of the students' progress, but as *a check on the school's own performance.* Present methods of evaluation do not help children explore themselves; they merely subject them to an academic competition which has little bearing on the youngsters' future—but which, as Eda LeShan writes, has quite an unfavorable effect on their present lives:

> It appears that in all our efforts to provide "advantages" we have actually produced the busiest, most competitive, highly pressured and over-organized generation of youngsters in our history—and possibly the unhappiest. We seem hell-bent on eliminating much of childhood.[22]

Ole Sand summarizes promising trends in evaluation as being:

From	To
1. Tests as punishment	Evaluation as a stimulant, a humane guide to continued growth and learning
2. Measurement by paper-and-pencil tests	A variety of evaluation techniques with emphasis on observation
3. Memory of the facts	Focus on creativity and inquiry
4. Exams at the end of a course	Cooperative and continuous evaluation
5. Narrow range of behaviors measured	Evaluation of cognitive, affective, and psychomotor behaviors
6. Evaluation only by the teacher	Self-evaluation
7. Colleges setting "standards" for admission	Colleges cleaning up their sterile programs and working with schools to develop valid evaluation techniques[23]

Strategies for Action

A crucial step in the characteristically slow-moving game of educational change is the development of mutual understanding as to what is to be revised or modified and what form the modification will take. The suggestions below reflect what might be the steps necessary for the NEA to take in such an action-oriented strategy.

For the Nation. Staff a commission to work with college and university scholars in developing new methods for appraising student progress that will provide teachers with genuine diagnostic tools.

Mount a national public information campaign to help laymen understand the deficiencies of the grading system, and to obtain their support for eliminating this system.

Disseminate to educators information about the alternate methods of student evaluation now in use, e.g., the "pass-fail" system. This system allows students to take courses for credit hours toward graduation without the pressure of getting a B instead of a C. The rationale, at least in part, is that fear of receiving a low grade prevents many students from exploring disciplines or courses that interest them, but which they know too little about to gauge their own aptitude.

Distribute materials describing the methods for developing an individually prescribed instruction program based on diagnosis of student strengths and weaknesses.

For the States. Work with state higher education groups to urge modification of the stress on high school grades and current College Board scores as criteria for college admission toward alignment with competencies noted on page 63.

Work with state organizations of business-interest groups (Chamber of Commerce, National Association of Manufacturers, industrial specialists such as personnel managers, etc.) to broaden businessmen's understanding of the weaknesses of high school grades and diplomas as criteria for employment, and the loss to the economy in accepting academic records as a valid index of ability.

For Local Communities. Urge elimination of the grading system by local school officials; as a step toward what would be a radical reform in most communities, devise experiments in individual schools that will allow the public to appraise grading in relation to more informative types of evaluation.

Life will draw up its own indictments sooner or later, but the society that calls in the jury when one of its children is only nine years old passes a judgment on itself more harsh than any Stanford-Binet ever pronounced. Let General Motors, Montgomery Ward, Chicken Delight, and Household Finance determine whether, for their specialized purposes, a young man or woman will succeed or fail; it is the purpose of the schools to help each boy and

girl determine what he or she can succeed at—to give them an honest pair of dice, to state the odds, and to let all of them roll their own when they have found a game to their liking.

THE HUMANE PROGRAM

Instructional programs aimed at developing the full range of human capacities, not just the intellectual; evaluation for the purpose of improving instruction, not for comparing children; and school organization that frees the student and the teacher to focus on learning, not the clock or the semester—these are some of the components of a humane education, an education that gives every individual a personal vision of what he might become rather than forcing him to come up to standards devised in other days for purposes that are no longer pertinent.

The emphasis is on ease, freedom, pleasure—and yet some standards must remain. *I am* in French is *je suis*, not *j'ai* or *je soos* or *je swees*. Humane education does not urge accepting a near-miss in place of a hit on the grounds that a child's self-concept must be strengthened at all costs. It does insist that children be educated for life, not tests, and that the tests by which we presumably evaluate a student's progress toward the mastery of essential skills have more and more lost contact with the realities for which education is supposed to be a preparation. Humane education argues that school curriculums are narrow, cut off from the world, impoverished in their conception of man (who is much more than a rational animal), and that while educators have chimed in with everyone else about the "accelerating pace of change," they have not interpreted the consequences of change for subject matter. It was not until the mid-1800's—250 years after the death of Shakespeare, almost 200 after the death of Milton, another 25 years after the death of Keats—that Oxford decided English was a sufficiently dignified language to justify classifying its poetry and drama as "literature," and to add a chair for its study to those for Latin, Greek, Hebrew, and Italian. The rigidities of other times seem quaint, absurd; are we doing any better?

Humane education, finally, insists that learning is one of the most exciting and deeply fulfilling human activities, and that something has gone haywire when the whole process has to be surrounded by a Gestapo-like environment that stresses order, discipline, neatness, and SILENCE WHEN YOU ARE NOT

RECITING, and hooks the whole business up to a system of emotional punishment. Being engrossed in anything brings its own discipline—discipline of the best kind: the self-imposed kind that leads a person, young or old, to choose one activity over another because he cannot do both at the same time.

How do you make learning more engrossing, more exciting, more fun than raising hell? For a start, by opening up the schools in ways we have tried to suggest above. They are suggestions, and all of them can be misused. In the right hands, they can produce an educational process that is fundamentally better because it is directed toward fundamentally different goals.

"In the right hands" means teachers who are free to exercise their own humaneness—teachers who don't have to pretend to know it all or to be right all the time, who don't have to defend every decision by the school board, and who have the right of any professional to depart from prescribed technique as soon as it proves a failure.

In the example used at the beginning of this section, the A. B. Dick Company was right to reward a teacher for trying to enliven *Silas Marner* by converting it into an exercise in journalism. That calls for imagination and energy of a high degree—and maybe more than a touch of desperation. In a school system that permitted each teacher to use his own judgment and to act on the evidence of his observation, he might have decided that any work requiring so much artificial respiration does not deserve life; instead he might ask his students to figure out why Falstaff and The Penguin are so much more beguiling and memorable than their respective straight men, Prince Hal and Batman. And 40 years later, an insurance man, introduced to one facet of literature by a teacher with the freedom and freshness to bring Shakespeare and a comic book together, might interrupt a school board meeting saying, "Oh, phooey, let's leave the teachers alone; they know what they're doing."

FOOTNOTES

1. Tyler, Ralph W. *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1950. p. 3.
2. Time. "Vocational Schools: Learning a Living." *Time* 92:47; July 19, 1968.

3. Foshay, Arthur W. "Schools for People." Paper prepared for the Teachers College Curriculum Conference. Columbia University, New York City, October 23-25, 1969. p. 2. (Unpublished)

4. *Ibid.*, p. 11.

5. *Ibid.*, p. 12.

6. Postman, Neil, and Weingartner, Charles. "What's Worth Knowing?" *Radical School Reform.* (Edited by Beatrice and Ronald Gross.) New York: Simon and Shuster, 1969. p. 164.

7. Black, Jonathan. "Street Academies: One Step off the Sidewalk." *Saturday Review* 52:88-89; November 15, 1969.

8. These definitions were prepared by Bernard McKenna, associate secretary, NEA Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards.

9. Education Turnkey News. "Where It's Happening." *Education Turnkey News* 1:1; July 1970.

10. Roszak, Theodore. "Education Contra Naturam." (Address given at the 25th annual conference of ASCD, San Francisco, March 1970. *A Man for Tomorrow's World.* (Edited by Robert R. Leeper.) Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, NEA, 1970. p. 27.

11. Evaluation Committee, Princeton Regional Schools. *Report on the Wednesday Program.* Princeton, N. J.: the Committee, 1969. p. 1. (Mimeo.)

12. Clegg, Sir Alec. "What Is a Humanizing Curriculum?" *National Elementary Principal* 49:11; February 1970.

13. Glasser, William. "The Effect of School Failure on the Life of a Child, Part 2." *National Elementary Principal* 49:12; November 1969.

14. Clegg, Sir Alec, *op. cit.*, p. 11.

15. McCord, David. Commencement address given at Colby College, Waterville, Maine, June 1969.

16. Stevens, William K. "Panel Asks Wide Reform of College Board Exams." *New York Times*, November 1, 1970. p. 49.

17. Tyler, Ralph W., *op. cit.*, p. 3.

18. Peterson, Russell W. "Accountability in Elementary and Secondary Education." (Speech presented at the Education Commission of the States Conference, Denver, July 1970.) *National Committee for Support of the Public Schools News*, July 1970. p. 2.

19. *Ibid.*

20. Bloom, Benjamin. "Learning for Mastery." *UCLA Evaluation Comment.* Los Angeles: Center for the Study of Evaluation of Instruction Programs, May 1968.

21. Institute for the Development of Educational Activities, Inc. (An affiliate of the Charles F. Kettering Foundation). *Individually Guided Education*. Dayton, Ohio: the Institute, 1970.

22. LeShan, Eda J. *The Conspiracy Against Childhood*. New York: Atheneum, 1968. p. 6

23. Sand, Ole. "What To Teach—and How." *High School 1980: The Shape of the Future in American Secondary Education*. (Edited by Alvin C. Eurich and the staff of The Academy for Educational Development.) New York: Pitman, 1970. pp. 122-23.

The Teachers

As Silberman points out in his *Crisis in the Classroom*, several of the most noted contemporary critics of education convey the impression that the schools are staffed by "sadists and clods"—and that it is these social misfits who are at the root of repressive practices in the schools. While admitting that teaching, like any profession, has its share of "angry, hostile, and incompetent people," Silberman suggests that the conditions under which teachers work are more at fault than the teachers themselves:

> Most teachers, however, are decent, honest, well-intentioned people who do their best under the most trying circumstances. If they appear otherwise, it is because the institution in which they are engulfed demands it of them. . . . If placed in an atmosphere of freedom and trust, if treated as professionals and as people of worth, teachers behave like the caring, concerned people they would like to be. They, no less than their students, are victimized by the way in which schools are currently organized and run.[1]

Accountability has fallen more heavily on teachers than on any other participants in the educational process; who else offers a more conspicuous or convenient target? Moreover, since teachers are the people most directly concerned with children in the classroom, they must be the villains, the ones who fail to educate, who assign failure to their students rather than to themselves.

PROBLEMS

This publication is addressed largely to teachers, and is sponsored by an organization financed mainly by teachers. For these reasons, it should get the insulting truth out of the way as quickly as possible; many teachers don't belong in the profession, and should get out of it. This is not surprising when one considers that teachers are hired by representatives of institutions that have traditionally placed high priority on authoritarian control and

order. But, in a school devoted to helping learners become self-directed, problem-solving human beings, teachers who conform to the traditional institutional mode are out of place. They might find fulfillment as tap-dance instructors, or guards in maximum-security prisons, or proprietors of reducing salons, or agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation—but they damage teaching, children, and themselves by staying in the classroom.

The Lack of Appropriate Teacher Control

Paradoxically, inadequate teachers can remain in the profession because teachers do not govern the admission of candidates into their own ranks, nor have they any control over who remains there. "It is pure myth," argued 1970 NEA President Helen Bain, "that classroom teachers can ever be held accountable, with justice, under existing conditions."[2] Her position is reflected in NCTEPS' working paper entitled "The Context and Purpose of Professional Self-Determination":

> In the present circumstances, teachers are confused and frustrated and, in the worst situations, desperate about their inability to govern their own profession. Many teachers see no way of attacking professional problems. They see no route to an appeal for reason and to ensure due process of machinery so cumbersome as to render it almost useless. As a result, teachers tend to conform, to live in fear and uncertainty, and to be timid when it comes to resisting unfair professional practices, combating autocratic demands of superiors, or demanding academic freedom. But how should they be expected to know that circumstances could be better? The profession has never had adequate mechanisms or power for ensuring professional justice for teachers. About the only alternative is appeal to civil courts. Few teachers can afford that route unless their case becomes desperate—and unless they have financial backing to assume legal fees. Also, many problems of professional self-determination are not within the jurisdiction of civil courts.[3]

These remarks are not to be read as a plea for control of all of public education by teachers. Any responsible teacher must agree that control of public schools is vested in lay bodies that draw their authority from the state, and those who recognize the need for broadening the governance of education recognize, too, the rights of parents to fight for better schooling. Yet, with regard to another aspect of teacher impotence—their inability to deviate

from rigid curricular specifications developed at the top for an entire school system—Fantini points out:

> It is inconsistent to ask more and more teachers of the disadvantaged to read, study, and try to understand the pupils as much as possible, to attempt to perceive the child's frame of reference, interests, and effects of his hidden curriculum, and, at the same time, to limit the teacher's freedom to put such knowledge to use by boxing him in with curricular mandates.[4]

Disadvantaged students are not the only ones hurt by the restrictions on teachers. *All* students, regardless of their socioeconomic background, vary in their aptitudes, interests, and learning styles, and such variations deserve a varied response from a teacher. Yet both teachers and principals, Fantini points out, are denied the freedom to alter routine practice by the current system of school governance:

> Under standard school operation, the principal attempts to implement instructional policies developed by those "above him"—from either a district superintendent who, in turn, is attempting to follow through with decisions made by the superintendent of schools. We are all familiar with the top-down flow of decision making. Under this arrangement, the agents are low men and are viewed as final implementors of remotely developed instructional policies. . . .
>
> However, teachers are the professional agents closest to the learner, and as such they should be in a better position to develop instructional policies than those who are farther removed.[5]

Inadequacies in Teacher Preparation

Any argument for giving teachers the freedom to determine instructional policies—or, at least, to deviate from standard practices when such change is indicated—must finally rest on their professionalism, that blend of education and experience which presumably equips a teacher to diagnose learning problems and then choose the appropriate remedy. Yet school failures during the last decade have directed criticism at both these presumptions, and thereby at the procedures by which teachers are educated and credentialed.

Educators are divided as to whether a teacher's professional preparation should stress the techniques of pedagogy or should instead focus on a discipline such as history or science. These are not true alternatives, of course; such programs as the Master of Arts in Teaching take college graduates with a bachelor's degree

in a subject field and introduce them to the art and science of teaching in a fifth year. Thus teacher education can combine both pedagogical and academic scholarship.

In practice, however, present programs for teacher education often do neither well. The usual liberal arts courses allow little opportunity for real inquiry and the methods courses themselves have been so frequently derided for their lack of content that they require no criticism here. The chairman of an education unit told questionable candidates that if the medical school would admit them, the school of education would consider them; after all, it's easier to take out an appendix than it is to teach reading.

Isolation from Reality. Perhaps the major defect of teacher education is its isolation from the practical classroom work and the problems of the schools. Curriculums have been designed entirely by university faculty members—usually the senior faculty, such as department heads, whose school-level teaching experience, if any, is long behind them. Schooled in a quieter age, before the pace of educational change accelerated and before the problems of dropouts and cultural differences received national attention, and accustomed to teaching college students—quite a different breed from the children whom young teachers encounter in the public schools—university faculties have generally been slow to recognize the irrelevance of much of their instruction for new teachers. It is time to take Robert J. Schaefer's advice and promote the concept of the school as the center of inquiry.[6]

The Pattern of Preparation. In addition, the sequence of teacher education is weak in two important respects. The student's practice teaching experience has been traditionally limited to one semester toward the end of his undergraduate career, instead of being woven into his education from the first or second year of college, enabling him to match theory with practice as he goes along. As the present sequence stands, the student is asked to absorb pedagogical principles in the abstract long before he sees their practical application.

Further, delaying practice teaching until the end of the student's undergraduate career makes it extremely difficult for him to choose an alternate field of study if after classroom exposure he feels that he would be happier in another profession. College and school supervisors, who are expected to weed out unsuitable candidates partly on the basis of the undergraduate's response to practice teaching, are also reluctant to force a switch after the

student has invested so much time and money in preparing for teaching. The result of the latter is that some incompetent teachers enter our school systems; of the former, that about 30 percent of those who do receive degrees in education do not enter the field.

The Weaknesses of Credentialing and Tenure

If the insipid nature of teacher education repels many who might otherwise have chosen teaching as a career and if its inadequacies produce many poorly prepared teachers, the rigidities of credentialing and tenure perpetuate weaknesses in school staffs. Certification procedures are based almost entirely on credit hours rather than on demonstrated teaching ability; moreover, no credit is given for experience outside of formal education, so that persons who have become specialists in some field of endeavor, but who lack a college degree, are prohibited from teaching.

Credentialing began as a wholesome reaction to the political process of appointing teachers in the early decades of this century. Teaching jobs were handed out by the victorious party much as various clerkships, inspectors' posts, and impressively titled sinecures still are today. The schools were riddled with political hacks; state approval of a teacher's qualifications through the credentialing system was a major reform.

Now it's time for more reform. "Perhaps if we could confer Ph.D.'s along with citizenship and a social security number at birth," former U.S. Commissioner of Education Harold Howe II told the College Entrance Examination Board in 1967,

> our schools would change from credentialing agencies to incubators of culture and centers of intellectual ferment. Barring such a development we need, at the very least, to find new ways to credential people who missed their footing on some step of the social, economic, and educational escalator.[7]

Just as credentialing began as a reaction to the spoils system in education, so tenure was instituted as a safeguard against the arbitrary firing of teachers. It retains its value in this respect, but tenure has, in some instances, provided a haven for incompetent teachers. Most often this condition is the result of inadequate interpretation and administration of the laws, rather than of the laws themselves. What is needed is a revitalized system that balances the teacher's right to reasonable security against the rights of students, parents, and other teachers to hold educators responsible for their performance, and to penalize them for failure. We in

the organized profession have given much attention to the rights of teachers and will continue to do so. But perhaps we should give equal attention to our responsibilities and maybe reorder our Commission title to the Commission on Professional *Responsibilities* and Rights.

Professional Misemployment

The preceding remarks have been directed at the processes of preparation, credentialing, and tenure that send poorly prepared teachers to the schools and help keep them there. Yet the great majority of new teachers—about 80 percent—probably have the potential to become good teachers. Of all the professions a college student might consider, teaching is the one to which all have had continuous personal exposure. The most moderately intelligent college student knows that teaching is not a lucrative occupation. This prior knowledge argues that there is a higher degree of choice, not chance, in the teacher's choice of a career—that most of them have a genuine interest in the field. If so many teachers fail or lose their initial enthusiasm for their work, then it is worth asking whether this personal attrition might not stem partly from what happens to them *after* they enter the field.

Professionals Without Recognition. The first reality that teachers encounter is that they are not treated as competent human beings with specialized expertise in educating. As remarked earlier, most instructional policies are determined by those furthest from the classroom. In addition, those officials closest to the individual school situation—including some principals, although there are many exceptions—absorb the administrative mentality until such considerations as order, quiet, and efficiency come to outweigh instructional strategy. Consider this incident from Silberman's *Crisis in the Classroom*, although for every similar official, one could cite examples of fine, humane administrators:

> A sixth-grade science teacher in a highly regarded suburban school, learning that one of his pupils is the son of a local butcher, obtains the heart and lungs of a cow. Next day, elbow-deep in tissue and blood, he shows the class how the respiratory system operates. When he returns from lunch, he finds a note from the Superintendent, who had looked in on the class that morning: "Teachers are not supposed to remove their jackets in class. If the jacket must be removed, the shirt-sleeves certainly should not be rolled up."[8]

Or this, from Bel Kaufman's *Up the Down Staircase:*

> There was one heady moment when I was able to excite the class by an idea: I had put on the blackboard Browning's "A man's reach should exceed his grasp, or what's a heaven for?" and we got involved in a spirited discussion of aspiration vs. reality. Is it wise, I asked, to aim higher than one's capacity? Does it not doom one to failure? No, no, some said, that's ambition and progress! No, no, others cried, that's frustration and defeat! What about hope? What about despair?—You've got to be practical! . . . You've got to have a dream! . . . And when the dismissal bell rang, they paid me the highest compliment: they groaned! They crowded in the doorway, chirping like agitated sparrows, pecking at the seeds I had strewn—when who should materialize but [the administrative assistant to the principal].
>
> "What is the meaning of this noise?"
>
> "It's the sound of thinking, Mr. McHabe," I said.
>
> In my letter-box that afternoon was a note from him, with copies to my principal and chairman (and—who knows?—perhaps a sealed indictment dispatched to the Board?) which read (sic):
>
> > "I have observed that in your class the class entering your room is held up because the pupils exiting from your room are exiting in a disorganized fashion, blocking the doorway unnecessarily and *talking*. An orderly flow of traffic is the responsibility of the teacher whose class is exiting from the room."
>
> The cardinal sin, strange as it may seem in an institution of learning, is talking.[9]

Such childishness on the part of adults—and why does one instinctively refer to petty, foolish behavior as "childish," when the examples considered here are adultish?—may be cured simply by calling attention to it, as Charles Silberman, Bel Kaufman, John Holt, Edgar Friedenberg, and a dozen other critics of education are doing these days.

The Misuse of Professional Talent. On the other hand, the proper utilization of professional talent requires a restructuring of the teacher's job. Many of the tasks associated with any profession need not be performed by the professional himself. Medicine is the most obvious analogy: the administration of anesthetics, the taking of X-rays and temperatures, the injection of shots, etc., can be performed by technicians with varying degrees of education. The housekeeping chores necessary to the practice of

medicine—making beds, maintaining records, preserving hygiene—can be performed by persons with a minimal education. Long ago, medicine learned to differentiate among its staff members, supporting the physician with anesthesiologists, laboratory technicians, registered and practical nurses, and hospital administrators whose fundamental skills were in management, not medicine.

Education has yet to learn this lesson—or, except in a few cases, to translate it into practice. The classroom teacher does everything: keeps records, collects money, hands out and monitors the use of supplies, supervises playgrounds and lunchrooms, grades papers—and teaches.

Which of these functions can be performed by paraprofessionals—parents, retirees, and any other citizens with sufficient interest in children to perform some valuable function for the schools? Should the broader use of paraprofessionals be regarded simply as a convenience to teachers? How can it free them for the emotionally and intellectually demanding work they were hired for in the first place? As one superintendent, a good guy, phrased it in a speech, "You don't need a bachelor's degree to read a story to children or sing a song or carve a dog out of soap. You don't need a certificate from the state of Texas to thread a film projector or make sure the kids in the lunchroom aren't rubbing their chocolate pudding into each other's hair."[10]

However, the way most schools are run today, you *do*—and that is why teachers frequently complain that they don't have time to teach. Hopefully, at some time in the near future, teachers will be solely responsible for doing what Goodlad has called the truly human tasks of the human teacher.[11]

ACTION TOWARD SOLUTION

The Teacher in Relation to the Schools

As an Individual. Humane schools cannot exist without humane teachers—teachers who, in addition to being well-prepared professionally, are free to express their own individuality, to use their own distinctive personalities as components of their teaching. A back-to-school feature story by Abby Chapkis expresses the worth of individual difference well in three paragraphs:

> A creative English teacher who has a way with kids, Mr. Jones has his eighth grade pupils eager to try their hand at everything

from composing Japanese Haiku poetry to recreating Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar* in modern dress. He's happiest in the classroom, unhappiest presiding over departmental meetings and inept collecting milk money or maintaining administrative records on his students.

Mr. Smith, on the other hand, is known by his colleagues as an administrative genius. Though competent in the classroom, he is more highly regarded for his energy, organizational wizardry, willingness to take on extra advisory tasks, and sensitive handling of both students and colleagues.

Who's the better teacher? Like carrots and oranges—both of which contain essential vitamins—neither is "better." They have different skills, interests, and ambitions.[12]

The task of schools for the 70's is to support such variations among professionals so that they succeed. If there is one concept upon which all educators are agreed, it is that of individualizing instruction—but that means respecting differences among teachers as well as among students.

As a Decision Maker. If teachers are to be held accountable for their performance, they must be given a commensurate degree of authority to alter prescribed practices which they believe contribute to school failure. This wider authority can be afforded by the school principals themselves—the men and women on the scene responsible for providing educational leadership to school staffs, and whom Goodlad believes to be the key agents of change. Leadership is more than dictation; it is drawing from within other competent people the resources for the achievement of a goal. Hence teachers in schools for the 70's must be given a much larger voice in determining what is to be taught, how, and under what conditions.

More and more often, the degree of teacher participation in instructional decisions has become a subject for negotiation (see Section III, p. 129). In a few cases, however, it has emerged by the decision of school boards and administrations to trust the professionalism of their own employees. Teachers are not just employees—they are members of a profession and expect to be valued as such.

In South Brunswick, New Jersey, for example, Superintendent James Kimple urged principals to assume near-total autonomy over the schools—but also told them they would be held accountable for the results. The teachers, in turn, were told to run their own classrooms. "In South Brunswick," Kimple explained, "teachers

select their own systems of instruction. A teacher isn't going to be any good unless she is enthusiastic about what she's doing."[13]

The results, apart from an improved teaching environment in which "75 percent of the administrators and teachers have turned themselves inside out to become better educators and better persons," include significantly higher performances by South Brunswick students in every subject area—not only higher than South Brunswick norms in previous years, but also higher than national norms.[14] And at least 75 families have called Kimple each year from nearby communities, stating their willingness to pay tuition if their children could attend school in South Brunswick—which, it should be noted, is a low-middle-income community.

Stop regarding teachers as talking textbooks and give them a chance to become managers of the learning environment—an environment consisting of man (the teacher and his staff of teacher aides, clerical assistants, and older students who teach younger ones), media, and machines. In the 1970's, no longer burdened with the dispensing of information (something that books, films, TV, and the whole world outside the school can do more efficiently and less expensively), the teacher can return to his ancient trade of philosophy—conducting a dialogue on what's true, what's false; what's moral, immoral, or amoral; what's right, what's wrong. In other words, what is the meaning of it all?[15]

As a Professional Educator. Differentiated staffing, an "innovation" honored more at education conventions than in educational practice, is intended to free the teacher for appropriate educational tasks. By the close of the 1960's, however, a number of school systems had begun experimenting with it in some form. The most publicized of these experiments were in Temple City, California; Kansas City, Missouri; and Beaverton, Oregon. In Temple City a "master teacher"—who functioned as the district's curriculum and research specialist in his subject area, and who was required to have a doctorate or the equivalent—could earn $15,000 to $20,000. Ranked below him were senior teachers, staff teachers, teacher associates, and several levels of paraprofessionals—each with different jobs at different salaries.

Such differentiation, according to Dwight Allen, offers the teaching profession several advantages:

—Good teachers will be able to afford a career in classroom teaching, rather than having to take an administrative job to obtain an increase in salary;

—Longevity—years in service, regardless of personal improvement while in service—would cease to be a criterion for promotion; and

—Students would benefit from teachers trained to handle specific responsibilities and specific teaching skills.[16]

Some critics of differentiated staffing argued, however, that it would enable school systems to offer "merit pay" in disguise—without adequate provision for preventing a school superintendent or principal from penalizing those whom either disliked—or allow school boards to economize by setting up a few, highly paid master teacherships as window dressing, reducing the number of staff positions below, and compensating by hiring large numbers of low-paid paraprofessionals.

But any good idea can be abused. As the 1970's opened, the bulk of professional comment was that differentiated staffing was a good idea. The National Association of Secondary School Principals went ahead with plans for a Model Schools project, incorporating differentiated staffing that would—

- Schedule a teacher for not more than 10 hours a week with classes of pupils, the balance of 20 hours to be spent on professional self-improvement, curriculum and materials development, evaluation, and conferences with individual pupils.
- Provide instructional assistants to oversee independent study, clerical help, and general aides for tasks that do not require competence in subject areas or in clerical skills.
- Broaden the teacher's role to include that of learning counselor, helping each of about 35 pupils to plan, schedule, and carry out individual study programs.[17]

As a Partner of Administration. Especially in the last decade, education has seen a proliferation in its own bureaucracies—and usually it is the administrator most distant from the classroom who has the greatest influence in determining what will go on there, setting curriculum, determining attendance requirements, etc. The distance of such administrators from teachers and their tendency toward rigid authoritarianism (perhaps understandable in view of community expectations and the politicalization of education) create distrust, hostility, fear, and insecurity between teaching personnel and their "bosses." Administrative jobs normally have carried greater prestige and larger salaries than teaching jobs, thus indirectly downgrading teaching and indicating that

the way to succeed in education is, in essence, to get out of education and into management.

The educational bureaucracy in state and large-city educational systems should be examined by responsible and competent parties (for example, parent-teacher-student-administrator task forces assisted by professional management-consulting firms) to determine how many existing administrative jobs are necessary.

The "up-through-the-ranks" tradition in educational administration should be reevaluated to distinguish between administrative positions that require an educational background and those that might be better (and even less expensively) filled by specialists trained in business. The greater part of a modern school superintendent's job, for example, has become a blend of politics, public relations, and business administration, with only a minor portion devoted to educational policy making; all administrative positions from the superintendency on down should be analyzed to determine where educational responsibilities can be split off from managerial responsibilities, with a consequent gain in administrative efficiency and educational performance.

Salaries for teaching positions and educational specialties (such as curriculum consulting) should be made commensurate with administrative positions, to eliminate the financial motivation that influences so many excellent teachers to leave the classroom and get behind a desk.

All administrators should be required to return to teaching periodically—for six months every four years, say—to renew their grasp of classroom problems and to diminish their psychological separation from the teaching professionals who perform the real work of education.

Principals, when viewed as instructional leaders and as people-oriented schoolmen, for maximum effectiveness might best be selected by their colleagues on a several-year cycle.

Teacher Control of the Profession

As "teacher power" began to make itself felt in the latter half of the 1960's, school systems did begin to recognize that any drive toward accountability would also have to be accompanied by new authority for teachers to regulate their own ranks. When the Ocean Hill-Brownsville Community School attempted to expel a group of teachers, the UFT called a strike that shut down the entire New York City school system. While accepting the idea

that community residents did deserve representation in the educational decision-making process, most teachers argued that they, might also be capricious. The reemerging constituencies in education have introduced tensions within the system of educational governance, and a proper system of checks and balances has yet to be found.

One approach to the problem was proposed by NEA President Helen Bain, who distinguished between governance of education in general, and control of the teaching profession in particular; the latter, she felt, was the proper and exclusive province of teachers. She listed "the achievement of self-governance for the teaching profession" as "one of the major priorities of the NEA for the 70's" and suggested this initial step:

> A first concern is the creation, by statute, of independent professional practices boards or commissions in each state. These boards must be broadly representative of the profession, and must give teachers the legal right to do at least the following:
>
> 1. Make and enforce policy decisions related to initial licensure and advanced credentialing of all educational personnel.
>
> 2. Determine, adopt, and enforce accreditation standards for initial, graduate, and in-service teacher education.
>
> 3. Develop and adopt a code of ethics and rules of procedure in accordance with established concepts of due process.
>
> 4. Enforce standards of teaching practice and ethical conduct.[18]

Improved Initial Preparation. Some progress has been made in improving teacher education. Several experiments designed to close the gap between theory and practice in teacher education were mounted in the second half of the 1960's. In Minneapolis-St. Paul, public school administrators announced a new partnership with local colleges and universities that would bring schoolmen into curricular design. "We got tired of just sitting back and accepting whatever the teacher-colleges sent us," said a spokesman.[19]

Higher educational institutions throughout the country gave new attention to teaching the disadvantaged—though too much of this emphasis was still based on courses: Project Aware, a nationwide survey of programs for educating teachers of the disadvantaged, found that more than 60 percent of the 122 college and university programs in this field were based on new courses

in urban sociology, anthropology, strategies of classroom control, and the like. Some of these specialized courses, reported the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, were taught by former teachers, and frequently amounted to little more than advice on how to survive in a particular school system. "Restricting as this may be," commented ASCD, "it is infinitely preferable to a course taught by an instructor who has no experience in or knowledge of the problems of teaching in disadvantaged areas, and who retreats to pious platitudes or irrelevant generalizations in attempting to deal with a content of which he is essentially ignorant."[20]

But some college- and university-related programs did stress personal experience in the inner city and its schools as a component of instruction. The Teacher Corps, a highly promising though chronically underfinanced federal program, offered college graduates a two-year blend of community service, inner-city or rural poverty-area teaching, and university study that would give them a master's degree, certification, and a specialty in teaching the disadvantaged. The program has been highly successful in interesting these new professionals in children whom the schools had failed: the majority of those who completed their two-year stint in 1968 remained in teaching—many in poverty-area schools. An urban education program, designed by Harry Rivlin, began the future teacher's preparation earlier in his undergraduate career: during the student's junior year, he spent the first semester as a volunteer in a community service agency, and the second semester as a paid school aide. In his senior year, the student was assigned as assistant to a specially selected classroom teacher for three hours a day.[21]

Every teacher-preparation institution should develop formal ties with school systems to guarantee that school superintendents, principals, supervising teachers, and all classroom teachers will have a voice in shaping both the teacher-preparation curriculum and the practice-teaching experience. School systems should no longer be forced into the position of accepting whatever the teachers colleges and universities send in the way of teaching candidates, nor should they defer any longer to the presumably higher wisdom of college and university faculties.

Similarly, the teacher candidates themselves should be given a greater voice in shaping the curriculums which will prepare them for their careers. Teacher education institutions should solicit the opinions of alumni as to the quality of their education, after these

graduates have had a chance to test their skills in working with students.

Continuing Professional Study. These are new currents in teacher education—but they have been restricted to new teachers. Like any profession, however, teaching has been affected by the knowledge explosion, and the education of teachers ten or more years ago slowly becomes obsolescent without continuing professional study. Recognizing this, school systems commonly encourage credentialed teachers to continue their studies by increasing salaries as they progress toward a master's or doctorate. But the teacher has had to pay for this instruction himself, and to make room for it on his own time. Education is the only mass enterprise dependent on highly skilled personnel that does not provide for the systematic updating of its employees' skills at its own expense, and on "company time." In consequence, many teachers have concluded that school systems do not take in-service education seriously, and have come to view "advanced study" as a cynical process of bolstering their paychecks through the acquisition of credit hours.

The most hopeful initiative along this line is more than a decade old: the institutes and workshops financed by the federal government under the National Defense Education Act of 1958. Originally restricted to mathematics, foreign languages, and the sciences, NDEA support for both the institutes themselves and the teachers attending them was later broadened to include the humanities and social sciences. Twelve years later, few school systems or state departments of education had followed the federal lead by investing their own funds in the continuing education of their professional staffs. This would give the professional an educational structure with opportunities for continuing growth and self-realization throughout his career. To produce such a structure a number of changes are required.

Talking thirty hours a week isn't difficult; teaching for even ten hours a week—real teaching, not just the emission of academic noise—is exceptionally difficult. A teacher needs time out of the classroom to do it properly—to analyze student response to presentations, to look for patterns of student failure and achievement, to rethink one's approach to a subject and the possibilities for improvement. If we were to spring students from the rigidities of the 50-minute class, the 6-hour day, and the compulsory attendance, we could reduce schoolteachers' loads to a level comparable

to that in higher education and give them the chance to exercise some scholarship on their own.

If school systems consider graduate courses and other varieties of in-service education important, they should pay for both tuition and the teacher's time; if they don't consider it important or don't want to pay for it, they should strike credits for continuing education from the criteria for promotion. "The influence of a teacher never stops—it continues for eternity." Mark Hopkins on the other end of the log. Faithful Miss Grundy, devoting her life to her flock. Mr. Chips, wonderful old Mr. Chips; he took boys and made them men. And so on. Let society put its money where its mouth is. If education is so important, set starting teachers' salaries at $10,000, extend the scale so that an outstanding teacher doesn't have to leave the classroom and get into the administrative game so he can take his family out to dinner now and then. Funds for continuing career development deserve high priority in the budgeting systems of American education.

Service requirements for retirement and other teacher benefits should be made sufficiently flexible to allow teachers greater freedom to move from school teaching to teaching in industry (or in government or community service or personal development programs) and back again to school teaching. For example, the teacher of a modern foreign language could serve overseas in an American embassy for two years, improving his grasp of the language and his understanding of a national culture with subsequent benefit to students. Such teacher-related service, even though outside the school system, should not cause teachers to be penalized through the reduction of benefits.

Reasonable Procedures for Credentialing and Tenure

It is important to both the progress of the teaching profession and the enrichment of educational programs that certification procedures become more flexible. State education departments should set up procedures for freeing school systems to determine their own certification procedures; the public interest and the Constitutional responsibility of the states for education require that they judge the ability of a community to depart from statewide standards, but excellence in education requires much more flexibility in the certification of teachers than state requirements now permit.

School systems or groups of them (especially in the case of small school systems) should develop methods for evaluating the

abilities of anyone wishing to teach, so that large numbers of specialists now prevented from entering classrooms as professional instructors—insurance actuaries, radio-TV repairmen, nurses, industrial chemists, computer programmers, journalists, etc.—can volunteer their services to the schools in something other than an envelope-licking or teacher aide capacity. Every community has a prodigious array of human talent developed with the aid of formal education and without it; the schools must be freed to take advantage of this talent, particularly since the knowledge explosion and the proliferation of occupational specialties have made it impossible for teachers to know much about the variety of careers open to their students.

It is also necessary to review many of the existing standards for tenure. Teachers are entitled to job security but should no longer be able to depend upon lifetime tenure as the sole basis for maintaining a place in the profession. The profession, as it moves toward self-governance, should develop procedures ensuring the continued growth of its members.

Teachers by themselves are powerless to bring all these changes about. All the constituencies of education—school boards, school administrators, parents, students—must recognize that improving the conditions under which teachers work is in their own interest, as well as that of the entire profession. And professional associations at the local, state, and national levels must place these items on their agendas if schools for the 70's are to reflect, in Silberman's phrase, "an atmosphere of freedom and trust" for teachers as well as students.[22]

FOOTNOTES

1. Silberman, Charles E. *Crisis in the Classroom*. New York: Random House, 1970. p. 142.

2. Bain, Helen P. "Self-Governance Must Come First, Then Accountability." (Editorial) *Phi Delta Kappan* 51:413; April 1970.

3. National Education Association, National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards. "The Context and Purpose of Professional Self-Determination." Working paper prepared for 1969-70 regional TEPS conferences on "Professional Self-Determination: Substance and Strategy." p. 3. (Mimeo.)

4. Fantini, Mario D. *The Reform of Urban Schools*. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, Center for the Study of Instruction, 1970. p. 38.

5. *Ibid.*, p. 81.

6. Schaefer, Robert J. *The School as a Center of Inquiry*. New York: Harper & Row, 1967.

7. Howe, Harold, II. *Picking Up the Options*. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, Department of Elementary School Principals, 1968. p. 240.

8. Silberman, Charles E., *op. cit.*, p. 145.

9. Kaufman, Bel. *Up the Down Staircase*. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1964. pp. 55-56.

10. Estes, Nolan. "An Educational Parable." Address given to the League for Educational Advancement, Dallas, Texas, November 19, 1968.

11. Goodlad, John I. *The Future of Learning and Teaching*. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, Center for the Study of Instruction, 1968.

12. National Education Association. "Discussion of Differentiated Staffing Concept Rages as Educators Argue Pros and Cons." (Press Release) *NEA News*, August 1970.

13. Harrison, Charles H. "Schools Put a Town on the Map." *Saturday Review* 53:67; February 21, 1970.

14. *Ibid.*, p. 66.

15. Sand, Ole. *On Staying Awake: Talks with Teachers*. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, Center for the Study of Instruction, 1970. p. 36.

16. Based on Dwight Allen's comments in *Differentiated Staffing in Schools*. (Education U.S.A. Special Report) Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, National School Public Relations Association, 1970. pp. 4-5.

17. Trump, J. Lloyd, and Georgiades, William. "Doing Better with What You Have: NASSP Model Schools Project." *Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals* 54:111; May 1970.

18. Bain, Helen P. *Loc. cit.*

19. Frazier, Alexander, editor. *Educating the Children of the Poor*. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1968. p. 19.

20. *Ibid.*, p. 17.

21. Rivlin, Harry N. "A New Pattern for Urban Teacher Education." *Journal of Teacher Education* 17:177-84; Summer 1966.

22. Silberman, Charles E., op. cit., p. 142.

The Students

There are those of us who still remember the movies of the 30's that glorified the apple-cheeked, loafer-shod teen-ager whose academic transgressions seldom exceeded a mild resentment toward being kept out of the "big game" because of poor grades. Well, it appears that those days, if they ever really existed outside the back lot of MGM, are over. The students in today's classes not only appear to have largely given up the traditional clean-cut image but, more significantly, also seem to be in possession of intellectual and social views that set them apart, not only from their celluloid forebears, but from their elders in present-day society.

This new breed of learner has unprecedented economic resources at his disposal, articulates a set of values that is unfamiliar to many of us, sees the nation and the world from a vastly different perspective, and, let's face it, is in many other ways quite different from the students who have progressed through our schools for decades. These differences have formed the basis for newspaper headlines, learned articles, books, and films analyzing that social condition labeled the "generation gap."

The so-called youth culture has extended from a new dress code—latched onto lately by high fashion designers and the over-25 group—to a disturbing questioning of what many citizens consider to be some of the most basic tenets of American society and culture. We have seen a somewhat humorous tussle over skirt length and hair density turn into a deadly serious debate about values, the nature of society, the role of legal-political institutions, and the relationship of the individual to the state.

At no point does this debate have more immediate impact or potential payoff than in the schools. Students are dissenting passively (this has probably always been true), they are dissenting actively, and in some instances they are dissenting violently. The real danger—that we may react to the symptom, to the dissent, rather than to its cause—is one that must be faced head-on. What is it in our schools that is turning off so many of our young

citizens? What reflection of the social malaise shines back at the youngster who looks to the school hoping to see a mirror-view of himself and his peers? What are the causes for the extension of "trashing" from slum tenement buildings to the schools nestled in spacious, middle-class suburbs?

Hopefully, through careful and thoughtful dialogue about the problems presented here, school people will begin to come to an understanding of the reasons for student dissent and, further, will act upon these reasons in ways that are considerate of the thinking student, the evolution of the school, and the progress of the nation.

PROBLEMS

At a minimum, humane education demands schooling tailored for each individual—a flexible educational program that can accommodate differences in ability to learn, readiness for learning, learning styles, social and emotional maturity, and other traits that distinguish one young human from another and that affect his scholastic performance. Yet, as we have seen in the discussion of classroom organization, the rigid patterns of many schools militate against any effective recognition of individual differences. Generally, age is the only placement criterion; the school day is divided into uniform segments that give each student the same amount of time in a subject regardless of its ease or difficulty for him; and teachers are often unimaginatively deployed. All receive a uniform program of instruction, and the grading system indicates how well students have adapted themselves to the instructional mold—not how well the schools have managed to determine where each child is and help him move ahead from that point.

Schools can overcome some of the disparities among learners through reorganization and the adoption of varied teaching strategies. But some of those disparities lie beyond the control of educators—and some of them so inhibit the realization of equal educational opportunities as to become grave social problems.

Cultural and Ethnic Differences

The most troubling of these disparities has been with us for 300 years—since the first Negroes were landed in America in chains. It is to the credit of Americans in the 1960's that we began—if

only in a faltering way—trying to remedy the manifold injustices that segregation of the races had produced in almost every aspect of American life. Yet this most explosive educational issue (and certainly one of the most divisive social issues) seemed no closer to peaceful resolution in 1970 than it had 15 years earlier, when the Supreme Court ruled that "separate but equal" educational facilities were inherently unequal, and ordered desegregation "with all deliberate speed."

Barriers to Integration. As several commentators pointed out, the result was more deliberation than speed. Nevertheless, the decade did produce evidence of significant progress. In 1964, when the Civil Rights Act was passed, only 2.5 percent of black students in the eleven states of the Old South attended schools with white classmates; by the fall of 1968, 18.4 percent attended schools in which the majority of students were white, and the Associated Press and other reporting agencies estimated that between 35 and 40 percent of black students in the Old South had white classmates.[1] Across the nation during the 1968-69 school year, according to an HEW survey, about one in four black students attended a school in which white students were in the majority.[2]

Despite such hopeful signs, total integration continued to be hampered by barriers over which school officials had little or no control. Many large cities, north and south, had such concentrations of black families that it was virtually impossible to integrate their children without crossing political lines or getting into large-scale programs of busing. The cost of housing had almost as much effect on place of residence as color, and the majority of minority parents were prohibited by their incomes (as well as by restrictive covenants or community practice) from seeking an integrated or even a better "neighborhood" school.

More fundamentally, however, many white Americans simply did not want their children to go to school with black children, and they fought desegregation with methods ranging from the forthrightly violent to the politically devious. In the South, when the Nixon Administration surprised many of its conservative friends and liberal opponents by taking segregated school systems to court, private "academies" for whites only sprang up; a few local governments and at least one state government announced plans to finance them with tax funds—but were prevented from doing so by federal rulings that prohibited this use of public

money. In mid-1970, the Internal Revenue Service ruled that private donations to these academies would not be eligible for the tax deduction normally given for charitable contributions.

In the North, where segregated schools were generally caused by patterns of residence rather than stated public policy, the emigration of whites to the suburbs continued—and the whites who remained in cities having high percentages of black families showed a tendency to place their children in private and parochial schools. In Washington, D.C., for example, blacks represent an estimated 76 percent of the population in 1970; in the school population, however, black children represent 94.3 percent.

Children as Diverse Resources. One could view desegregation—not only in education, but also in employment, housing, and other social enterprises—as a matter of social justice, a compound of conscience and fair play. The Coleman Report of 1966—the result of a directive to the U.S. Commissioner of Education, in the Civil Rights Act of 1964, to study "the lack of availability of equal educational opportunities for individuals by reason of race, color, religion, or national origin" throughout the United States and its possessions—offered a more specific view of integration as one key to educational improvement for minority children.[3]

In the Fall 1967 issue of *Public Interest*, Coleman reported that he and his colleagues had indeed discovered disparities in the quality of educational opportunity afforded white and nonwhite children—disparities in teacher salaries, pupil-teacher ratios, availability of school libraries and laboratories, and other factors traditionally associated with school excellence. Surprisingly, however, these differences were not large—certainly not large enough to account for the large gaps in achievement between white and minority children. In fact, Coleman wrote that for broad geographic areas and for each racial or ethnic group, the physical and economic resources of a school had very little relation to the achievement of its students.[4]

Two other factors were much more closely related: first, the family background, the educational and economic resources provided by the home environment; second, the educational resources provided by a student's classmates. Both these factors, Coleman found, bore more relation to student achievement than any resources provided by the school district.[5]

School integration by itself can do nothing to bolster the "hidden curriculum" which child development specialists have

found in the home: the parental attitudes toward education, the availability of reading matter, and—perhaps most important—the frequency with which parents discuss matters, whether trivial or important, in the presence of their children. But school integration can bring the second kind of educational resource to bear on culturally deprived children—the experience of meeting, knowing, and learning with children who come from homes where education is valued and supported. The classmates to whom a child is exposed make an important difference in student achievement.

After discussing the variations from school to school and their effect on student performance, the Report calls attention to the importance of variations between students in a *single* school:

> . . . this variability is roughly four times as large as the variability between schools. For example, a pupil attitude factor, *which appears to have a stronger relationship to achievement than do all the "school" factors together, is the extent to which an individual feels that he has some control over his own destiny*. . . . The responses of pupils to questions in the survey show that minority pupils, except for Orientals, have far less conviction than whites that they can affect their own environments and futures. When they do, however, their achievement is higher than that of whites who lack that conviction.
>
> Futhermore, while this characteristic shows little relationship to most school factors, *it is related, for Negroes, to the proportion of whites in the schools*. Those Negroes in schools with a higher proportion of whites have a greater sense of control.[6] [Author's italics.]

Thus integration, apart from its justification in social equity, seemed to be a powerful strategy for overcoming the gaps in achievement between white and minority students. Those gaps were serious, the Report pointed out; more importantly, the schools—far from closing the gaps between white and minority learners as the years passed—seemed powerless to prevent their actual widening. In the metropolitan Northeast, the average Negro sixth-grader was 1.6 years behind his white peer; by ninth grade, the difference had increased to 2.4 years, and by twelfth grade, to 3.3 years.[7]

The evidence, in sum, pointed to the social necessity of school integration if the United States was going to take its centuries-old doctrine of equal rights for all citizens seriously. In 1970, we still had not offered a definite and convincing answer.

Unequal Educational Investment

One of the most striking findings of the Coleman Report—and one that came as a surprise to most educators—was that differences between schools in such matters as faculty salaries, teachers' education, pupil-teacher ratios, numbers of library books per student, and other factors long considered indices of school quality were not that closely related to student achievement.

This does not mean, however, that the value of these traditional determinants of school quality is negligible. They do account for a substantial portion of student achievement—and more so in the case of the "culturally deprived" students than the "culturally lucky." Coleman and his colleagues found, for example, that while about 10 percent of the achievement of white students in the South can be directly attributed to the particular schools they attend, about 20 percent of black students' achievement can be so attributed. The apparent explanation of this disparity is that the average white home, together with membership in the socially and culturally dominant white race, better prepares children for education than does the average black home.[8]

"Cultural disadvantage" is not entirely a function of race. Many white children in depressed areas such as Appalachia enter school with less of a cultural head start on learning than do many black youngsters in more economically favored regions of the nation. Regardless of the ethnic background of youngsters, a major point may be made about the Coleman findings regarding excellence of school facilities and the importance of home background: *Although school quality is not as important as home background, it nevertheless remains a component of student achievement that can be directly and quickly influenced by public policy. The quality of a student's home life cannot be so directly influenced.*

What is surprising about educational expenditures in the United States is that they vary widely and erratically across the country so that, in essence, the quality of a youngster's education depends largely on the place of his birth. Some forms of economic determinism will always operate in every human society; a young man whose father is president of a bank will have more chances for the things he wants in life than the son of the bank's teller. Yet we depend on education to overcome, at least in part, the force of circumstances in life, and to give meaning to our characterization of the United States as the "land of opportunity"; hence it is disturbing to find economic determinism operating in the schools, too.

In 1965, New York spent an average of $876 on the education of each public school student, while Mississippi allocated only $317. Pupil-teacher ratios that year varied from 29.8:1 in Hawaii to 19:1 in Kansas. Similar gaps were to be found nationwide in virtually every other traditional index of school quality: the adequacy or even existence of libraries, teacher salaries, extent and variety of curriculum, professional preparation of the staff, and so on. Even these averages conceal equally striking differences within small areas. The State of Illinois, for example, spent an average of $591 on each public school student in 1965—the sixth highest expenditure in the nation; within the state's Cook County alone, however, Stickney Township spent $1,244 per student, Chicago, $617, and Burnham, $392.

In an earlier age, when few American students left the communities or states in which they had been born, such differences in educational expenditure might not have been socially or personally important. By the 1960's, however, one in five American families was changing its residence from one county to another annually—and the other county might be one mile away or clear across the country. One educational consequence of population mobility was that a youngster who had attended third grade in New York might enter fourth grade in Georgia; severe disparities in educational investment could materially affect the continuity of his learning career. Moreover, this penalized children raised in economically depressed areas, lessening their chances for entrance into college or for job success beyond the communities of their birth. Finally, these disparities in educational investment cost the nation itself an undetermined sum in lost potential of youngsters whose inferior educations have failed to develop their capacities.

Disadvantages Based on Sex

The Women's Liberation Movement brought to public attention the inequable treatment of females which Abigail Adams had complained about to her husband (future President John) way back in 1774—and which led her to observe that "if particular attention is not paid to the ladies, we are determined to foment a rebellion, and will not hold ourselves bound by any laws in which we have no voice or representation."[9]

According to the U.S. Labor Department, nearly 30 million American women were working in 1970—but they could expect discriminatory treatment at the pay window. The median income of a white woman with a high school education or better was

$4,100 in 1969, and that of a black woman with the same education, $3,000. The median income of a white man with less than a high school education was $7,000, and that of a black man with the same education, $4,500.[10] Elizabeth D. Koontz, director of the Women's Bureau of the U.S. Department of Labor and a former NEA president, argued that the schools should revise vocational curriculums at the secondary level to give females a crack at more lucrative jobs; "Women," she said, "are expected to go into only those occupations which the world deems 'women's work' "[11]—and those fields almost invariably paid less than male occupations requiring a similar amount of training or less.

But if females received unfair treatment after graduation, there was some evidence to indicate that they got a better-than-fair shake in school. After studying the scholastic records and aptitude test scores of 950 seniors in its 1970 graduating class, the Fairfax County, Virginia, schools concluded that teachers exhibit a "consistent bias in favor of the girls." The study found that though boys received higher aptitude scores in all subject areas, they received fewer A's and B's, but more D's and F's, than girls—and Acting Superintendent Barry Morris suspected that "perhaps the curriculum is loaded in favor of the girls."[12]

A number of other studies found the same bias, but suggested that it stemmed not so much from the curriculum as from the typical class environment, which rewards obedience and order and tends to penalize any manifestation of male aggressiveness ranging from horseplay in class to divergent thinking. While society teaches males from their earliest years that aggressiveness is appropriate to them—an expectation conspicuously mirrored in history texts, which almost exclusively concern the deeds of outstanding men—the schools seem to discourage this normal development.

Varied Learning Styles

One of the more important insights into the learning process that received sudden attention during the 60's was the recognition that there are wide variations in the ways people learn. Schools had begun to act on this variance long ago, but chiefly in terms of the age of the child, e.g., visual, concrete, manipulable objects disappeared from his classrooms as the child grew older. Thus, it was common to see counting sticks, place value pocket-charts, and models of farm animals in kindergarten and first-grade classrooms but the materials of instruction in the fifth and sixth grades tended

to be books, dittoed worksheets, pencils, and paper. In the same vein, in the early years of schooling, teachers have traditionally provided students with more opportunity for mobility and have depended less upon the lecture-recitation method than their intermediate- and secondary-level colleagues.

But, with the advent of audiovisual materials and the "new" curriculums—math, science, social sciences—there was increased emphasis on the idea that even though John and Marcus may be the same age, come from pretty much the same background, and have similar interests in motorbikes and surfboards, it is likely that they learn most effectively in quite different ways. One might be sight-and-symbol-oriented; the other confused by the printed page but effectively reached by a tape recording of the same material. The decisions about the medium of instruction began to take into consideration how the individual learns best rather than the mode that the teacher (or publisher) feels most comfortable with. This extension of understanding about student differences from the cultural and economic toward the intellectual has profound implications for schools and has begun to receive greater attention from researchers and practitioners alike.

Although the definitive word is not in, it appears that some students learn more rapidly by arguing ideas in a small group, and still others learn best when allowed to study independently. Often the act of learning is dramatically stimulated when an older child tutors a younger: this "cross-age teaching" not only succeeds for the younger ones, but improves the achievement of the older—even those who have been having difficulty in the subject they are tutoring.

Each of these differences that learners brought to school with them—in cultural background, learning style, and sexual outlook—coupled with wide variations in educational investment from community to community and from state to state, limited children's opportunities to develop fully in the schools as they are presently structured.

ACTION TOWARD SOLUTION

The closing years of the decade offered educators a veritable smorgasbord of experimental approaches to closing achievement gaps and trying to compensate for the intellectual, emotional, and social disparities that youngsters bring to school with them. Many of these are too recent to have been evaluated; for others, the evi-

dence is inconclusive. Yet there are enough clues to indicate promising lines of experiment for the Association and for individual teachers.

Integration

The various means for desegregating schools—pairing white and black schools across attendance zones, redrawing attendance zones, busing, establishing educational "parks" that draw students from many schools in a large region of a city—are well known, and require no elaboration here. The NEA and the federal government both offer local school districts technical assistance in devising the best desegregation plan for specific community circumstances.

The more important problem for most school districts is achieving acceptance of school desegregation. While there is no magic technique for this, the following suggestions—based largely on the experience of Charles Glatt and William Gaines—may be helpful to school districts preparing for desegregation.

1. *How can a community public relations campaign be launched to precede actual, physical desegregation?* This campaign must (a) identify the opposition, and (b) stress the advantages of integration to *all* students. "If a white parent can be convinced that his children will receive a better education, his opposition will disappear." One such advantage is that a desegregated school district is eligible for federal funds; a segregated school district is not.

2. *What part will improved physical plants and facilities play in acceptance of desegregation?* Improvements in education are often impossible to demonstrate in a brief period; physical improvements—whether they actually affect the educational program or not—can frequently convince parents that desegregated education does indeed bring advantages.

3. *How can desegregation be a two-way street?* One of the most serious mistakes that school systems make is to close Negro schools and to desegregate white schools. Because their schools, even though segregated, were frequently the only social institutions that blacks controlled, they have had a stronger attachment to them than whites have had to their schools. The implied rejection by districts in closing those schools has led to serious community friction and, in some instances, boycotts by black students.

4. *How can teachers and administrators be prepared for desegregation?* Summer institutes and human relations work-

shops that rely on consultants to resolve tensions between black and white teachers rarely succeed; the most productive workshops emphasize small-group activities in which professionals of both races learn about each other by working on projects together—rather than being *told* about each other.

5. *How can in-service programs which draw upon the competence of teachers and district personnel to resolve the problems inherent in desegregation be planned and tied to specific needs?* Too many such programs rely almost exclusively on "experts" from colleges and universities, but "in the complex arena of school desegregation almost no real experts exist." Inviting ideas from school personnel themselves, rather than herding them to workshops to hear addresses by outside consultants, emphasizes that desegregation is their *own* problem, not that of the school district.[13]

Integration is an almost mechanical process, a matter of placing children of different backgrounds together so that the kind of educational chemistry that Coleman documented can take place. Children learn from each other—and they learn more from each other and more quickly when they are products of distinctly different homelives. Coleman focused on intellectual achievement, the kind that can be measured by standard tests; yet it may be that when today's children become adults, we will find middle-class youngsters have learned as much from minority classmates as they have taught—tolerance, appreciation of different attitudes toward life, respect for cultural difference, personal acquaintance with the hardships of others.

Compensatory Education

Because of the racial and ethnic composition of our metropolitan areas, however, thorough school desegregation seems a long way off. Most American youngsters of any ethnic background will probably not have enough classmates from the majority or minority groups in the foreseeable future to regard them as anything more than strangers or oddities. Pragmatism suggests that, while the United States must work persistently toward desegregation, educators cannot wait for it to resolve learning disparities stemming from varied racial and ethnic backgrounds. Compensatory education programs probably must continue—in both integrated and segregated classroom situations—until we achieve metropolitan school systems.

The Problems of Funding. Apart from integration, which was generally viewed as a matter of broad social justice (to the detriment of its educational value), the most publicized attempt to reduce the gap in achievement between culturally "deprived" children and their more "fortunate peers" was Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Title I, a form of "compensatory" education, was designed to channel more than $1 billion annually into school districts where there were "large concentrations of children from low-income families." With the approval of the state education department, the money could be used in any way that local school officials felt would improve instruction: for extra teachers to reduce pupil-teacher ratios, for remedial instruction, for medical and dental examinations, for clothing and food.

Title I, as did ESEA itself, signaled a new federal concern for the quality of American education, and represented a victory for national compassion and common sense over the traditionalists' abstract concern about federal intrusions on local control. By 1970, however, Title I was being criticized as a "billion-dollar band-aid" in that it spread too little money over too many deprived children to do any good. The U.S. Office of Education encouraged local school administrators to focus their federal funds on a relatively small number of disadvantaged children, so that Title I grants would have real impact—but political realities made this strategy nearly impossible to carry out.

Further, there were signs that Title I funds were not being used as intended. In some cases, federal aid was used as a substitute for local or state support, so that the compensatory investment in low-income areas rose only marginally over that for schools in middle-income neighborhoods. In other cases, federal funds were spread throughout a city to all schools. The California State Department of Education investigated a $10-million federal grant designed to improve education for 12,000 ghetto children and found that instead of its being focused on them, much of the money was spent for services throughout the district.

> Thus, while financing was provided to give all ghetto elementary school children additional reading and language arts instruction, only two out of five actually received such assistance. Of 477 staff positions approved for the "target" schools, only 276 employees could be accounted for (the funds for the other positions presumably were financing personnel at other schools). Further, one-third of the total budget for instruction supported administrators working in the district's central office. This resulted in

severe understaffing of schools for which the federal and state governments had designed the grants.[14]

Such shenanigans inspired USOE to announce late in 1970 that school districts receiving Title I funds would henceforth be required to show evidence of "comparability" in their allocation of local and state funds. In some districts, USOE found, cities were spending as much as $500 per pupil more for "rich" schools than "poor" ones—and had been using Title I funds to make up the difference. By July 1971, Title I districts would have to submit data on teacher salaries, instructional personnel, equipment, pupil-teacher ratios, and other factors indicating that such disparities had been leveled out; they could accomplish the leveling-out either by raising local taxes (a doubtful alternative as the decade opened) or by reallocating funds from rich schools to poor ones.

The federal government was not alone in its attempt to improve education for poor children. Some states and cities acted on their own to increase educational investment in deprived schools: California's McAteer Act has provided additional funds for special programs since 1963; in 1965, the Ford Foundation granted the Pittsburgh public schools more than $1 million for compensatory programs and has since spent millions of dollars for urban education.

Is Money Enough? While federal, local, and state governments grappled with the gap in achievement between deprived and advantaged students, and applied the remedies which the conventional wisdom suggested—raising teachers' salaries, reducing pupil-teacher ratios, installing better facilities of all sorts—a number of evaluations forced second thoughts about strategies for improvement. Teachers' salaries did rise during the decade, from a national average of $4,995 in 1959-60 to $8,552 in 1969-70, and the pupil-teacher ratio declined from 26:1 to 22.7:1. Local, state, and federal expenditures rose from $15.6 billion in 1960 to an estimated $39.5 billion ten years later. Communities throughout the nation scrimped to finance "media resource centers" and other innovations which, it was asserted, would convert Slater's Corner Independent School District into another Scarsdale.

Another important approach to improving the achievement of disadvantaged children was starting them earlier. Kindergarten and preschool education, widely regarded in 1960 as baby-sitting services designed to distract toddlers with milk-and-Montessori while Mom went shopping or pursued fulfillment, emerged by

1970 as one of the most sensible, educationally profitable investments that a highly advanced society could make in its young. The research of Martin Deutsch, Jerome Bruner, and Benjamin Bloom, the painstaking observations of Jean Piaget, the magnificent analysis and synthesis of J. McVicker Hunt, and the developmental probing of other investigators indicated a host of fascinating probabilities: that the human mind attained nearly half its intellectual growth by the age of six; that the IQ was not fixed, but could be altered by strategic early "intervention"; that certain schema—patterns of intellectual, physical, and physiological cooperation required to master learned skills (walking, talking, learning a foreign language)—were more easily developed in the early years; and that elementary forms of genuine learning actually took place in the womb.

The implications of these findings were harder to define—or face up to. The federal government sponsored Head Start as one response to this research; at decade's end, researchers were quarreling about the meaning of the resulting data. Samuel G. Sava argued that the traditional pattern of increasing educational investment with the student's age ought to be reversed, so that the nation would devote more time and talent to educating its three-year-olds than its twenty-year-olds.[15] Until the country decided whether to finance early childhood education with tax funds, its affluent parents could send their progeny to day-care centers run by an increasing number of for-profit corporations—one of them the subsidiary of a chain of fried chicken restaurants.

In 1964, 3.2 million American children five years old or younger were enrolled in formal education programs of some kind; by fall of 1969, enrollment had increased to 4.3 million. Of these children in 1969, 654,000 were black.[16]

But evidence of improved achievement from all these investments was mixed, and by 1970, President Nixon questioned whether the old equation—more money equals better education—held true. There is some research to support his doubts. The Coleman Report, already cited, found the student's home and classmates more important than the school itself. After examining 91 studies on class size and its relation to college-level instruction, going back to 1924, Robert Dubin and Thomas Taveggia of the University of Oregon concluded it created no difference: large lecture classes, small discussion groups, independent study, and combinations of these arrangements all produced approximately the same test results.[17] Reports summarized in the *Encyclopedia*

of *Educational Research* tend toward the same conclusion for school-level instruction.[18] The U.S. Civil Rights Commission reported that, of the major compensatory education programs—some established as early as 1957—"none . . . appear to have raised significantly the achievement of participating pupils."[19]

Synthesis for a Learner-Directed Solution

Such findings, while disputed by some educators and researchers, inclined those who accepted them to four broad points of view:

- That compensatory efforts to date had not been intensive and persistent enough; educational improvement for underachieving students would show results only when a "critical mass" of resources had been assembled in their classrooms. Though the analysis was sophisticated, the solution urged was simple: more.
- That a profound restructuring of the students' social environment, in and out of the school, was necessary—through such means as integration with children from different home backgrounds, early childhood education, and "schools without walls" that would draw upon the entire community and the varied experiences of all its residents for instruction.
- That schools and teachers use "poor" home backgrounds as an alibi for their own failures. According to these critics, such as Dr. Kenneth Clark, the schools can teach disadvantaged children effectively by maintaining high scholastic standards and making clear to the children the staff's confidence that students from any environment can meet those standards. If a student is expected by his teachers to do poorly, he senses the expectation and fulfills it.
- That we simply do not know what produces educational achievement, and that basic research into the chemistry of learning is needed before we spend more money on programs that might or might not produce.

These categories of opinion were not mutually exclusive; many educators, perhaps most, felt that the truth lay in some blend of these viewpoints and that—as appears to be the case with reading—there is no single best method of teaching every child anything.

And here—as in all teaching—the basic principle, though one that is generally ignored, is to begin with the student *where he is* and work with what he *has*, rather than to force him to adopt the

school's judgments about what is important, interesting, or worthwhile. Some examples to illustrate the point:

- In Bedford-Stuyvesant's Reid Junior High, teacher Edward Chervin gave up on trying to interest his fourteen-year-olds in the third- and fourth-grade books they could manage, and instead decided to base his instruction on material he *knew* they were interested in: TV shows. First asking each student to list his five favorite programs, Chervin then watched those listed, noting the principal characters and the plot lines. He summarized these plots, including in each a number of new vocabulary words, and concluded with questions based on the programs. "I don't claim to have accomplished any miracles," wrote Chervin, "but with relevant curriculum adapted from their favorite TV shows, at least I'm seeing some hands raised in my classes. And I know by watching their faces that they look forward to each new story."[20]
- In *Hooked on Books*, Daniel Fader recounts his success in getting teen-agers in a Michigan reformatory to read—to the point where these dropouts and "underachievers" hid favorite books in their rooms—by supplementing the usual readers with paperbacks on subjects that interest adolescent boys: automobiles, motorcycles, money, etc. An equally important component of Fader's strategy was to have his students write in *every* subject—not just in the courses labeled "English" or "composition," but also in science, shop, and every other area of the curriculum.[21]
- When public school funds in Prince Edward County were cut off during Virginia's period of "massive resistance" to school integration, volunteers teaching black children without benefit of approved texts found they responded with unusual interest to *Ebony Magazine*—a popular publication about black adults.
- A teacher in an affluent New Jersey school district introduced a group of seniors to the mysteries of mathematical probability by setting up a crap table and a "21" game in his classroom. His principal was nervous at first, and some parents were soon indignant—but they became enthusiastic when the use of dice and cards quickly led the students to an active interest in one branch of mathematical theory.

Disparate as these examples are, they answer a single question: How can a youngster's past experience and his current interests

be used as the base of a learning program? It a teacher's educational goal is to teach the skill of reading, does it matter what the student reads, as long as he reads something with increasing interest and facility? Similarly, if addition, subtraction, multiplication, and division are essential skills, it does not matter *what* the student adds or divides, as long as he learns to do it. Some math teachers have learned, quite by accident, that teen-age girls who had been having difficulty with fractions learned to manipulate them rather quickly in home economics classes, where they had to calculate the ingredients for recipes. Many of the most successful experiments in overcoming learning problems, in sum, suggest an absolute inversion of the usual instructional process: instead of trying to interest students in school work, fashion school work out of the things that already do interest them.

A major result of the debate by the end of the decade was to sometimes cast doubt on the professional competence of educators because of the attention given to lack of money as the root of all instructional ills. Money, it appeared, might be part of the necessary strategy for making equal educational opportunity a reality in the United States—but it was only part. The Coleman Report found that Oriental-American first-graders, alone among the minority groups, exceeded white first-graders on median scores of nonverbal ability and closely approached them in verbal. This suggested that differences of racial and ethnic background need not predispose a youngster to scholastic mediocrity, even in a society whose every institution proclaimed the dominance (and implied the superiority) of white Europeans; by twelfth grade, however, even Oriental children had slipped slightly behind whites, indicating that cultural dominance worked slowly but surely, and that the schools should try to offset this erosion by creating in minority children a sense of pride in themselves and their backgrounds.[22] Disparities stemming from sex and from different learning styles, finally, had virtually nothing to do with money at all; not only did preschool boys from white, upper-class backgrounds exemplify somewhat greater verbal aptitude than girls, but so did preschool boys from black slums. Making education humane by making it genuinely individual, it is clear, will require educators and their allies from other walks of life to return to their drawing boards.

FOOTNOTES

1. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of the Secretary. (Press Release) *HEW News*, January 4, 1970. p. 2.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 1.
3. Coleman, James S., and others. *Equality of Educational Opportunity*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1966.
4. Coleman, James S. "Toward Open Schools." *Public Interest* No. 9:20-27; Fall 1967.
5. *Ibid.*
6. Coleman, James S., and others. *Equality of Educational Opportunity*. Summary Report. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1966. p. 22.
7. *Ibid.*, p. 20.
8. *Ibid.*, p. 21.
9. Adams, Charles F., editor. *Letters of Mrs. Adams*. Boston, 1840. p. 75.
10. National Education Association. "Schools to Blame for Crippling Women's Employment Potential." (Press Release) *NEA News*, August 1970.
11. *Ibid.*
12. Office of Psychological Services, Department of Instruction, Fairfax County Public Schools. *A Study of the Relationship Between Grades and Standardized Tests*. Fairfax, Va.: Fairfax County Board of Education, July 1970. p. 7. (Mimeo.)
13. Glatt, Charles A., and Gaines, William A. "School Desegregation: A Look at Some Common Impediments and Solutions." *National Elementary Principal* 49:34-39; January 1970.
14. San Francisco Sunday Examiner and Chronicle. "This World" supplement. *San Francisco Sunday Examiner and Chronicle*, August 3, 1969.
15. Sava, Samuel G. "When Learning Comes Easy." *Saturday Review* 51:102; November 16, 1968.
16. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, National Center for Educational Statistics. *Preprimary Enrollment October 1969*. No. OE-20079-69. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1970. p. 10.
17. Trans-Action. "Roundup of Current Research." *Trans-Action* 6:10; October 1969.
18. Ebel, Robert L., editor. "Class Size." *Encyclopedia of Educational Research*. Fourth edition. New York: Macmillan, 1969. pp. 141-46.

19. Freeman, Roger A. "A Communication." *Washington Post*, March 15, 1970. p. B5. (Freeman is currently special assistant to the President.)

20. To balance the implied criticism (see p. 72) of the A. B. Dick advertisement, with which "The Instructional Program" begins (see p. 41), the editors feel it proper to state that Chervin's experiment was also described in an advertisement from the same company.

21. Fader, Daniel N., and McNeill, Elton B. *Hooked on Books*. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1968.

22. Coleman, James S., and others. *Equality of Educational Opportunity*. Summary Report. p. 20.

School Finance

It may not make much difference in the education of two students if one has $750 invested in his instruction and another $690; to take the possibilities to their limits for purposes of illustration, however, it will clearly make a difference if one has $1,440 invested in his education and the other has nothing. And though the extension of education to every American student at public expense has virtually eliminated the chance for such a contrast's existing, the actual disparities in public investment for education from system to system are almost as striking. The American mechanisms for financing education have become unfair to taxpayers and students alike; equity for all during the 1970's and beyond requires some drastic revisions.

PROBLEMS

During the 1939-40 school year, Americans invested $3.1 billion or 3.5 percent of gross national product at all levels of public and nonpublic education; by 1949-50, spending for education dropped to 3.4 percent of GNP, but had risen in dollars to $8.7 billion; for 1959-60, dollars and percentage both rose, to $24.7 billion and 5.1 percent; and for 1969-70, the figures are $69.5 billion and 7.5 percent of GNP.

Clearly we place a great value on educating our young—but just as clearly, the taxpayers have become restive about the continuing calls for more on behalf of schools and colleges. In Ohio, reported Byron H. Marlowe, "School districts, like other taxing jurisdictions, experienced little difficulty passing tax or bond issues until the mid-1950's"; then a downward trend set in, and the "decline in voter support has accelerated in the late 1960's. . . ."[1] Ohio's experience was reflected across the nation: during the 1968-69 school year, a total of $3.9 billion in school bond issues was submitted to the voters; only $1.7 billion, or 43.6 percent of the dollar value, was approved.

As already indicated, educational improvement will require more than money—but it will require at least that. The problem of financing schools for the 1970's involves not only *raising the money*, but *allocating and managing it*.

Raising the Money

Tax funds for the public schools come from three sources: local, state, and federal governments. During the 1967-68 school year, local governments provided 52 percent of these funds, state governments, 40.3 percent, and the federal government, 7.7 percent. Across the United States, about 10 percent of our income is derived from property. In most states, however, at least 50 percent of revenues for the support of the schools still comes from property taxes levied by local governments. The amount of these local taxes, in turn, depends on two factors: the *amount of taxable property* in a community, frequently expressed as "the assessed valuation per pupil," and the *tax rate* which a community chooses to levy against that property.

Both the amounts of property and the tax rates vary widely across the United States, of course, with the result that some states and communities tax their citizens more heavily for education than others—but still come up with less money. For the 1963-64 school year, for example, Mississippi ranked 50th among the states in its ability to support education (as measured by per capita income and similar economic indices) and 50th in its actual spending per pupil in the public schools, but it ranked fifth in its effort to support education; its citizens devoted 5.3 percent of their total incomes to the public schools and produced only $241 per pupil, while residents of New York—which ranked first in the nation in actual support—taxed themselves only 4.2 percent (30th in the nation) and still produced $705 for every pupil in public schools.[2] In 1969, the Boston suburb of Weston had a local tax rate of 43 mills and a per-pupil expenditure of $956; Boston itself had a tax rate of 144 mills—over three times as high—but could only raise $655 per pupil. The Gorman School District of Los Angeles County has a tax base 40 times as large as the nearby districts of Hudson and Compton City; it is not surprising, then, that it can muster $2,089 for every pupil while the other districts can only manage $560, even with state aid.

Allocating the Money

Such differences in quantity of educational support are bound to produce differences in educational quality. Recognizing this,

both the states and the federal government have tried to develop formulas or programs to modify discrepancies in local wealth—but neither is working well.

The High Cost of Urban Education. In some cases, state and federal aid actually tend to exaggerate the inequities in local support for education—particularly in the cities. To understand why, it is important to know that the state "foundation" laws—essentially state-aid programs designed to ensure a minimum educational program in every community regardless of its wealth—were passed around the turn of the century, when the cities were rich and the surrounding rural areas comparatively poor. The intervening 70 years have shifted the financial balance to the suburbs and have gradually impoverished the cities through a series of interrelated social phenomena.

- *Socioeconomic Development:* Between 1960 and 1967, central-city population growth averaged only 3.8 percent, while suburbs grew 17.6 percent. The problem lies in the *character* of that growth—who moved where. Average family incomes in the central cities run $1,500-$2,000 behind suburban family incomes: 19 percent of city families have annual incomes below $4,000, compared with 12 percent of suburban families, and only 33 percent of city families have incomes over $10,000, while 45 percent of suburban families do. Between 1958 and 1967, retail sales in the central cities of the nation's 37 largest metropolitan areas increased at an annual rate of 12.6 percent; retail sales in the suburbs during the same period increased at a rate of 105.8 percent!
- *Tax-Base Deterioration:* Between 1961 and 1966, property values declined in 14 of 17 Northeast and Midwest metropolitan areas; in none of the surrounding areas was there less than a 10 percent growth in value. For all sections of the nation, property values in the suburbs appreciated at a rate 250 percent that in the central cities . . . at a time when per-pupil educational expenditures were rising three times as fast as property values.
- *Municipal Overburden:* While the cities' tax resources have been shrinking, the demands on their available funds have been growing disproportionately. Necessary expenditures for general government services such as public safety, transportation, sanitation, welfare, public housing, recreation, and the like are much greater in the cities than in the suburbs, with the result that while suburban communities devote less than 45 percent of their expenditures to noneducation purposes, the cities must

spend nearly 65 percent of tax income on them. In 1966-67, the nation's 37 largest central cities spent an average of $366 for each resident, while their suburbs spent only $308—a significant difference of $58 for each man, woman, and child; however, because of "municipal overburden," the cities had to spend $230 of that for purposes other than education (vs. $138 in the suburbs), and could spare only $136 per capita for education (*vs.* $170 in the suburbs). The best evidence is that central-city residents pay at least 25 percent more local taxes per capita than suburbanites—but have fewer dollars left for their schools.

- *Higher Costs:* Cities pay more for land, for construction, and—despite higher salary schedules in many suburbs—for teachers, due to the larger percentage of senior teachers in the city systems who are at the top of the salary scale. A 1967 study of costs in Michigan showed that Detroit paid an average of $100,000 per acre for elementary school sites, while surrounding school districts paid only about $6,000. The major reason for higher costs of education in the cities, however, is the composition of the school population. Higher proportions of the culturally disadvantaged, the poor, the handicapped, and the foreign-born are located in the central cities; programs to serve them exceed normal school costs by significant margins—about 400 percent in the case of physically or emotionally handicapped children, about 135 percent for vocational education.[3]

"In summary," writes Joel S. Berke, "lower city educational expenditures take on an added significance when they are placed in the context of the higher costs inherent in urban education. It is apparent that city school systems would have to spend considerably more than their surrounding areas to provide equal educational results. In fact, . . . cities are actually able to spend less."[4]

Attempts at Compensatory Allocation. State foundation formulas and federal programs have not compensated for the higher costs of urban education. Though it is true that state formulas generally operate in inverse ratio to a local school district's own wealth—the poorer the district, the more state aid it receives—in most states, even the wealthiest school districts receive some state aid and the amounts of state aid are not enough to significantly modify the disparities in local ability to support education. In 1967, the median school district among Michigan's poorest communities (the bottom 25 percent according to assessed valuation per pupil) received $319 in state aid, while the median district

among the wealthiest quartile received $215—a difference of $104 which cannot begin to close the gap between poor and rich districts.[5] And as always, "medians" and "averages" conceal as much reality as they disclose; here are the total per-pupil educational expenditures (including local, state, and federal funds) for Michigan's five highest- and five lowest-spending districts in 1967-68:

Highest Districts		*Lowest Districts*	
1. Whitefish	$1,038.40	1. Beaver Island Community	$411.96
2. Republic Michigamme	1,033.35	2. Flushing Community	425.82
3. Dearborn City	998.74	3. Summerfield	432.91
4. Oak Park City	973.21	4. Three Rivers	450.88
5. Bloomfield Hills	959.54	5. Hartford	456.77

Federal aid is regarded by many educators and informed citizens as the greatest single hope for remedying disparities in local ability to support education. In 1967-68, the federal government contributed $2.4 billion or about 8.1 percent of the $29.9 billion spent for public schools—an amount that could make a difference in equality of educational opportunity if it were all devoted to aiding poor school districts. In point of fact, however, only Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is earmarked for school districts with large concentrations of low-income families. Most other federal aid-to-education programs award funds on the basis of outstanding proposals, or require matching local funds; in both cases, poorer school districts are at a disadvantage; in the first place, they do not have as many imaginative or knowledgeable proposal-writers, or extra cash to match grants if they do receive federal money. The result in Michigan, according to James W. Guthrie and others, is that "wealthier school districts tend to receive more federal dollars per pupil than do poorer districts."[6] The results, regarding city *vs.* suburb, seem to be analogous across the nation: in 1967, the suburbs in America's 37 largest metropolitan areas received $64 per capita of educational aid from state and federal governments, compared to $48 per capita from the same sources for central cities.

Educational resources, in sum, are not allocated according to need, and state and federal programs designed to compensate for disparities in local resources for education do not do so. In this sector of American life, as in others, the rich get richer and the poor get poorer.

ACTION TOWARD SOLUTION

A number of reforms have been proposed to bring equity to our mechanisms for raising and allocating taxes.

Redefining Equality of Educational Opportunity

The first reform, and one that must precede every other comprehensive approach to school-finance reform, is a redefinition of *equal educational opportunity* in financial terms. Every teacher knows that children differ in their learning rates—that one will understand a given concept in half the time another requires. It follows that educational investment varies: one youngster will require more of the teacher's time. And it follows from this that *an equal number of dollars will not bring equality of educational opportunity.*

Guthrie, Kleindorfer, Levin, and Stout go at the problem of redefining equality of educational opportunity in this way:

> In our society's present race for "spoils," not all runners begin at the same starting line. Children from higher socio-economic circumstances presently begin life with many advantages. Their home environment, health care, nutrition, material possessions, and geographic mobility provide them with a substantial head-start when they begin schooling at age five or six. Lower SES [socio-economic status] children begin school with more physical disabilities and less psychological preparation for adjusting to the procedures of schooling. This condition of disadvantage is then compounded by their having to attend schools characterized by fewer and lower quality services.
>
> What must we do if schooling is to compensate for these disparities and to provide equality of opportunity? What actions are implied in such a goal? In responding to these questions it is important from the outset to make clear that we are *referring* to equality of opportunity *among* groups of *individuals*, that is, by race, socio-economic status, residence in city or suburb, and so on. We recognize fully that genetic differences and variations in other characteristics among individuals within such groups will continue to promote *within*-group differences in attainment. However, we reject explicitly the necessity of having differences among groups with regard to the equality of their opportunity. Equality of opportunity implies strongly that a representative individual of any racial or social grouping has the same probability of succeeding as does a representative individual of any

other racial or social grouping. Stated another way, given equality of opportunity, then there should be a random relationship between the social position of parents and the lifetime attainments of their offspring.

We believe strongly that the task of the school is to equalize opportunities among different social groupings by the end of the compulsory schooling period. This belief is reinforced by the fact that most states require all minors to attend schools until at least age sixteen. Inferred from this mandate is the view that formal schooling will enable representative youngsters from all social and racial groups to begin their post-school careers with equal chances of success. *In a true sense, while the race for spoils will still be won by the swiftest, if schools are functioning properly, then typical individuals from all social groups should be on the same starting line at age sixteen.* Our society would wish that representative children of each social grouping begin their adult lives with equal chances of success in matters such as pursuing further schooling, obtaining a job, and participating in the political system. It would seem that equality of educational opportunity could be interpreted in no other way.

But if children born at different SES levels are to have the same set of opportunities at age sixteen, though starting off with different chances of success at age five, *equal amounts of school resources for children at each level will not suffice.* Clearly, those children who begin their schooling with the greatest disadvantage must have disproportionately greater schooling resources in order to equalize opportunity at age sixteen. Of course, as we have documented for Michigan, the present operation of schools leads to greater schooling resources for children from upper SES levels, a parody on the concept of equal educational opportunity. Translating school resources into dollars, *more dollars must be expended on those children who typically enter school with the least initial opportunity, those from the lower socio-economic strata.*[7]

The question remains, of course, How *many* more dollars must be expended to put every American youngster on the same starting line at the end of the period of compulsory schooling? One economist, Dennis J. Dugan, investigated this problem by estimating the amount of "human capital" that had been invested in a national sample of children at various ages, basing his calculations on the amount of time devoted to each child by his mother and father, and the market value of that time considering the parents' level of education, i.e., what parents might have earned had they devoted that time to gainful employment.

The approach can be criticized on several grounds, the most obvious being the oversimplified relationship between dollars and time. Two mothers, both college graduates, can spend one hour a day for a year with a five-year-old daughter and yet obtain different educational results for the simple reason that, as with professionals, some amateurs are better teachers than others. Yet the approach is interesting in that it exemplifies the possibility of quantifying at least some educational investments and, perhaps, some aspects of the home environment that are related to education. Dugan found that an additional $6,662 per nonwhite student is necessary to raise the nonwhite mean achievement to the level of the white achievement mean for sixth-graders. Spread out over the first five years of schooling, that would mean an average expenditure of about $1,300 a year per nonwhite pupil above the $400 national average that was being spent for nonwhite pupils in 1965, the year for which Dugan developed his estimates.[8]

It should be stressed that Dugan's statement of equal educational opportunity as a contrast between white and nonwhite students is also a generalization; some nonwhite students would require a smaller investment to bring them up to a certain achievement level than would some white students. The nation's concern for urban decay has focused a great deal of attention on inner-city populations, where there are high concentrations of black and Spanish-speaking children. Yet the majority of poor children in the United States are white. Similarly, the current emphasis on the problems of urban schools should not be allowed to deflect attention from the different but equally serious problems of rural schools in which geographical isolation and small staffs frequently prohibit the offering of any but the most restricted curriculum.

Raising and Allocating Resources

The overriding problem in American education for the 1970's, according to Hugh Calkins, chairman of the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education:

> . . . is to develop a means by which the 20 percent of our population who are excluded from the mainstream of American life acquire the educational level they must have to enter the stream. That requires many things, one of which is money. The overriding objective in school finance must be to turn it around so that, instead of obstructing that objective as it does at present, it will assist in achieving it.[9]

To accomplish that turn-around, Calkins suggests a four-point "priority agenda":

1. *Restore equity to our school-foundation laws* by (a) devising adjustments in state aid—as Pennsylvania, Michigan, and New York have begun to do—to take municipal overburden into account and compensate cities for the higher costs of municipal services and of urban education; (b) modifying the effect of enormous community disparities in assessed valuation per pupil on local schools by collecting property taxes statewide; (c) equalizing valuations—as Wisconsin, Maryland, and Florida have done—to eliminate the extraordinary range in assessments against market value (between 10 and 50 percent in Michigan); and (d) providing matching state aid—as only four states have done so far—to reward local effort above the legal minimum.

2. *Adopt a "sensible philosophy of broad categorical grants"* on the basis of need, not program. Special programs of instruction for the mentally or emotionally disturbed, the handicapped, and the disadvantaged, and for the world of work all cost more than the "normal" or academic school program. "A school district should be allowed a subsidy upon a showing that it is spending more money on a child with a special need and is fulfilling that need," writes Calkins.

3. *Adopt a federal income tax for education* to compensate local school districts for extra expenses involved in serving children with special needs, to help states whose per-capita or per-pupil incomes are below the national average, and—as a reflection of political practicality—to provide some measure of financial assistance for all. Calkins urges passage of a National Education Act, initially funded at $3 billion and financed by a 4 percent surcharge on individual income taxes up to $15,000 annual income, 7 percent on taxes paid on the portion of personal income over $15,000.

4. *Learn to use competition constructively and fairly* by supporting alternatives "within and without" the public school system where traditional methods have failed and where experiments—the street academies, the Philadelphia and Chicago "Parkway" programs of "schools without walls," the "factory schools" which combine job training with remedial education for dropouts—offer promise. However, Calkins questions the wisdom of legislation adopted by four states providing state funds for the salaries of teachers in parochial and independent

schools. "We must be careful," he argues, "not to create a school system in which middle- and upper-class children enjoy superior education at a mixture of public and private expense, while children from families in the bottom half of the income spectrum attend public schools of rapidly declining quality." His point seems to be that financing mechanisms must be developed to offer alternatives to the public schools—but to offer them to all children.[10]

Calkins' proposals are echoed by other critics of present school-financing methods: some support his suggestion that property taxes be collected at a uniform, statewide rate, and the slack between the sums raised and those needed be supplemented by state sales and income taxes; others agree on the need for greater federal support, but differ as to who should control the money coming in from Washington—state or local school boards; some share his feeling that subsidizing parochial and independent schools would undermine the public schools, and might open up havens for the avoidance of integration—but feel at the same time that the parochial schools are in serious trouble, and that their continued decline will have serious financial consequences for public education. Calkins' suggestions, on the whole, offer a good overview of the major alternatives to present tax-raising and tax-allocating techniques.

One other suggestion seems sufficiently distinctive to merit specific mention: a proposal by Guthrie and others that compensating federal or state subsidies be made to local school systems on *a school-by-school basis*, not to the district at large. Regardless of its concentrations of disadvantaged students, every big-city school system has one or more schools whose students come from culturally advantaged homes and who simply do not need subsidies. It is unfair to subsidize their education when other children in the same district need much more help than any present taxing scheme can provide.

Better Management of Current Resources

Along with considering possible sources of more money, educators should probably think about making better use of the resources they already have. This means, at the outset, better management—and attention to such matters as follow.

Educator vs. Manager. The schools must recognize that they have become large, complex businesses, and that an Ed.D. and 20 years of climbing the seniority ladder do not qualify even the

best-intentioned man to run the dollars-and-cents aspects of a school system. Educational administration is a specialty and so is business administration; it is time to recognize that the distinction between the two specialties has become blurred by school administrators who admit only one kind of professional to their ranks. Donald Rappaport suggested that the schools need "the same cadre of dollar-a-year men that was formed by the business community in World War II," and suggested that corporations arrange tours of duty in the schools for middle-management personnel: "Let the San Francisco School District, for example, have your assistant purchasing agent for a year or two. Let Oakland have one of your warehouse managers. Loan one of your maintenance executives to Sacramento."[11] The major question about such proposals, however, is not whether business would be willing to spare some of its best young managers, but whether the schools would be willing to let them in the door.

Education vs. Educational Support. Schools need buses, cafeterias, distribution systems for texts and materials, and a host of other supporting services. They do not, however, need to run all these ancillary enterprises by themselves, and it is questionable—when all the recruiting and training of support personnel, the purchasing and maintaining of equipment, the buying of supplies, the maintaining of retirement programs, etc., have been added to simple daily costs—whether the schools can do the job as cheaply and effectively as private management. The Dade County, Florida, school system turned over its entire building program to a private engineering firm, and Philadelphia turned over custodial services for certain schools to private companies to explore possible gains in efficiency. Much more such experimentation is warranted.

Accountability. This is a word with two meanings, one having to do with the responsibility of educators to the public (discussed earlier under "The System," see p. 27), and the other having to do with the ways schools handle their accounting—the ways they keep their books. As Dwight Allen pointed out at the 1965 White House Conference on Education, the school systems' emphasis "has long been on annual 'per pupil cost,' how much money it costs to keep one pupil in school for one year. The description of a 'learning unit cost' would be more educationally relevant."[12]

That means, at the outset, new accounting procedures that move from line-by-line categories (teachers' salaries, administrative expenses, text outlays) to program categories such as "the teaching

of reading." Each such program category or "learning unit" must be quantified in terms of specific performance. For example, as Allen described it, " 'level one in reading' would include a specified level of performance in reading skills such as vocabulary recognition, reading speed, and comprehension."[13] Finally, each program or "learning unit" must be related to specific costs: the teaching of reading (or remedial reading, or arithmetic, or writing) requires a certain percentage of the instructional staff's time and of the school system's facilities, and all such items can be translated into dollars.

The point of all these new-fangled jugglings is not only to give school systems a better idea of the costs of certain educational tasks, but to guide them in reallocating their financial resources. Teaching first-graders to read is, flatly, a few hundred times more important than teaching them to play "My Bonnie Lies Over the Ocean" on a xylophone, and if other educational investments have to be sacrificed in order to increase a school district's investment in reading, they should be. Under present school-system accounting procedures, however, educators have difficulty shifting effort from low-priority to high-priority items because they simply do not know how to measure the effort going into each.

The Pentagon had an expression for it: "more bang for the buck." Tired as that phrase has become since Robert McNamara sponsored it, it makes excellent educational as well as social and political sense. Most school systems are not going to get all the money they ask for, and they must learn how to make scarce resources go farther, as well as to defend their expenditures to an increasingly skeptical public. The literature on planning, programing, and budgeting systems (PPBS) and management information systems (MIS) grows apace; strange as the terms may sound and threatening as the concepts may appear, schoolmen in the 70's must read that literature or hire somebody who has—for the grand old generalities of school superintendents that "your school system is dedicated to quality education" just aren't going down with the public. It's not only students who are dissenting—so are parents, and so are taxpayers—and educators will be increasingly required during the 1970's to show—before receiving new money—what they have wrought with the old.

Reordering Our National Priorities

As the 1970-71 school year opened, federal, state, and local expenditures for education totalled $38 billion; federal expendi-

tures for defense were $82 billion—up from $48.6 billion in 1963—and federal spending for education was estimated at $4.4 billion. This "fiscal imbalance," said an NEA release, "has significant impact in terms of social services lost to the nation. The $82 billion for defense is just about equal to all of the money spent throughout the nation to build new homes, apartments, factories, warehouses, shopping centers, motels, schools, bridges and highways."[14]

The cost of the antiballistic missile system alone ($12 billion) could pay for almost one-third of the basic cost of public education—approximately the proportion the NEA believes the federal government should pay. An aircraft carrier costing $640 million could provide compensatory education for 2 million children for one year, and one atomic submarine costing $158 million could buy a school lunch every day for one year for 1,416,111 children. The cost of producing the F-111 plane which, noted Oregon's Senator Mark Hatfield, "after years of testing continues to lose its wings," exceeded the 1970 budget of the U.S. Office of Education.[15]

Such figures and comparisons led the NEA and many other organizations and individuals to call for a reordering of our national priorities. The most divisive war we had engaged in since the Civil War was bleeding us not only of a sense of national community, but of staggering amounts of human and financial resources which the United States badly needed for other purposes.

President Nixon's program of withdrawal from Vietnam seemed to offer some hope for the reduction of these expenditures and their allocation to more constructive uses. Yet some experts claimed that the Vietnam "peace dividend" would not suddenly deluge social service agencies, including the schools, with wealth. Indeed, the possible advent of peace seemed to offer as many economic problems as economic benefits, for a sizable portion of our industry, and therefore American workers, depended on defense expenditures. Those workers bought television sets and cars, patronized dry cleaners and restaurants, and banked savings and paid insurance premiums that financed housing and commercial development. Defense expenditures pervaded our economy, and it appeared likely that the transition from war to peace would cause financial dislocations for years to come. And, finally, we had created in a small Asian country an artificial economy based on our military investment; would we have to prop up Vietnam with our dollars even after our soldiers came home?

Action for Today

The reordering of national priorities would take a long time. Over a period of years, federal support for education might rise from the 6 percent of the total educational budget to the 33 percent that the NEA felt was appropriate. The federal program of revenue sharing, proposed in 1970 by the Nixon Administration, could over the next decade alleviate some state and local financial problems.

But the schools needed help *now*, and the emphasis upon federal aid appeared to be distracting state and civic officials from the reordering of priorities that they could begin at home immediately. Former U.S. Commissioner of Education Harold Howe II touched on this subject in a 1967 speech about urban education:

> But school officials themselves cannot solve the problem of the city schools, for this problem is not simply educational in nature. It is civic. If we are ever to have fine city schools drawing their strength from the cities themselves, rather than from desperate experiments financed by foundations and federal programs, we must restore to the cities the financial and political power to solve the problems thrust upon them.
>
> The fact is that the cities have sapped their own political power by driving away middle-class families; they have eroded their own financial power through poor land use, unplanned development, and subsidized ugliness. A man with two or three children, an annual income of $10,000, and a normal desire for decent housing cannot afford to live anywhere but the suburbs. More and more, the only people who can afford city living are the rich, the poor, and the childless.[16]

As examples of the ways in which cities have given away their own financial power through careless use of land—their major resource—Howe pointed out that fully 50 percent of Los Angeles' downtown area, 54 percent of Atlanta's, 40 percent of Boston's, and 44 percent of Denver's were "monopolized by streets and parking lots"—relatively unproductive, low tax-paying usages which, in any case, serve more suburbanites than city residents.[17] Urban property taxes are usually based on the value of the building, rather than on the value of the location itself: i.e., the owner of a decaying building in a downtown area pays much lower taxes than the developer of a new building would have to pay on the same site. The resulting underassessment of slum property combined with the desirability of the close-in locations on which so

much aging property is located inflates the sale price of the site. "Nearly a third of all the people of Manhattan still live in railroad flats that were banned before 1900, and these slums are so underassessed and undertaxed that it has cost an average of $486,000 an acre to buy them up for demolition."[18]

Ten years ago, the complexities of tax structure, of zoning, of urban planning would have seemed irrelevant topics for a school administrator. But urbanization and the financial pinch on education have made them, as Howe pointed out, highly pertinent inquiries:

> Educators must think about buildings and transportation and air pollution while they forge new alliances with city planners, architects, politicians and precinct captains, industrialists and chain store operators and all the people who make a city go. We must, in brief, form a new integration of specialties, for it is, above all, *disintegration* that threatens both cities and schools today. Our cities tend to enforce the segregation of minority from majority, of rich from poor, and to separate us in all the aspects of our lives. We drive 20 miles from the place we work to the place we play. We have allowed expressways, urban growth, and suburban sprawl to distribute our lives into cubicles separated from each other by concrete, dirty air, dirty water, and political boundaries that encourage apathy. Our schools and offices, busy while the sun shines, become blacked-out warehouses when work is over. Our theaters, our imposing monuments to culture, do not come alive *until* dark. And our downtown areas, comprising billions of dollars of physical and spiritual investment, millions of human beings working with an imagination and energy that have amazed the world, are ghost towns from five at night until nine in the morning, and all day Saturday and Sunday.[19]

Allowing waste, ugliness, and lack of imagination in shaping the places where we live and work, we are fouling our own nests. The concern for environment, so often presented as a matter of beauty alone, is a matter of money, too. "Perhaps," said Howe, "my remarks amount to saying that it is time educators realize that the cities are *their* business, and that we will never have first-rate city schools unless we have first-rate cities."[20] Financing humane schools for the 70's will require educators to drop their "professional" concerns from time to time so that they can join their fellow citizens—each a professional at something, an amateur at most things—in the hard fight for humane cities.

FOOTNOTES

1. Marlowe, Byron H. "Voter Behavior in School Bond and Tax Elections in Ohio." *A Time for Priorities: Financing the Schools for the 70's.* Proceedings of the 13th National Conference on School Finance. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, Educational Finance Committee, 1970. p. 158.

2. National Committee for the Support of Public Schools. *Contemporary Issues in American Education.* U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Bulletin 1966, No. 3. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1965. p. 45. (Reprint.)

3. Adapted from Berke, Joel S. "The Impact of Present Patterns of Funding Education for Urban Schools." *A Time for Priorities: Financing the Schools for the 70's.* pp. 117-35.

4. *Ibid.*, p. 131.

5. Guthrie, James W., and others. "Educational Inequality, School Finance and a Plan for the 1970's." *A Time for Priorities: Financing the Schools for the 70's.* p. 101. (A summary of a larger work by the same authors, *Schools and Inequality,* which was published by the Urban Coalition in 1969.)

6. *Ibid.*, p. 102.

7. *Ibid.*, pp. 103-104.

8. Dugan, Dennis J. "The Impact of Parental and Educational Investments upon Student Achievement." *Proceedings of the Social Statistics Section, 1969.* Washington, D.C.: American Statistical Association, 1969. pp. 138-48.

9. Calkins, Hugh. "Goals for the 70's in Financing American Education." *A Time for Priorities: Financing the Schools for the 70's.* pp. 12-14.

10. *Ibid.*, p. 15.

11. Rappaport, Donald. Address given to the Northern California Industry-Education Council, April 29, 1968.

12. Allen, Dwight W. "Innovations in Elementary and Secondary Education." *Consultants Papers.* Washington, D.C.: White House Conference on Education, 1965. p. 130.

13. *Ibid.*

14. National Education Association. "NEA Calls for Reordering of Priorities as Nation's School Crisis Worsens." (Press Release) *NEA News,* August 1960.

15. Prentice, Perry I. "What Kind of a City Do We Want?" *Nation's Cities* 5:35-36; April 1967.
16. Howe, Harold, II. *Picking Up the Options.* Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, Department of Elementary School Principals, 1968. p. 192.
17. *Ibid.*
18. Prentice, Perry I. *Op. cit.*, p. 35.
19. Howe, Harold, II. *Op. cit.*, p. 196.
20. *Ibid.*, p. 194.

SECTION III

The United Teaching Profession Acts

Dialogue for the Future

We teachers are barraged every year with hundreds of injunctions to change. Most of the suggestions in the preceding chapters may appear to be simply one more such injunction, and weariness may be setting in—especially since individually we have had so little power to alter the school environment. The crucial questions at this point—the moment of truth, as it were—are, Change for what? And by whom? And using what means?

There is a vital difference, in terms of subsequent action and chance for success, between changing one's own behavior and changing the system in which one labors daily. For too long we have accepted the notion that if individuals somehow alter their teaching styles, or their manner of constructing audiovisual aids, or their means of marking homework papers, the school and, indeed, the system will respond and change, not only accommodate the "innovation" but probably adopt it. This educational version of the water on stone technique appears not to have made an appreciable dent on school systems across the country. Likewise, the march through colleges of education and, later, in-service education classes seems to have resulted in many individual teachers with specialized skills and abilities who practice them in relatively isolated splendor.

What we are after now is a drastic and lasting change in the system of education which holds in this country. And we will achieve such a revision through the influence and purposeful activities of our united profession.

NEGOTIATION AS A MEANS TO CHANGE

Teachers have often been characterized in terms of the jack-of-all-trades who wears many hats—counselor, psychologist, nurse, philosopher, humanitarian, scholar—all these and others have been used simultaneously and individually to describe the teacher.

Further, we must now acknowledge that in addition to these hats which identify us functionally, or by responsibilities, we wear other hats which identify us according to the basic allegiances which we feel are a part of our professional lives. We are sometimes confused about these allegiances and have a difficult time sorting them out. We are members of a school faculty, and as such we have definite loyalties and responsibilities for the programs and activities of the school. We are members of a school system and we care about the success or the failure of the system in responding to the needs of the learners and the community it serves. We are part of a profession the members of which have banded together in a national effort to promote the welfare of teachers and to serve the best interests of students, schools, and society. And all the while, we are autonomous, self-actualizing, independent human beings who respond to the concerns we feel for the world around us.

How do we separate out these loyalties? Need they be in conflict? What happens when conflict is unavoidable? What do we do to promote the best interests of our clients and our profession? The prime purpose of this book and, indeed, the entire SCHOOLS FOR THE 70's series is to initiate a dialogue which will help us to answer these questions and others. But we need not start from an intellectual and practical vacuum; we have a history and we are able to draw upon some of the experiences of the past to help us with today and tomorrow.

From Employee to Partner

We have not been entirely excluded from decision making about professional matters. Even before the 1960's, when our militancy made us a powerful new force in education, school boards and administrators sought or at least listened to our views, or those of our representatives, on instructional policy. A typical example has been the job of textbook evaluation which has been handled in many areas almost entirely by teachers. In the main, however, our views were "taken under advisement," or accepted "for the consideration of the board." School boards made the final decisions; whatever the rhetoric about our professional standing, we continued to be treated as employees working for a benign management which, after all the viewpoints had been expressed, really knew what was best for everyone.

Teacher strikes and association-imposed "sanctions"—by which local or state affiliates of NEA warned prospective applicants for

teaching jobs that certain school districts or entire states were unattractive places to work—changed that. For the first time, school management had a professional version of mutiny on its hands.

The transition from the former employer-employee relationship to one of genuine partnership between school management and teaching staff is by no means complete—nor has it proceeded with the dignity and quiet order that one might have associated with education in the past. But that transition has begun. The most significant indication of this new environment is the formal negotiation agreement, which is coming to be a principal component of master contracts between school boards and local associations.

The Principles of Negotiation

Though negotiated agreements will vary from place to place and according to the items considered, they are usually rooted in the following principles:

1. In formal negotiation procedures, both parties must discuss matters of mutual concern in "good faith." This implies that school boards and teacher groups must present to each other reasonable positions in an atmosphere of mutual respect with each party recognizing the seriousness of the deliberations. It is expected that questions will be answered, evidence produced, and a joint system of human amenities observed.

2. In formal negotiation procedures, structures exist to help resolve any impasse which may be reached in the dialogue. Before formal negotiations gained acceptance, there were no deadlocks—school boards reserved to themselves the right to make all final decisions.

3. In negotiation procedures, the purpose of the dialogue is to produce a mutually acceptable set of written agreements which govern the behavior of the school board and the teachers. Previously teachers hoped that their discussions would influence school board members to make decisions favorable to the teachers' needs, but recognized that such favorable decisions were gratuitous and dependent on whatever collective generosity the board might wish to exhibit.

Although no negotiation laws require that school boards and teachers agree with each other, the essential thrust of the negotiation process is toward agreement. Because of this, school boards have been forced under the process to be considerate of our views. This and other essentials—or at least universal qualities of the

process, such as the various legal obligations and remedies, the written contract, and the moral pressures—have led to a considerable increase in our power to achieve our objectives.

"Innovative" Negotiation

The negotiating process is creating a new structure for decision making in public schools. It gives us a power that we have never had before. Now that we have seized it and successfully exercised it throughout the country, however, the question is to what purposes we will put it.

At the outset of the militancy movement, we focused our attention on salaries, fringe benefits, and other bread-and-butter issues that were of the most direct, immediate importance to us. In a number of cases, we also fought for smaller classes—on occasion, even harder than we fought for increased salaries. By and large, however, the first stage of our negotiations might be termed "corrective" in nature, aimed at improving an unacceptable situation.

Certainly wages and salaries will remain a topic of negotiations from now on. More and more, though, our state and local associations are trying to extend their influence to shape the entire schooling environment through what might be called "innovative" negotiations; instead of patching up inadequacies in the present school situation, we want to create *new* schools by helping to determine curriculums, criteria for teacher selection, and even the design of educational facilities. And it is the major premise of this section that the local association is the logical and desirable agency in the system to promote change.

NEGOTIATION AS A HUMANIZING PROCESS

A major consideration in any forthcoming program to assist local education associations in influencing the system will be the growing muscle of negotiation. This crucial association process will receive increased attention as it is used to make the professional lives of teachers more satisfactory, the environment of teaching and learning more consistent with the best of our knowledge, and the consequences of our united actions of continued high value to our country.

Much of the discussion of negotiation stresses rules of procedure and contract provisions. Essential as these are for making

certain that negotiations are genuinely that and not just conversation, the philosophical implications of negotiation as a tool for humanizing education should not be obscured by an exclusive discussion of technique.

The Self-Respecting Teacher

The first of these implications is that negotiations can transform us into the self-respecting, self-motivated adults we must be if we are to humanize education. It is almost self-evident that we cannot help students explore their human natures fully if our own capacities, personalities, and possibilities are held in check by a school system that values conformity and efficiency over everything else. As Silberman expressed it earlier, we ourselves are victimized by the schools in which we work.

There is no need to look for dark plots here. Any school principal or superintendent worth his salt knows that we make the system go, and many value the advice that a classroom veteran can offer. Yet the circumstances under which such advice was sought or accepted worked subtly on both parties. We knew our views carried no real authority and, in the worst cases, they were brought to committee meetings in an atmosphere thick with condescension. Introduced in such a manner, our natural response was submission to obvious authority, and a feeling of gratitude for having been asked in the first place; the power of the administrator or school board was acknowledged, their authority accepted, and their "generosity" appreciated.

Negotiations indicating genuine power have changed this servile attitude on our part. To be sure, some veteran negotiators have noted that teachers have, in fact, sounded just as raucous and immature as their students sound to them on occasion. Yet our initial aggressiveness and perhaps even belligerence in confronting our bosses were predictable. The notion of meeting as equals was new, as was that of having the power to back our views. The posture was strange, unfamiliar; it had to be tried out, explored before it could be assumed naturally, without undue strain. Now that we have flexed our muscles and seen what organization can do, it is expected that we will settle down to more quiet (though no less forceful) expressions of our strength.

As a corollary to negotiation, we know that there *are* significant changes that can occur because individuals work for them. For example, we know that we are happier and more effective as

teachers when our skills are up to the job we face. And we are aware of traditional avenues which have been open for us to improve our professional abilities—graduate school, in-service education, NDEA workshops, and the like. But the focus now is upon the united profession—how we can use the resources within our association to promote what used to be called "upgrading on-the-job performance." And this should probably have been called "lock step, hurry-up-and-wait, don't-practice-what-I-preach time wasting."

There are numerous ways a local association can influence the individual member's competence:

- Sponsor a film series for members and others which features innovative practices, materials, or modes of instruction.
- Survey the membership to determine the major concerns about job satisfaction in terms of performance and use the results to negotiate a more reasonable in-service education program within the school system.
- Provide professional books, periodicals, and other resources to the membership on a loan basis.
- Compile, as a result of information volunteered by members, a compendium of innovative practices which are being used in the system and which work; this can serve the purpose of helping spread good ideas as well as offering well-deserved limelight to those willing to share their teaching techniques.
- Activate an "instructional improvement" column in the association newsletter and offer it as a soapbox to members who wish to present views about bettering teaching and learning.
- Promote, through negotiated agreement or cooperative consensus, the practice of interschool visitation by teachers who wish to capitalize on the successes of their colleagues.
- Systematically evaluate the in-service experiences of members as they attend graduate schools as well as meetings and workshops in the system; then make the results of this evaluation public and use them as a baseline for negotiating changes in procedures for helping teachers become more skilled.

Admittedly, the above suggestions, either in part or in total, have been used by individual teachers for years to informally improve their teaching. The new twist is that these are now seen as appropriate endeavors for association action. At the state level, some associations have been going beyond their usual services to

the membership by sponsoring workshops for the improvement of instruction—and have negotiated the release of teachers on regular school days to attend. The Iowa Education Association financed a day-long seminar for teachers from five districts through Title V funds, signed over to the association by the superintendents of the districts. Again, the key here is the provision of opportunities for teachers to teach better through efforts of the association.

A New Relationship with Students

Further, this new-found maturity should affect our relationships with students. "Power corrupts," Lord Acton said, "and absolute power corrupts absolutely." But as someone else has pointed out, "Powerlessness corrupts, and absolute impotence corrupts absolutely." Treated as inferiors, denied any solid power over the circumstances of our professional lives, denied any authority except what the school board chose to give us, many of us have taken out our frustrations on students, running our classrooms like concentration camps in which every inmate had to hold up his hand and ask for permission for any activity apart from sitting still.

Indeed, one can argue that the militant stance taken by students over the last decade may have been taught them by some of us who suddenly got our backs up and, by confronting the "establishment," indicated much more effectively by action than by quoting *Hamlet* that one can take arms against a sea of troubles. And now that we have real power and authority, more of us may be able to understand and accept the "oddball" student who challenges our own authority. Now we may be able to tolerate and even create an atmosphere that will enable students to approach us as individuals in their own right, rather than as indentured servants of the adult establishment, on the assumption that interaction between teacher and learner will be mutually beneficial. We need to deal with our students, and their parents, in the same way we expect administrators and boards of education to deal with us.

Improvement of Curriculum and Instruction

Finally, most of the observations made earlier about the absurdities of the educational system come as no news to us. The inequities of the grading system, the irrelevance of the curriculum, the inadequacy of the current concepts of "education" for fully developing human possibility may puzzle school boards and parents, but they do not surprise those of us who have witnessed the slow making of human tragedy in our classrooms. Any one of us spends

more time with an adolescent than either his father or mother does—and these are not just hours of residence under the same roof, but hours of focused attention. Very often the components of a humanized and humanizing education are well known to teachers, and the power to do something about these perceptions may supply the classroom-level force and motivation that have been missing from efforts to bring about educational change.

The larger issues call for concerted action on the part of our professional organization as a component of the larger system of schooling. Curriculum planning, school organization, prescribed textbooks, student participation, evaluation of program and students—these are matters requiring some agreement among the parties who participate in their formulation and implementation. This agreement can be in the form of a negotiated contract between the board and the association, or it can be the result of a less formal means of coming to a meeting of the minds.

The Rationale for Teacher Involvement. Many school superintendents, board members, and other education officials view negotiated agreements for teachers to participate formally in decisions about curriculum and other instructional matters as dangerous. The negotiations process itself, they say, places education in a quasi-political context, one in which decisions are made by the force of greater numbers or under the implied threat of a strike. Teachers, on the other hand, argue that there are three good reasons for involving them in decisions about curriculum.

1. Teachers are closest to daily classroom experience; they can see what works and what doesn't, and they have the experience to vary instruction to suit individual needs.

2. Current centralized administrative procedures on textbook adoption, teacher manuals, standardized testing, etc., emphasize conformity and efficiency over educational excellence, and reduce the number of instructional alternatives available.

3. The helpful innovations introduced during the last two decades will not be adopted widely and quickly unless teachers are involved in the process of change.

This last point is of vital importance to American education. Most of the ideas and techniques necessary for humanizing education by tailoring it to the individual learner are available now, and have been available for a long time. For the most part, however, innovation remains on display at a few laboratory and "lighthouse" schools; it has yet to permeate schools around the country.

And in many cases, the form of an innovation—minor changes in class grouping, the use of a new vocabulary by teachers and administrators—has been adopted rather than the substance. If the "innovation" persists under such circumstances, it cannot, of course, produce the results expected of it—and the entire cause of educational change becomes discredited.

Several years ago, Arthur Corey, executive secretary emeritus of the California Teachers Association, stated the case for involving teachers and their professional associations in bringing about educational change:

> One of the gravest problems we face in America is whether education will be able to change fast enough to keep up with those changes within our lives caused by developments in the sciences and the humanities. However, using the normal channels of educational change—the channels we have considered orthodox over the last hundred years—may not be enough. Teachers' organizations will have a moral responsibility not only to promote better instruction but also to influence the determination of what is to be taught. Changes in curriculum have been notoriously slow in America. In an age of transcience, society should not permit a lag of a total generation between important social and economic change and the resultant adjustment in education. Through its organizational structure, the teaching profession must be far more active in leading, or even in pushing, desirable changes in educational objectives, curriculum, content, and teaching method.
>
> The traditional methods of effecting educational change through teacher education in the colleges and through local supervisory leadership in the school districts must now be supplemented by programs mounted by the total profession. Professional associations can stimulate significant improvements in the quality of instruction without in any way intruding upon the prerogatives of the official agencies of administration and supervision. Motivation for improvement is often more effective when it comes from one's peers rather than from one's superiors.
>
> The most important change in the programs of our associations in the next three decades must be increased involvement in the improvement of curriculum and instruction. This responsibility has long been recognized, but it must be given first priority in association budgets and, hence, in program emphasis. No group can develop or maintain professional status when its right to make basic decisions regarding its own work is challenged or denied.[1]

The Strength of Organization. To some degree, the question of whether teachers should be involved in decisions about instruction—and in a formal capacity, a function safeguarded by provisions negotiated in a contract—is academic. Teachers believe they should be, and now that they have learned the political lessons of the 1950's and 1960's and have begun using numbers to strengthen their demands, that belief is what counts. Some educational decisions are reserved to other bodies by law—but even laws are subject to change through the political process, and teachers during the last decade began taking advantage of the same political procedures which corporations, lobbying groups, mayors, and other citizens' associations have been using throughout our history.

Much of this discussion has implied a carry-over of negotiating behavior and attitudes into individual schools and classrooms. Although negotiations have involved too few people to make these implications reality, there are developments that hold promise for much broader involvement. Two factors provide the primary impetus. (1) There is a growing awareness of the possibility that in attempting to make a single written contract cover a wide variety of situations, an association would merely be replacing a school board's tyranny with its own. To prevent that, many contracts are now allowing individual faculties or even smaller teacher groups to, in effect, negotiate subcontracts at the building level under procedures established in the master contract. (2) Recognizing the value to association support and impact that results from membership familiarity with negotiating processes and behavior, many associations are involving as many members, directly and indirectly, as possible.

As an example of subcontracting at the building level, some teachers in Livonia, Michigan, began to find maximum class sizes, as established in the master contract, too restricting in their attempts to group students. A subsequent contract allowed the staff in any individual building to decide whether to abide by these maximums or to develop its own schedule utilizing various groupings and staff assignments. Operating from their basic quota of professional positions, with the provision that they could convert some of these positions into paraprofessional or aide positions, the staff could allocate their talents and time to better fit the needs of their students.

An essential piece of knowledge learned from negotiation is that, to the extent we can organize to achieve a particular purpose,

our experience, knowledge, and numbers create real power—a power that is applicable and appropriate apart from negotiating master contracts. That power need not be applied solely at the school system level: In several instances, individual faculties have developed instructional or operational plans and presented them to the building administration as a faculty proposal. We have always suspected administrators to be political, but only lately have we learned to take advantage of it. In other instances, tired and frustrated in their attempts to achieve improvement in teacher training institutions, a few local associations have cut their feeder colleges off at the source by refusing to accept any student teachers until the college made some acceptable changes. This was initiated by political maneuvering; negotiations effected resolution.

In several instances, curriculum and instruction improvement programs have been the result not of negotiated contracts between the board and the association, but of agreements by both that there exists a need for such programs. In California the local associations and the NEA have worked for three years within two school systems on extensive projects to revise the total programs of studies and to provide advanced in-depth career education for teachers. With major financial backing from the local boards of education and some support from the associations, the projects have resulted in revised decision-making processes, new means to evaluate programs, increased student involvement in curriculum planning, status studies of what appears to be working and not working in the systems at present, and an across-the-board strengthening of the teacher as a full participant on the systems' goal-setting and -implementing teams. Other system-aimed programs designed to improve curriculum and instruction will be forthcoming through the recently instituted UniServ network which will provide leadership for member associations as they assess the needs of individuals and school systems and mount programs to meet them.

THE FUTURE OF NEGOTIATION

Our thrust toward greater power for teachers has been aided by two external circumstances. First, the general public knew that we were underpaid by virtually any measurement of professional compensation that one cared to apply. Second, the American public used to take education more or less for granted; they, along with

the educators, assumed that the service provided by the schools was good, and that failures among students were the fault of student abilities, not the result of shortcomings of the staff.

Both these conditions are changing. Whether or not we have achieved a proper level of compensation, the public knows that teachers have been winning larger salary settlements, and public sympathy for still larger raises is waning. In addition, the notion that we are largely or at least partly responsible for our performance has taken hold. Future demands by teachers are likely to be met with demands by the public for a quid pro quo based on accountability, which we accept when we have achieved governance of our profession.

Beyond these external circumstances which help shape the environment for negotiations, though, there is an additional circumstance that will influence the course of teacher negotiations: the form of these negotiations themselves. When we first sat down at the bargaining table, the only guideline we had for what was to happen next was a rudimentary understanding of the labor-management bargaining model. The operation of that model rested on the tension between two alternatives: the possibility that management would withhold pay for services, and the possibility that labor would withhold services.

In labor-management relations, however, the price of the product can be adjusted to accommodate increases in the price of labor. In education, that "price"—the amount of taxes the citizenry is willing to pay for public education—can be raised, too, but not nearly as quickly or as easily as in industry. Tax increases usually require a vote or, in any case, subject people who are not a party to the wage settlement, e.g., mayors and city councilmen, to retaliation by the taxpayers. And the experience of any number of cities in the United States during the 1960's showed that a significant number of taxpayers is willing to see the schools shut down for a month or two rather than see levies on property and sales raised.

Taken together, these factors suggest that there may be some difficult days ahead for our associations at the bargaining table—unless, that is, we move farther ahead into "innovative" negotiations that serve the interests of students and the community as well as our own.

That may seem an idle wish, a pious hope that ignores the basic conflict of interests which makes negotiation necessary in the first place. But the labor-management model of negotiations is not necessarily the most appropriate one for administration-staff

negotiations in a professional field. To a much greater degree than in industry, the professional in education knows not only how to render the service for which he is paid, but how to improve it. And our knowledge in this respect, moreover, usually exceeds that of our employers—administrators, school board members, and the general public.

Viewed from one perspective, the present public disenchantment with teachers, the growing citizen resistance to larger outlays for schools, and the public's increasingly "product-oriented" perception of the educational system (as reflected in the drive for accountability) could weaken our organized teaching profession. Viewed from another perspective, the confrontation between an informed public and a newly mature teaching profession could lead not only to a badly needed, fresh concept of education, but to the development of a new model for the interaction of organized interest groups and the public.

Whether we can successfully develop the badly needed latter option will depend on our ingenuity in preventing service to membership and service to clients from becoming mutually exclusive categories. The profession must formulate concepts of job satisfaction and teacher welfare that incorporate increased service to students.

At the publication date of this volume, the Center for the Study of Instruction is designing an action program which will be available on an increasingly wider scale over the next several years. Centered largely around the issues raised in this book and in the supporting Preliminary and Auxiliary volumes of the series, this action program will focus on the role of the local association in improving curriculum and instruction, and will feature accompanying tapes, study guides, action plans, and examples for study (see SCHOOLS FOR THE 70's Publications and Accompanying Materials, p. 147). It is through this component of the SCHOOLS FOR THE 70's program that the nationwide dialogue about the association's responsibility to its members and to public schooling will be channelled.

The vast majority of us entered the profession with noble intentions and great expectations. Many of us still allow ourselves—perhaps in those reflective moments before we drop off to sleep at night—an occasional glimpse of what schooling could be, if only. . . .

That "if only" and all the dreams it represents must find their way into the raw material of the negotiations process. In each

town meeting across this land, we must involve our members and the students and the public in a dialogue aimed at making the school a humane institution.

FOOTNOTE

1. Corey, Arthur F. *The Responsibility of the Organized Profession for the Improvement of Instruction.* Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, Center for the Study of Instruction, 1967. pp. 2-4.

EPILOGUE

We are teachers. We are vitally concerned with the character of our society, our democratic institutions, and our people as individuals. We are also convinced that we can and do play a crucial role in the determination of what the country's progress shall be—an extension of the principles of freedom, intellectual and ethical excellence, and social responsibility. And we know that as members of the United Teaching Profession we will have increased power to induce the changes in schools that appear to be so necessary to the creation of a humane place for teachers and students.

This book has posed some problems and put forth some options which might solve them—means by which we can act to make changes really happen. There is an absence of recommendations here because we know that it is necessary to listen to many voices before hard-and-fast proposals issue from a body as representative as the National Education Association.

We propose, then, the creation of a nationwide dialogue to be carried on at all levels of the profession and to include all of the voices that must be heard and considered thoughtfully and openly —teachers, parents, students, administrators, industry, government. In local, state, and national associations we urge the implementation of an educational version of the town meeting—a forum where we all can debate the essential questions regarding the purposes of schools, the roles of individuals in them, and the ways we can work together as partners in the exciting and rewarding world of education.

The content of the dialogue could be the ideas set forth in this book. It could be the provocative concepts which are included in the Preliminary and Auxiliary Series of SCHOOLS FOR THE 70's. It may well be based on problems or ideas which have not been included in this program but which are vital agenda items in one of the tens of thousands of schools in this country.

The result of such a dialogue will be a series of well-developed, carefully considered recommendations which can be put forth as the platform of the united profession as we continue to translate

our knowledge and experience into effective school programs. Such a set of principles and plans for action will further strengthen our position as the truly central party to making schools work effectively.

As was stated in the Foreword to this volume—this is not an end, but a call to action so that every school in this land is a showplace of excellence by the time we celebrate our bicentennial as a nation in 1976. As a practical first step, many local associations will begin now to govern and operate schools to achieve that end.

SCHOOLS FOR THE 70's

Publications and Accompanying Materials

PRELIMINARY SERIES

Curriculum for the 70's: An Agenda for Invention. Arthur W. Foshay.
Combines a soundly formulated rationale for developing a revitalized curriculum and an equally sound guide for practices leading to the creation of a humane schooling experience.

75 pp. Paper, $1.50 (Stock No. 381-11946); cloth, $3.00 (Stock No. 381-11948).

Decision Making and Schools for the 70's. William Pharis, John Walden, and Lloyd Robison.
Examines the shifting nature and accountability of legal, extralegal, and power groups, and outlines areas for decision in the 70's.

82 pp. Paper, $1.50 (Stock No. 381-11940); cloth, $3.00 (Stock No. 381-11944).

On Staying Awake: Talks with Teachers. Ole Sand.
Describes a multilevel approach to humanizing education in five essays: "On Staying Awake," "Putting First Things Last," "In Search of a New Bird," "How Much Does Gray Matter?," and "Entrances and Exits."

60 pp. Paper, $1.25 (Stock No. 381-11954); cloth, $2.25 (Stock No. 381-11956).

The Reform of Urban Schools. Mario D. Fantini.
Calls for a new structure for cooperative governance of public schools that involves teachers, students, administrators, and community members, and proposes an alternative public school system based on choice.

100 pp. Paper, $1.75 (Stock No. 381-11950); cloth, $3.25 (Stock No. 381-11952).

AUXILIARY SERIES

The Practical: A Language for Curriculum. Joseph J. Schwab.
Expands on the view that the curriculum field is "moribund" largely because work within it has been based on theory rather than on the real world of the classroom.

46 pp. $1.00 (Stock No. 381-11934).

A Selected Guide to Curriculum Literature: An Annotated Bibliography. Louise L. Tyler.
Goes beyond the usual listings of references and brief annotations to serve as an intellectual instrument meant to stimulate discussion and reexploration of the curriculum field.

142 pp. $2.00 (Stock No. 381-11628).

The Study of Curriculum Plans. Arlene Payne.
Offers examples and discussions of the process for analyzing curriculum plans, based on the theme that the analysis itself provides one approach to planning.

44 pp. $1.00 (Stock No. 381-11862).

Values and the Curriculum: A Report of the Fourth International Curriculum Conference. William G. Carr, editor.

Includes papers from the Fourth International Curriculum Conference developed by William F. O'Neill, Lawrence Stenhouse, Mario Fantini, Robert Brackenbury, and others.

150 pp. $3.75 (Stock No. 381-11936).

MAIN REPORT

Schools for the 70's and Beyond: A Call to Action. A Staff Report.

Tells "a lot about what you want to know about schools but never dared ask," and challenges the teacher to grab the system by the horns. More than just a book!

148 pp. Paper, $2.25 (Stock No. 381-11962); cloth, $4.00 (Stock No. 381-11964).

Quantity discounts on publications: 2-9 copies, 10 percent; 10 or more copies, 20 percent. All orders must be prepaid except for those on your official purchase order forms. Shipping and handling charges will be added to billed purchase orders. Make checks payable to the National Education Association. Order from NEA Publications-Sales Section, 1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20036.

ACCOMPANYING MATERIALS

Because the purpose of SCHOOLS FOR THE 70's is to encourage an intensive, nationwide dialogue on the crucial questions of education, this main report has served as background for a series of "discussion-starter" tapes. In process of development, these tapes focus on four topics—the teacher, the curriculum, the system, and the organized profession. Each topic is dealt with in a series of brief, single-concept tapes, designed to stimulate discussion and action in the field.

In addition to the discussion-starter tapes, several talks with teachers by Ole Sand, director of the Center for the Study of Instruction, are also available; these tapes have been drawn from the Preliminary Series volume, *On Staying Awake: Talks with Teachers*, described above.

All inquiries and orders should be addressed to the NEA Publications-Sales Section, 1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20036.