

that set society moving in a certain direction in respect to the way democracy itself shall go in the future. Not to perceive this is to lead to this half-truth from one of its interpreters, "a group does not exist in a vacuum; it exists to act in terms of its needs, purposes, goals. . . ."

But where do these needs come from? He should have added, "and in terms of the other processes that surround it and press in upon it."

Ultimately, the process is to be meas-

ured not by how efficiently it solves this or that particular problem, but only as it brings an individualistic motivation into harmony with a corporate society at hand, as it reconciles the dignity and worth of the individual with social responsibility, as it redefines democracy and expands it into "unprocessed" areas, and, finally, as those outside the process become sensitive to the emerging forces in society, still inchoate, that can be brought into harmony with these assumptions.

When School and College Cooperate—

JOHN I. GOODLAD and FLOYD JORDAN

This is a report of the Atlanta (Georgia) Area Teacher Education Service. The authors are John I. Goodlad, associate professor of education, Emory University, and Floyd Jordan, professor of education at the University of Georgia. The authors are, respectively, consultant in curriculum and instruction and coordinator in the Atlanta Area Teacher Education Service.

"THIS YEAR we plan to hold our annual planning conference several weeks after the beginning of the fall term. By that time, we'll have most routine matters under control and will be free to concentrate on instructional problems. What do you think of the idea?"

This question, part of a telephone conversation held early in the summer of 1949, was a link in a chain of events culminating in a major educational conference in the fall of the same year. It was asked of the Coordinator of the Atlanta Area Teacher Education Service by the Director of In-Service Edu-

cation in a large county school system in the Atlanta area. This workshop-type conference included a banquet and keynote address, two days of intensive group study under trained leadership, an evaluative summary, and a final inspirational address. It involved more than 800 local teachers, supervisors, administrators, and consultants. Of greatest importance, it represented the co-operative planning of all these persons and resulted in certain specific recommendations for the betterment of local educational conditions.

The above account is only one of many that might be written to describe

educational projects initiated and carried out by school systems in the Atlanta area with the cooperation of the Atlanta Area Teacher Education Service. The purposes of this report are to sketch the structure of the Service and to illustrate its function.

Colleges and School Systems Plan Together

The structure and organization of the Atlanta Area Teacher Education Service have been described elsewhere.¹ It is desirable, however, to mention certain features here. The Service is sponsored jointly by six city and county school systems and the six institutions of higher learning comprising the University Center in Georgia. It offers three major types of assistance to the educational personnel of these six systems:

¶ Courses applicable to degree credit at the University of Georgia or Emory University and to meeting certification or salary increment requirements. These functional courses are focused directly upon the problems and needs of the teachers enrolled and are given in the public schools nearest to the majority of the participants.

¶ Consultative on-the-job help to any teacher enrolled in any course who requests such help. The consultant requested need not be the one directing the course, but may be any one of a staff of almost twenty persons representing a wide range of special interests and training.

¶ Consultative help to any group of teachers within the six cooperating school systems. Such groups frequently include several teachers interested in a common problem, a school faculty seeking advice

on a current enterprise, or an entire school system engaged in educational planning.

The staff consists of faculty members from the University of Georgia and Emory University who give all or part of their time to the program. Some special services are provided by means of a fund raised jointly by Kappa Phi Kappa educational fraternity and the Education Committee of the Atlanta Chamber of Commerce. These services include fellowships to experienced graduate students and the consultative services of outstanding educators as requested by participants in the program. These special consultants are brought in for brief periods of time to confer with regular staff personnel, teachers, supervisors, and administrators.

A Class at Work

Courses for the current year are requested by the teachers through their representatives on the Advisory Committee. Usually, the requests fall within the scope of regular course offerings at both Emory University and the University of Georgia. Occasionally, however, it is necessary to seek approval for new courses through the Graduate Councils of these institutions.

One course currently being offered in a high school only five miles from Emory is entitled Problems in Teaching. Sixteen teachers are enrolled for credit, six at Emory and ten at the University of Georgia. Registration cards and fees are sent directly to the registrar and bursar of the institution at which the student desires credit. In this case, the instructor is a faculty member of the Department of Teacher Education at Emory.

This course grew out of several

¹L. D. Haskew and Kenneth R. Williams, "Metropolitan Atlanta Streamlines Teacher Education In-Service," *Elementary School Journal*, Vol. 46, No. 5, January, 1946, pp. 253-257.

years of intensive county-wide work in the areas of curriculum development and child study, and represents a desire for help in the implementation phases of curriculum planning. At the first meeting, the teachers listed the problems they wished to study for the year. These were then grouped under the following headings:

- Understanding the Child
- Understanding and Teaching the Child
- Understanding and Evaluating the Child
- Establishing and Maintaining Desirable Home-School Relationships
- Managing the Classroom
- Developing a Philosophy of Education
- The Teacher and Ethical Behavior

Quite an assignment for one year's work! However, the group members approached the study with the understanding that they would never be "finished" with any one of these areas but would seek to increase their understanding in these fields. A bibliography was compiled, many books were obtained from the State Library Extension Service, and the group got down to work.

It was decided to work together on these seven areas, sharing reading and experiences in discussion situations. In addition, however, each person proposed problems of special personal concern upon which to concentrate study during the year. These projects frequently are discussed by the total group in order that the individual may profit from the thinking of all its members.

As previously mentioned, the instructor is available for classroom visitation during the interim between meetings. The group, then, determines its own course of studies, seeks materials appropriate to the jobs to be

done, shares responsibilities according to the needs and interests of individuals, and evaluates its own progress. The instructor serves as a resource person playing a variety of roles from passive listener to active leader and on-the-job consultant, according to the needs and requests of the participants. Other resource persons are brought in whenever the need for their services is felt.

The Consultant in Action

Instructors in the program visit participants only on invitation. The staff member responds to such invitations personally or recommends the services of a colleague whom he considers better qualified to fulfill the particular request. Such negotiations usually are handled through the coordinator. The following situation illustrates this phase of the service in action.

Recently a member of the staff, who is a faculty member of Emory University, and a graduate fellow conducted a course in curriculum planning. The participants, with the exception of a public health nurse, represented a large proportion of the faculty of one high school. The study sessions centered upon curricular problems of that school and resulted in suggestions for improving cafeteria conditions, securing better coordination of recreational facilities, and the revision of certain instructional procedures.

One member of the group, stimulated to attempt broader student participation in the planning of the social studies program, encountered difficulties in the evaluation phases. Her modified philosophy of student participation and her unmodified philosophy of testing the

outcomes in terms only of subject matter achievement were incompatible. She called for help.

As a result, the instructing assistant and the staff specialist in evaluation, this time a faculty member of the University of Georgia, spent an afternoon in the school. Techniques other than the commonly used paper-and-pencil means of evaluation were discussed. The teacher readily accepted and expanded upon such ideas as observing the group process, examining the products of project activities, measuring social outcomes, and watching for concomitant learnings. She reported her progress and secured further assistance in the regular class meetings. Resources from two neighboring educational institutions, a national education fraternity, the local chamber of commerce, and a county high school had "teamed up" to the educational advantage of thirty boys and girls.

A School System Plans Its Faculty Meetings

The cry of "What, another meeting!" is not unknown in educational circles. Teachers protest less when they are confident that worthwhile things are being accomplished in the most expeditious way. Faculty meetings—particularly those that embrace an entire school system—come in for much of the criticism.

Two years ago, the administrative and teaching personnel of one of the six cooperating school systems turned the light of inquiry upon the worthwhileness of the regular county-wide faculty meetings. After some preliminary planning and clarification of needs, the help of the Atlanta Area Teacher Education

Service was sought. As a result of joint planning, a schedule of regular faculty meetings centered upon problems of curriculum and instruction was drawn up. A corps of specialists representing the regular staff of the Atlanta Area Teacher Education Service and the faculties of the various departments of three participating institutions was drawn together. The teachers divided into groups according to their areas of interest, and a year of profitable study was under way.

But progress was not halted at the end of the school year. A group comprising more than thirty representatives of the schools was sent to Emory University to participate in a summer workshop in curriculum planning. The recommendations of this workshop group led to the establishment, the following September, of a course in curriculum planning under the auspices of the Atlanta Area Teacher Education Service. Cooperation is the key-word in this 'round-the-year program of continuous planning, doing, and evaluating.

Some Unique Features

The foregoing illustrations have highlighted some of the unique features of the Atlanta Area Teacher Education Service:

- ¶ Teachers enroll in the in-service course of their choice, with the instructor of their choice, and secure credit at one of two educational institutions without regard to the university affiliation of that instructor.
- ¶ Teachers enrolled get more than the class services of the instructor. They may call upon him or one of his colleagues for on-the-job assistance at any time.
- ¶ Individual teachers, groups of teachers, or entire school systems may secure special

ized assistance completely free from the expense of consultative or travel fees.

¶ The services of outstanding educational authorities from all parts of the country are made available for short periods of time—and again without cost to the school systems involved.

¶ Staff members team up, regardless of their university affiliations, to bring together their respective competencies for attack upon the problem at hand.

¶ Regular faculty members of college education departments are kept constantly in close contact with teachers' current problems. Undoubtedly, there is a carry-over in practicality to the campus courses of these instructors as a result of their participation in the in-service program.

Helping Systems Help Themselves

It must be emphasized that the Atlanta Area Teacher Education Service in no way substitutes for the planning

and initiative of school personnel in the cooperating systems. It takes part in the educational enterprises of these systems only when invited to do so. Members of its staff go to meetings of teachers or inside the classrooms of teachers only on invitation. Courses are set up with the approval of the school systems involved through their representatives on the Advisory Committee.

The Service is truly a service—it exists for the sole purpose of helping existing educational systems to do better the jobs they must do anyway, with or without the existence of the Atlanta Area Teacher Education Service. Its presence, however, is further evidence of the spreading belief that all agencies engaged in education can do a better job cooperatively and coordinately.

'She Wents and Comes'

ALICE MIEL

Alice Miel, associate professor of education at Teachers College, Columbia University, examines professional diaries in which supervisors show what they try to accomplish and how they work.

FOUR-YEAR-OLD Mary Ann was discussing the adults in her nursery-school world: "I have Miss Miller, she's my teacher; and then I have Miss Parks, she's the mother teacher."

"And what does Miss Parks do?" asked Mary Ann's mother.

"Oh, she wents and comes."

All in all, this is a pretty good definition of a supervisor—whether he or she be the director of a nursery school, the principal of an elementary or secondary school, a general or special supervisor, or a department head. A supervisor is a person who does not

stay with a group of children or youth; she "wents and comes."

Let us see what some of this coming and going is all about, by turning to professional diaries in which supervisors show what they were trying to accomplish and how they worked.¹

The Job of a Department Head

A department head whose responsibility it was to supervise the science

¹ For the examples in this article the writer is indebted to Maurice A. Dawkins of New York City, Walter H. Hellmann of Fairfield, Connecticut, and James Murray of Pierce County, Blackshear, Georgia.

Copyright © 1950 by the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. All rights reserved.