

Democratic Planning for TEACHER EDUCATION

Cooperative and comprehensive planning produce a vital new program of teacher education within the framework of a liberal arts college.

TO DEVELOP, and then *put into practice*, a total new program for the education of prospective teachers, requires the cooperative thought and planning of all who are going to be involved in the program. A well chosen and hard working committee can, it is true, evolve a program more expeditiously, and with effective leadership can perhaps get consent of at least the majority of the staff. But for effective operation of the new program each member of the staff needs to feel it is a program that he has helped to make, that it is one into which he can put his mind and his heart, that it is one all aspects of which, in their intermeshing, he thoroughly understands. At Brooklyn College we have had an unusual opportunity to apply this principle.

In 1948 the legislature of the State of New York undertook the subsidy, to a large extent, of the preparation of teachers in the four municipal colleges of New York City—City, Hunter, Brooklyn, and Queens. It did so with the proviso that a fifth year of training be included for all education students, whether preparing for early childhood, elementary or secondary school teaching, and that the undergraduate train-

ing be revised, enriched and made a part of a five-year program. Each of the four colleges in its own way carried out this mandate. The way used by Brooklyn College, involving every member of the staff, is the subject of this article.

At the time state support became available, the Department of Education at Brooklyn College had a staff of twenty-seven full time instructors, and offered undergraduate professional sequences for early childhood, elementary, and secondary school teachers. While the staff included able and even distinguished persons, the program was orthodox—history of education, educational psychology, principles of education, educational statistics, mental hygiene, etc., and an array of courses in methods, followed by a semester of practice teaching in the last half of the senior year. In the fall of 1948 a full sequence of graduate courses leading to the Master's degree was added, and the staff was enlarged. An Educational Clinic—a full fledged child guidance clinic—was established to be used in the training of undergraduate and graduate students. From 1949 on new members were rapidly added, temporary appointees were replaced with

carefully selected permanent staff, and the department grew, during the next five years, from twenty-seven to sixty-five.

The period of expansion was also the period of fundamental reconstruction of the professional education of teachers at Brooklyn College. That reconstruction was carried out by a purely democratic process in which every member of the expanding department participated and, informally, through their instructors, many of the students contributed criticism and ideas.

In February 1949, all members of the department were asked to dream—to dream of what would be the most ideal program of teacher education the members of the department could imagine, without regard, for the moment, to city or state requirements, to habit and tradition, or even to time or money. What were the characteristics we believed teachers should possess, and how could these be developed?

Policy Groups

During that first semester many members of the department wrote notes or essays on the subject, all discussed it informally. Then, in the fall of 1949, the entire department was divided into six "Policy Groups," each person choosing those with whom he wanted to work. Each of these groups met regularly for an hour or two a week, or somewhat longer every two weeks. All six groups wrestled with the same problem—what would be the best possible professional edu-

cation of prospective teachers at all levels?

Each group selected one of its members to serve on a Policy Coordinating Committee. These six, plus three "rovers" (the director of the educational clinic, the director of evaluation and educational research, and the deputy chairman of the department who had previously been chairman) met with the Director of Teacher Education (who was also chairman of the department) for two or more hours every two weeks. Each representative reported on the deliberations of his policy group, and reported back to his group what the others were thinking and planning. The Policy Coordinating Committee as a whole tried to reconcile or bring into relief the differing plans and to work toward some sort of cohesion.

In the Policy Groups there was earnest and sometimes heated discussion. Like all teachers, but especially college teachers, many loved to wrangle over definitions and semantics. Discussions sometimes rose to philosophic heights and sometimes sank to personalities and college politics. The director of teacher education being new made blunders, unwittingly trod on toes, but managed to keep the Policy Groups working and thinking. It was a rough year, but a year of rapid growth.

Plans being worked out in other institutions were studied and discussed. One member of the department was sent to Syracuse University to study the program of teacher education in that institution, and reported back to the Policy Coordinating Committee and to the department as a whole.

Carleton W. Washburne is director of the Division of Graduate Studies and Teacher Education Program, Brooklyn College, Brooklyn, New York.

Others made similar reports from written documents emanating from other colleges and universities struggling with similar problems.

Emerging Consensus

By the end of that year (spring of 1950) certain trends had begun to emerge in all the Policy Groups. There was general but not unanimous agreement that neither the history nor the philosophy of education should be the introductory course, but that there should be historical and philosophical strands running through all the undergraduate work, with the systematic study of these two fields left for the graduate year where they could help integrate and give perspective to all the preceding courses. There was practically unanimous agreement that a small number of large integrated courses should replace the many separate and often overlapping courses of the then current curriculum. There was also widespread agreement that field work, laboratory work and work with real children should form an experiential base for each of the new courses. That methods courses and practice teaching should be more closely related was also generally agreed.

During the summer of 1950 the Director of Teacher Education, going through the minutes of all Policy Group meetings and those of the Policy Coordinating Committee, sought to formulate these common denominators and show the degree of consensus that had been reached. When he presented this document in the fall, however, he found that it was premature—no Policy Group was satisfied with his formulation, although subsequent ac-

tions show that in essentials it was not far from the joint thinking of the department. More group thinking was necessary to amalgamate the widely diverse individualities so characteristic of college faculties.

The Framework Committee

The next step was the appointment of a "Framework Committee" by the Director of Teacher Education. This committee was composed of representatives of the Policy Groups, so chosen that the various specializations in the department were all used—early childhood, elementary, junior and senior high school, philosophy and history of education, psychology and mental hygiene, educational sociology. It was also so chosen that new and old and intermediate elements of the faculty were represented. Since the same person might be a representative of a Policy Group, a faculty member of long standing, and a specialist in early childhood, and another single person be a representative of a different Policy Group, a relatively newly appointed member of the staff, a specialist in secondary education and in the social sciences and educational sociology, the committee was not unwieldy—ten members altogether. This committee, ratified by the department as a whole, met regularly and long with the Director of Teacher Education, who served as chairman.

In contrast with the stormy meetings of some of the Policy Groups the preceding year, this Framework Committee learned to think cooperatively and constructively, with genuine mutual respect even when differing among themselves, as they often did. Within

a few months the general framework of the new program took shape, and there was a clear idea as to what the introductory course should be. The department, almost without dissent, accepted this formulation of the thinking of the Policy Groups as developed by the Framework Committee. A special committee was then organized to work out details of the new introductory course, known as "Education 10: Introduction to Education." On the basis of its work the elected Curriculum Committee of the department worked out title, course description and brief syllabus, for presentation to the department as a whole. This was accepted with practical unanimity, was presented to and approved by the College Committee on Curriculum and Admission Requirements, the four-college Dean of Teacher Education, the Brooklyn College Faculty Council and the Board of Higher Education which controls all four municipal colleges, to become effective with the upper sophomore class in the spring term of 1952.

Education 10

Meanwhile the "Education 10 Committee" was reorganized to consist of those members of the staff who would like to teach the course and were believed competent to do so. The committee worked arduously and long, planning experiences, books, visual aids and all the details of the introductory course; and preparing a very full syllabus. When the course was given, the committee continued to meet to exchange experiences, and to evaluate and refine the procedures. Since there are nine to eighteen sections of this

course each semester (about thirty students to the section), interchange of ideas and experiences among the instructors is essential if the different instructors are going to get comparable outcomes. The instructors constitute the Course Committee which continues to meet, to plan, evaluate and improve the work of this introductory course. The chairman of the course committee has a small amount of released time to coordinate the work.

The course is based on two types of experience—(a) the study of an individual child throughout the semester by each student; and (b) carefully planned conducted field trips to social agencies dealing with youth, and schools at all levels and of various types. Those experiences are supplemented by observations in the Educational Clinic and in the campus nursery school and kindergarten of the Early Childhood Center, by all sorts of visual aids, and by extensive reading. In class there is discussion to integrate and interpret the experiences and the reading, and there is time allowance for individual counselling of each student—both curricular and personal. The course is an orientation to teaching, involving both its individual and social aspects. It is the means of helping students and instructor to discover whether teaching is indeed the field for each of the students. It is problem-centered rather than organized logically in terms of subject matter. It is good general education for future citizens and parents even if they are not going to become professional teachers. It is required of all students who plan to teach, at whatever level, from nursery school through senior high school. For

the most part it is very popular both among students and among those who teach the course.

As Education 10 was being launched, the Framework Committee turned to junior and senior courses.

The Junior Year

After much thought and discussion, and reading and re-reading of Policy Committee reports, the junior year course began to emerge. For a while it was conceived of as a single, five-hour course extending throughout the junior year for all students, without differentiation as to the level at which they were going to teach. But from the beginning of the work of the Framework Committee practical considerations were being borne in mind. The total number of credits that should be allowed for professional courses had to be taken into account—Brooklyn College is a liberal arts college, and is jealous in preserving a predominantly liberal arts education with room for a large amount of general education common to all, specialization in some liberal arts field, and some free electives. Professional education had to be fitted into the total pattern. With this all-college point of view the Department of Education was in general agreement; yet it was keenly conscious, as the rest of the college was not, of the importance of professional training. The committee also had to bear in mind the abilities and specializations of the members of the department varied. State and city requirements, on the other hand, presented no obstacle, since both the state education officials and the chairman of the Board of Examiners for the city had

expressed interest in what Brooklyn College was doing and had given assurances that this kind of re-thinking of teacher education was just what they wanted; formal requirements would, if necessary, be modified to fit the new program.

The idea of a single course for the junior year had to give way to practical considerations of available personnel. For it was decided that during this year students should get both a psychological and a sociological background, and few instructors were qualified in both. Furthermore, it was not considered desirable that students have contact with only one member of the department throughout the whole year. The outcome was a parallel pair of year-long courses. One of the pair is a course in Human Development and the Educative Process, within which are included the functional elements of psychology, mental hygiene and behavior problems, and measurements of intelligence and aptitudes. The other member of the pair is Education in Modern Society. In this the students consider the role of the culture in shaping educational institutions; the interrelations of the school and other social institutions (family, church or synagogue, social agencies, etc.); the teacher's role in society; curriculum making; and educational principles and practice in the light of historical and philosophic considerations and of social needs and purposes.

For both courses community experience is a required experiential base. Each student is required to spend one late afternoon or evening a week throughout the year as a volunteer worker in an approved youth-serving

agency which will provide adequate supervision—over a hundred such agencies are used. The Educational Clinic and Early Childhood Center serve as laboratories. Again much use is made of audio-visual aids. Again extensive reading, class discussions and individual counselling pull each course together. These courses are more systematically organized than Education 10, and go deeper; but, as in Education 10, the subject matter is functional, closely linked with real problems and based on practical experiences.

After much discussion it was agreed that the course in Human Development and the Educative Process should be differentiated as between those who are planning to teach at the early childhood or elementary level and those who are planning to teach at the junior or senior high school level. Both groups cover the entire range of growth from birth to adulthood; but one (Education 20) concentrates more on the phases prior to adolescence, while the other (Education 25) spends only about a third of the year on infancy to early adolescence and twice as much time on adolescence and post-adolescence. Theoretically, Education 30 (the parallel course—Education in Modern Society) would be the same for both groups, but the fact that the same section of students stays together, so far as practicable, for both Education 20 and 30, or both Education 25 and 30, results in some differentiation of treatment of Education 30 according to the level at which the students plan to teach. Education 20 and 25 carry three credits each semester; Education 30 carries two each semester, making a total of ten credits.

While the Framework Committee kept in touch with Policy Groups (which now only met on call) or with members of the department individually, this plan was not yet submitted to the department as a whole. The senior year course had to be worked out first.

The Senior Year

It was decided, not quite unanimously even within the Framework Committee, that methods and practice teaching should go hand in hand. At least one member of the Framework Committee and subsequently several members of the department felt that before a student did any practice teaching he should have some work in methods.

There were a number of desiderata in regard to methods and practice teaching, the first two of which seemed mutually exclusive. These were:

1. Students should know something about how to teach before they actually begin, even under supervision, to handle a class.
2. The study of methods should be in a setting of reality, where the student will see the problems in the classroom and will be able to make immediate application of the methods.
3. The student should get much more practice in handling children in classes than had heretofore been possible in one semester—practical classroom work should extend for a year.
4. The student should get experience in both morning and afternoon sessions at the elementary and early childhood level.
5. The student should participate in the opening of school, which precedes by two or three weeks the opening of college. (There being no campus school, all practice teaching is in the public schools of Brooklyn and a few private schools.)
6. The same instructor should teach the

methods, supervise the same students' practice teaching, and confer with them in regard to their practice teaching.

Only the first of these criteria (1.) was met under the then-existing program. The typical elementary school student had three methods courses under three different teachers, at least two of the courses preceding the practice teaching. Only occasionally, more or less by chance, did the student have his practice teaching supervised by one of his methods teachers. His practice teaching began several weeks after the opening of school. It took place mornings only. It lasted only one semester. Practice teaching group-conferences were under still another instructor.

The problem was how to get in as many as possible of the desiderata within the practical time and program limits of the college, the instructors and the students themselves.

The program finally worked out by the Framework Committee and accepted by the department with very few dissenting votes, necessarily involved some compromises that made some people dubious or unhappy, but that satisfied to some degree each of the criteria. For the sake of simplicity, let us consider the program for students preparing to teach in elementary schools as the basic pattern, and then show how this was adapted to the needs of early childhood and secondary school prospective teachers.

Methods and Practice Teaching: Elementary School (Education 50)

First of all, it became obvious that the methods courses would have to be divided differently. The old program

covered methods from grades 1 to 6 in three courses, divided by subject matter, i.e., art, crafts, music, and language arts, grades 1 to 6, were grouped in one course; reading and arithmetic, grades 1 to 6, in another course; social studies, science, and health, grades 1 to 6, in the third course. This made it necessary for the student to have three methods teachers, and made it practically impossible for the methods teachers to supervise their own students in their practice teaching. It also militated against interrelation and integration of subjects—the use of art, crafts, children's literature, and dramatics in the teaching of social studies and science, for example. It was doing on the college level just what the students were being taught not to do on the elementary level—putting subjects in separate, more or less water-tight compartments. The way out was found in an adaptation of the program already existing at Queens College: Divide the methods courses horizontally instead of vertically; i.e., in one six-semester-hour course teach *all* methods for grades 1 to 3, and in a similar, successive course teach all methods for grades 4 to 6.

By this means it became possible to arrange for one instructor to take a group of about twenty-eight students for three two-hour periods a week in the afternoon, and to supervise these same students as they do practice teaching out in the schools in the morning. During the lower-senior semester (Education 50.1), the students have methods of teaching in grades 1 to 3, and do their practice teaching at the same level; during the upper senior semester (Education 50.2), they have

their methods for grades 4 to 6 and do their practice teaching at that level.

Other desiderata were brought into line without too much difficulty. During the first few weeks of the semester the student observes in the classroom while getting the first notions of method; then he participates with the classroom teacher, working with individuals and groups of children; then, during the last part of the semester, he takes over the whole class in regular practice teaching. Arrangements were made for one full day each week, throughout the year, to be clear of all college classes so that the student can have experience with the full school day, and for students to be assigned to their practice-teaching classes the previous semester so that they can begin work with the opening of the elementary schools before the college term begins.

The college liberal arts schedule was rearranged by the dean of faculty and the registrar (both of whom were exceedingly cooperative throughout) to schedule the elective courses most often chosen by senior students preparing for the elementary schools so that these courses can be taken in the afternoons or parts of afternoons when the students are not taking methods or spending the afternoon out in the schools.

The two greatest difficulties were in specializations of faculty members and the adequate supervision of so many students. The first of these arose from the fact that instructors who were expert in teaching methods of reading and arithmetic often knew little of teaching art, crafts, music, etc. The same was true for each of the old methods courses. This problem was met by

the device of scheduling all methods classes for grades 1 to 3 simultaneously in one block of rooms, close to each other, and making similar arrangements for methods in grades 4 to 6. Thereby instructors can exchange classes for a week or two at a time, ad lib, and exploit each other's specializations. Meanwhile they can learn from each other and from reading and the observation of their own students in their practice teaching, what they have not previously had to learn in regard to methods outside their own specialization. The music, art and crafts being the most serious weakness for some of the methods teachers, a specialist in this field was employed as coordinator of the arts in education, to teach methods, but with released time to work with the Music, Design and Speech Departments in developing ancillary courses and to give special help to methods teachers in the Education Department.

The second difficulty was met, in part at least, by grouping the students doing practice teaching, about seven to a school. For this the cooperation of the city schools was necessary. Conferences were held with appropriate officials from the headquarters of the Board of Education, assistant superintendents in charge of the district within reach of Brooklyn College, and with principals. Since we were doubling the already large number of students who were doing student teaching (all being out in the schools two semesters instead of one), and since in the past many schools had taken students from other colleges and universities, the sympathy and cooperation of the schools were essential. Fortunately

ly we met with the greatest helpfulness. Certain schools were assigned exclusively to Brooklyn College for student teaching and observation, and principals agreed to take the larger numbers. They all liked the changes we were making, as a whole, and laid themselves out to facilitate our work.

Early Childhood Education (Education 40)

The program for students preparing for early childhood education is very similar to that for students of elementary education. For them the first semester of the senior year (Education 40.1) is given over to methods and practice teaching for nursery school and lower kindergarten; the second semester (Education 40.2) is devoted to kindergarten-primary methods and practice teaching. Grouping of seven students to a school is, however, obviously impossible at the nursery school-kindergarten level; but the numbers are small enough to make this not too serious a handicap.

Secondary Education (Education 60)

Students of secondary education require more modification of the program because of their subject matter requirements. The total number of credits in methods and practice teaching could only be seven (120 clock hours) as against eighteen (300 clock hours) for the early childhood and elementary students. This smaller number of hours cannot be adequately defended from a professional standpoint, in spite of the fact that secondary school teachers only require competence in one or two subjects while teachers of younger children have

to be competent in all. But practically, within the time available to students, the thorough knowledge of the subject they are going to teach requires of prospective teachers on the secondary level so many hours of preparation that there is not time for more professional courses without sacrifice of general education and opportunity for at least a few electives. Students of secondary education, therefore, during the first semester of the senior year (Education 61.01 to 61.14), spend two hours a week observing and participating in classrooms while taking the first half of the course in methods (in general and in the students' specialization). Their second semester (Education 62.01 to 62.14) continues the methods course, and includes ten hours a week of practice teaching. The same instructor has the students for methods throughout the year, and supervises both their observation and practice teaching. He meets with the students in class two hours a week throughout the year, in addition to supervising their work in the schools.

When this plan for the senior year had been worked out by the Framework Committee, in frequent consultation with members of the department, it and the plan for the junior year were submitted to all the Policy Committees for discussion, then to the department as a whole. They were agreed to with very few dissenting votes.

College-wide Acceptance

Then began the struggle with the College Committee on Curriculum and Admission Requirements. That committee consisted entirely of members of departments other than Educa-

tion. There was no real objection to the nature of the new program—it was recognized from the outset as an improvement on the old one. Nor was there disagreement as to the importance of retaining a strong liberal education as well as professional education for those who were to be teachers. Most of the argument was in regard to whether the professional program should be eighteen or twenty-one undergraduate credits for secondary school teachers and twenty-eight or thirty-two (out of 128) for elementary and early childhood teachers. There were also questions as to the matter of possible increased costs, of over-demand for classroom space, and so on.

When the College Committee wanted changes made, hours reduced, etc., the Education Department pulled together with complete unanimity in rejecting most of the proposals. Finally the Education Department yielded on a few points that did not destroy the philosophy and structure of the new program: the old requirement of a preliminary course in general psychology was readily waived—we could cover the most important functional aspects of that in our year-long course in human development. Reluctantly the number of credits for the introductory course, Education 10, was reduced from six to five hours on the teacher's schedule, and from four to three hours on the student's schedule (the extra hours for teachers are for the counselling and the supervision of field trips). The Committee thereupon recommended approval. The four-college Dean of Teacher Education also approved. Faculty Council passed it without a struggle. The Board of Higher Educa-

tion made it the official program of the college for those planning to teach. The State Department of Education agreed that it met all State requirements. The City Board of Examiners agreed that the new program met all their requirements. The program was inaugurated.

It had previously gone into effect for upper sophomores (spring of 1952). It went into effect for lower juniors in the fall of 1952, for lower seniors in the fall of 1953.

Graduate Year

Since a large majority of the graduate students are teaching, substituting, or (occasionally) serving as internes, the graduate "year" is usually spread out through two or more years. The graduate courses are given in the late afternoon and evening.

The program for the graduate year, leading to the Master's degree, presented less of a problem than did the undergraduate sequence. The general working basis established by the four-college Coordinating Committee in 1948 and implemented, with variations, in each of the colleges, was reasonably satisfactory; so the revision of it could wait until the undergraduate program was established. But during the year 1952-53 the department's Curriculum Committee wrestled with the problem of making the fifth year a real capstone for the undergraduate work, and the matter was discussed at length in department meetings. By April 1954, the most important revisions had been worked out by the Department Curriculum Committee and had been successively approved without much struggle, by the Educa-

tion Department, the College Graduate Committee on Curriculum and Admission Requirements, the four-college Dean of Teacher Education, the Brooklyn College Faculty Council, and the Board of Higher Education.

The goal was five-fold: (a) to round out the practical work of the senior year with a graduate workshop in which students would attack problems they were actually meeting in the classroom, either as employed teachers or as internes; (b) to give, through a research seminar, training in the scientific approach to educational problems, with practice in working out by approved research techniques some one problem that each student actually needed to solve; (c) to help the student to synthesize all his previous work in terms of historical, philosophic or world-wide perspectives; (d) to afford an opportunity for each student to elect one or more professional courses on the graduate level that would allow him to pursue a special interest; and (e) to leave time for graduate work in his subject matter field if he were to teach on the secondary level, or for his major nonprofessional Liberal Arts interest if he were on the early childhood or elementary level.

With these purposes the whole department was in agreement. For working out the courses that would, as nearly as possible, attain these goals within a thirty semester-hour time limit, the Curriculum Committee was augmented by a group of subcommittees which worked through the spring and fall of 1953. Since the earlier Policy Groups and the Framework Committee had all considered the graduate year in their thinking, the subcommit-

tees had a substantial basis of department-wide consensus on which to work.

The resulting fifth year program is therefore as follows:

1. Workshop, accompanied by actual teaching or intern teaching. Sections in early Childhood, Elementary and Secondary Education	Required 2 credits
2. Seminar in Educational Research. Research techniques, with application to a real problem often developed into a thesis	Required 2 credits
3. Perspectives in Education: One or more of the following courses:	
a. Philosophical Issues in Contemporary Education	Required 2 credits
b. Educational Ideas in Historical Perspective	or 2 credits
c. Education and the World Community	or 2 credits
4. Electives in Education: Choice of a wide range of offerings	3 to 9 credits
5. Major sequence in department of specialization and Liberal Arts and Science electives	15 to 21 credits
6. Thesis or Comprehensive Examination	no credits
Total	30 credits

Evaluation

Many kinds of evaluation are being applied to the new teacher education program. Students graduating under the former program (through June 1953) have been measured in a variety of ways, and as students have completed the new program (beginning in June 1954) they are being compared, by these same measures, with their predecessors. Each course in the new

sequence is being evaluated, and improvements will be made in accordance with the findings.

Before we can *really* know how effective the program is, we must see what happens to children taught by the teachers we train. An attempt is being made to develop instruments for measuring changes in children during the course of a year under a single teacher. When these instruments are developed and applied we shall be able to identify teachers who produce optimal growth in their children. We can then see whether the current new program produces more effective teachers than do more traditional programs. Furthermore, we shall be able to establish the various patterns of characteristics that distinguish effective from ineffective teachers, and therefore to evaluate each aspect of our program in terms of its efficiency in producing such characteristics.

The long-range program we envisage is briefly described in the May 1953 *Journal of Educational Research*. We are still in the earliest preliminary phases of that total evaluative program.

Of course there can never be a fully adequate evaluation of an on-going program of teacher education. We must, at the best, evaluate results of a *past* program—often several years past; because tentative evaluations will be made as we progress and programs and courses will be under continuous revision. An evaluation of products will therefore always be an evaluation of a program that *was*, and that has since undergone revision.

At the present time, more or less subjectively but not without a number of objectively observed factors, we can

say the following things about the new Brooklyn College teacher education program:

1. Both students and instructors are finding it interesting and challenging
2. It carries out to a high degree the principles of learning as established by research—experimental base, integration of parts, interest of students.
3. It applies systematically well established principles of guidance.
4. It provides for continuous evaluation.

The new program is not a finished product—by a long way. But we feel that we have made a wholesome and promising start. At least equally important is the fact that through genuinely democratic group process every member of the staff has had a vital part in its construction. All the basic principles were worked out by the Policy Committees, in which each staff member participated, and all of which worked simultaneously on the same fundamental problems, with a coordinating committee to keep all committees in touch with each other's thoughts. Practical details were worked out by more specialized committees—Framework Committees, Department Committee on Curriculum, Course Committees—every staff member being a member of one or more of these.

The inevitable result has been much better thinking on a wider base of experience than would have been possible with fewer participants; *and* a very large staff with wide diversity of background has learned to work together as a team, with real understanding of what they are trying to do and with high morale.

Copyright © 1955 by the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. All rights reserved.