R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 012 655 RC 001 154

HIGH SCHOOL EDUCATION FOR RURAL YOUTH.

BY- GIVIDEN, NOBLE J.
NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR CHILDREN AND YOUTH

PUB DATE SEP 63

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$1.20 30P.

DESCRIPTORS- ADMINISTRATIVE PERSONNEL, *ADMINISTRATOR RESPONSIBILITY, *BUILDING DESIGN, CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT, CURRICULUM ENRICHMENT, COMMUNITY SCHOOLS, HIGH SCHOOLS, HIGH SCHOOL ROLE, INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS, *RURAL EDUCATION, RURAL SCHOOLS, RURAL SCHOOL SYSTEMS, SCHOOL BUILDINGS, *SMALL SCHOOLS, TEACHER IMPROVEMENT, *RURAL YOUTH, SECONDARY EDUCATION, NEW YORK, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

SMALL HIGH SCHOOLS HAVE BEEN CONSIDERED POOR SCHOOLS, AND MOST EFFORTS TOWARD IMPROVEMENT HAVE BEEN TO ELIMINATE THE SCHOOL BY REORGANIZATION. THE STRUGGLE FOR COMPREHENSIVENESS IS SEEN IN THIS PAPER AS THE FUNDAMENTAL PROBLEM FACING SMALL HIGH SCHOOLS. IMPROVEMENT DEPENDS ON A RETURN TO COMMUNITY SCHOOL EMPHASIS, CONTINUED IMPROVEMENT IN LEADERSHIP AT ALL LEVELS, AND SERIOUS CONSIDERATION OF NEW IDEAS IN DESIGN OF SCHOOL BUILDINGS, INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS, AND EQUIPMENT. TWO TABLES PRESENT INFORMATION REGARDING PUPIL-TEACHER RATIOS, TUITION COSTS, AND DATA ON TEACHERS. THIS PAPER WAS PREPARED FOR PRESENTATION AT THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON PROBLEMS OF RURAL YOUTH IN A CHANGING ENVIRONMENT (SEPTEMBER 1963). (SF)

5.

HIGH SCHOOL EDUCATION FOR RURAL YOUTH

by

Dr. Noble J. Gividen
District Superintendent of Schools

of
First District, Westchester County

National Committee for Children and Youth
1145 Nineteenth Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

HIGH SCHOOL EDUCATION FOR RURAL YOUTH

by

Dr. Noble J. Gividen
District Superintendent of Schools

of

First District, Westchester County

Prepared for

The National Conference on Problems of Rural Youth
in a Changing Environment

September 1963

HIGH SCHOOL EDUCATION FOR RURAL YOUTH

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT

HIGH SCHOOL EDUCATION FOR RURAL YOUTH

by
Dr. Noble J. Gividen
District Superintendent of Schools
of
First District, Westchester County

The 1944 White House Conference on Rural Education was a benchmark from which progress was gauged in the 1954 National Conference on Rural Education. The second point of the ten-point charter designed by the 1944 Conference stated,

> "Every rural child has the right to a satisfactory, modern secondary education.--This education should assure the youth continued progress in his general, physical, social, civic and cultural development begun in the elementary school, and provide initial training for farming or other occupations and an open door to college and the professions." 1/

If "progress in intellectual development" were added to the above statement it would still be the benchmark from which gains on the rural high school front should be judged.

There has been considerable progress in school district reorganization, teachers' salaries, transportation, the educational attainment of rural adults, and in development of the intermediate unit. There is still much to be done about school mergers, teacher improvement, the problems of the disadvantaged groups - - - but the primary problem of secondary education in rural areas is curricular improvement of the small high school (under 300 students in grades 9-12).

While continued attention to school district reorganization is needed, too many states have allowed their merger programs to be the only approach to the improvement of rural secondary education. Except for those schools fortunate enough to be significantly influenced by the Catskill Area Project in Small School Design, The Rocky Mountain Area Project, The Texas Small Schools Project and the Western States Small Schools Project, most small high schools will continue to have woefully weak educational programs.

There are the remote "necessarily-existent" schools numbering in the thousands, there are the newer schools serving newly reorganized school districts (they are larger than the two or more separate schools which formerly served the area, but still small), and there are the small schools within county unit systems as well as in independent districts which should be merged with neighboring attendance areas or school districts. Wherever they are and whatever their status, they now serve youth who deserve to be served better.

Significant improvement in the small school primarily depends upon the adoption of the new "project" program designs, a return to community school emphasis, and continued improvement in the leadership at the intermediate and county unit level. Especially promising for small school improvement is the technological revolution possible in education.

The First White House Conference on Rural Education in 1944 developed a "Charter of Education for Rural Children." The Conference referred to the points of the charter as the rights of the rural child ". . .because they are the rights of every child regardless of race, or color, or situation, wherever he may live under the flag of the United States of America."1/ The second point of the ten-point charter stated,

> "Every rural child has the right to a satisfactory, modern secondary education. -- This education should assure the youth continued progress in his general, physical, social, civic and cultural development begun in the elementary school, and provide initial training for farming or other occupations and an open door to college and the professions."2/

If the charter were written today it would undoubtedly be the same as it was in 1944 with one exception -- included in the above-mentioned quote would be "progress in intellectual development." With that addition the 1944 charter becomes a benchmark from which progress in modern rural education should be judged. The assessment of the 1954 National Conference on Rural Education 3/ was that considerable gains had been made on several fronts, notably school district reorganization, teachers' salaries, expansion and improvement of school transportation, there was some improvement in the financing of rural schools, and there was a 50 percent increase in the educational attainment of rural people as measured by the number who had completed a high school education. Significant among achievements was improved development of the intermediate unit. Significant among the many remaining problems was school district reorganization, small high school program narrowness, teacher inadequacies and the educational problems of disadvantaged groups -- primarily among Negroes in the rural South and the Spanish-American and Negro migrant workers.

One generalization which could well be used as current assessment of rural education is the 1962 UNESCO comment on rural education in the United States.

> "The most outstanding feature of rural education in the United States from 1958-1962 has continued to be the reduction in the total number of schools in rural areas and the corresponding increase in the average size of rural schools brought about by the formation of new redistricts, centralization, and other forms of merger. The outstanding characteristic of the publications on rural education appearing in this period has been the focus on improvement in the quality of these schools, which, for various reasons, seem unlikely to be consolidated with other schools to form larger units.
>
> "Publications. . . .provide information on current trends concerning the use of new media ranging from simple machines to airborne television, the development of small school building designs, the role of community-school relations, development and utilization of new concepts for work with adults in rural areas, and federally sponsored co-operative research on the education of exceptional children in rural areas. Thus, while the trend towards improving quality by enlarging schools in rural areas continues, the new dynamic in research and publication is centered on helping the small schools maintain and improve their quality." 4/

The story of secondary education in rural America is essentially the story of the small high school. This paper provides background for consideration of the small high school and suggests simply that improvement of rural education involves continued progress in school district reorganization, radical improvement of the small high school and marked improvement in leadership and services from the intermediate and county unit of school organization. There is no attempt to get into curriculum details because the programs of small schools are being considered more directly in other papers.

PERSPECTIVE

An excellent review of forty years' (1920-1960) of literature on the small high school was contained in Iwamoto's recent survey 5/ and from it were drawn the following generalizations about the weaknesses of small high schools. Ten of the eleven studies indicated that "the curriculum was poor or the offerings were limited." Nine studies referred to teachers as "poorly trained or inexperienced." Eight reported that the facilities in small high schools are "generally inferior"; seven reported "inadequate or inappropriate equipment." Two weaknesses listed by six of the eleven studies were "heavy teaching loads" and "little or no effective supervision of teachers." "Inexperienced administration" or "poor leadership" was named five times as was 'high costs." Two or more studies also mentioned the following as weaknesses: "social sterility," "limited extra-curricular program," "underfinanced," "shortage of guidance and special services," "little teacher specialization" and "low salaries."

Small high schools have long been regarded as poor schools because they endeavored to imitate large schools and they were judged by the extent to which the imitation was successful. Until recently almost all efforts to improve secondary education in rural areas and small communities were confined to the elimination of the small high school. Too often the school district reorganization program of a state has been its only program to help youth in small schools. Rural areas are generally financially deprived areas and relatively limited local resources have been available for education. This has been compensated for in some states by a "sparsity" factor in state support which recognizes that local sources should be supplemented more in small schools than in large ones.

Small school leadership has generally been poor in terms of experience, formal training, and tenure. And one who has looked at small schools for a long time could theorize that small school administration has not inspired eager and promising men to stay where imitation was the goal and where well identified school board members or other lay citizens have been anxious to compete with administrators rather than to advise, appraise, and support them. Add poor administrative leadership to these factors and the case is presented for the small school's lack of success in attracting and holding promising teachers.

Until 1957 no organized and sustained effort of significant scale was mounted to look creatively and plan unique approaches for the improvement of unique institutions -- the small high school.

Finally, insufficient attention has been given to the development and use of area agencies which could provide shared personnel and cooperative services to small schools.

It is somewhat paradoxical to talk about the small high schools in the United States as "unique institutions" because they outnumber large schools. A majority of the 2500 high schools existing in 1889 were small 6/ (they enrolled approximately 203,000 students) and in 1960, 53% of the nation's 25,000 high schools (approximately 12,000,000 students) enrolled fewer than 300 students in the top four grades, 9-12. Acceptance of Dr. Conant's classification for small high schools -- those with fewer than 100 in the graduating class -- would raise the number of small schools to approximately two-thirds of the total.

THE STRUGGLE FOR COMPREHENSIVENESS

The fundamental problem in the educational format of the small high school revolves about its "struggle for comprehensiveness."7/ The basic design of the small high school in America has changed little from the beginning of the century despite the influences which changed much of secondary education from narrow college-oriented institutions to modern comprehensive high schools.

The almost explosive expansion of secondary education was characterized, among other things, by the establishment of many small high schools in rural America. They were created in the image of their older city cousins and in the tradition of the famous 1892-93 NEA Committee of Ten which assumed that preparation for life and preparation for college are synonymous. 8/ But as the secondary school programs of the country began to yield to the desires of the people the principals of small high schools found it increasingly difficult to deploy the talents and energies of a few teachers to match the instructional potential of larger staffs. With notable exceptions the small high school has long been a loser in the struggle for comprehensiveness. The efforts have generally been so unsuccessful that graduate schools and state education departments have coupled program meagerness with inefficiency and customarily assumed that no small high school could be a good one without exorbitant expense and that the only cure was elimination of small schools through consolidations.

Except for Robert Maynard Hutchins, members of the Council for Basic Education and perhaps a few more critics of public education, the ideal of the comprehensive high school as the appropriate institution for American secondary education has not been abandoned.

> "Since throughout most of our history secondary schools were established while the community was still small, one school to a community became the rule. While it has not always provided a program wholly suitable to the youth of the community, the trend has been toward offering a broader and broader program. It has become a school committed to the education of all youth without segregation on the basis of sex, socio-economic class, intelligence, or future vocational or educational plans . . . This broad program . . . is not an outgrowth of modern or 'progressive' education. It is not an evil that has recently crept into our educational system and is about to subvert it. It is instead the fruition of a long term trend that is almost as American as the Fourth of July.

> "Some of our critics look at this broad program and condemn it as unnecessary; as catering to 'fads and frills'; as providing too many electives and, therefore, permitting youth to escape from what are supposed to be the more rigorous subjects. They either do not recognize the breadth of the educational needs and interests which the unselected student-bodies of today's high schools possess or else they are willing to see the needs and interests of an educational elite served while those of other youth are neglected."9/

Such statements emphasize that a broad program is imperative in the American high school. They do not deny the importance of general education, and most small schools have provided the "college preparatory" program as general education. But the unique organizational problems of small schools are related to program breadth.

In 1893 the Committee of Ten 10/ recommended that 38 courses be taught in the secondary school, 14 of the courses were in foreign languages. There were no courses in non-academic subjects such as physical education, industrial or technical training, business education, art or music. The need for program breadth far exceeds that of 1893 because the high school is no longer selective and the needs of youth today are more complex.

In 1953-54 a study of 21 small high schools in the foothills of the Catskill Mountains in New York indicated that the median number of offerings per school was only 34. 11/ The schools ranged from 56 to 250 in 9-12 enrollment. Their offerings were inadequate yet they were among the best financed and best staffed small schools in the world. (The communities are relatively poor in terms of local wealth but the support from state tax sources exceeds $600 per student.) How much more inadequate are the offerings in other small schools throughout the country! A suburban school in Bedford, N. Y., offers over 120 different courses to approximately 800 students and yet it sends 50 students daily to a half-day program where an intermediate unit offers 14 more courses in vocational and technical education. Should the opportunities for rural youth be less than this? The staff resources available for a broad program diminishes much more rapidly than the variety of needs of students when one goes from Bedford to the Catskills.

Today some large high schools are trying new methods of organization (including the school-within-a-school plan to obtain a "small school atmosphere") but most of them are still based upon the reconciliation of the needs for comprehensiveness with the time demands of the Carnegie Unit, and this organization relies primarily upon the exposition and questioning a teacher can direct to groups (classes) of students. This method of achieving comprehensiveness is too expensive for the small high school. Some effective adaptation to the needs of students and communities represented by small high schools has occurred in the fields of vocational agriculture, vocational homemaking and business education. There has been effective, but infrequent use of correspondence courses in various fields. But endeavors to increase the variety of learning opportunities has often resulted in the adoption of eight-to-ten-period days for scheduling. The highly segmented day in small schools is supposed to spread the talents of small staffs over more courses, and short periods force "class-oriented" instruction and discourage creative teaching in a school setting inherently geared to informality, to small

group and individual learning. This inappropriate effort to imitate the large high school has been as damaging to small high schools as was the rural one-room elementary school's acceptance of recommendations (by city superintendents) in the 1890's that they be organized by grades. Dr. Frank W. Cyr, 12/ of Teachers College, Columbia University, would say that small high schools need a new design and he would probably add ". . .they should no more be judged by the same design criteria of large high schools than should an automobile be appraised by criteria applying to trains."

COMMUNITY SCHOOLS

Until 1957 no significantly identifiable effort was made to improve the program of small schools since the joint school-community endeavors reported by Olsen, 13/ Seay and others in the 1940's and 1950's. Much of the citizen interest and participation in schools typical of the 1950-1963 period sprang from the community school movement. But the specific community school emphasis which held so much promise for small school improvement in the 30's and 40's seems to have evaporated. There were many glowing reports of specific school-community projects (predominantly from the South) where the school aimed at improvement of the local community and the human and material resources of the community enriched the school programs. Joint study of community problems by youth and adults provided excellent opportunity for observations, the development of objective evidence and sound judgment. The close cooperation between school and community seemed best in small communities where the identity of youth and adults alike encouraged the establishment of mutually advantageous projects. The stories of the Sloane experiment in Kentucky, the Buckingham (Virginia) cannery, Wilson Dam, Tennessee, Arthudale and Colloden, West Virginia, were great adventures in education and many small communities had similar experiences. But affluence or television or the lack of sufficiently inspired educators or the return to prominence of "academic excellence" and the subject-matter curriculum in the minds of citizens and school people alike -- some or all of these influences and others led to a failure to capitalize on fine examples set in isolated small communities in America.

The professional staffs and the citizens interested in small school improvement could resurrect great promise by finding ideas and suggestions in community school literature. The small school administrator must be expert at community analysis and community leadership if the high school educational program is to be expanded, particularly when curriculum change involves community study and development. Burton W. Kreitlow, in "Standards of School Organization in Relation to the Community to be Served," 14/ pointed out that there are still vast social and cultural gaps among various rural communities and between rural and urban communities despite closer economic ties, better communication and greater interdependence. In a study which matched homogeneous and heterogeneous rural neighborhoods Kreitlow found that farm people in heterogeneous neighborhoods were consistent in favoring new ideas in education and they believe in a higher level of formal education than do people in comparable homogeneous neighborhoods. The educator must assess which has primacy in his community -- decisions based upon cultural tradition or those based upon educational objectives. Though the school administrator can easily incur failure by trying to move too fast in changing the school program and improving the community in homogeneous situations, more often than not our narrow school programs have persisted because the administrator has not tried to raise expectations and enrich the learning setting. Community improvement --

change -- is at the heart of the community school concept for rural schools.

Under "Characteristics of the Small School"15/ the Catskill Area Project in Small School Design stated that "Human relations are basic" and "The school is an integral part of the community." The small school's strong identity with the community it serves enhances cooperation. It must be exploited if the small high school program is to avoid sterility.

THE "ALL-THE-EGGS-IN-ONE-BASKET" APPROACH

But even in the hey day of the community school, many state departments of education were too busy with school district reorganization or lacked funds to give adequate attention to both merger and small school improvement. The community school approach was subordinate to the idea that school district reorganization is the only way to handle the incurable weaknesses of the small high schools.

Nowhere was the general thinking about small high schools better illustrated than in Iowa in the late 1950's. The state was a national leader in reducing the total number of school districts and in reducing the number of inadequately programmed small high schools. Paradoxically, the mergers in Iowa created enlarged districts called "community school districts," but the resources available for education were sufficient only to create the districts and name them -- there was little attention given to the special character of these still-small high schools. No concerted effort was made to implement the community school concept or dwell upon the possibility of exploiting potential strengths of smallness. The advantages of reorganization were not sufficiently capitalized in many new districts and some state education department officials feared that improvement of small schools would perpetuate those which were scheduled for reorganization.

There were no doubt many exceptions to the above generalization about Iowa, but in varying degrees it typifies the plight of secondary education throughout most states -- particularly where county units (Policy, financial and operational control rest at the county level rather than at the local level.) do not exist. The creation of school districts with greater potential in human and material resources should be an obvious priority for state school systems, but the small school problem has not been treated comprehensively. Two complaints are lodged against the "all-the-eggs-in-one-basket" approach. (1.) Improvement in educational opportunities deserved by youth in "necessarily-existent" small high schools and youth who had no control over the perpetuation of other small high schools has been neglected. (2.) Given the desirability of school district reorganization, state legislatures have the power to achieve improved school district structure through means other than threat of financial reprisal or discreditation -- means which unfairly limit opportunity for youth in the small schools. West Virginia (in 1933) created entirely new networks of local school districts overnight, thus illustrating legislative power to achieve "state master plans" of local districts. While this action may seem repugnant to those who cherish democratic action at the local level, it is nevertheless difficult to defend a state's use of sanctions against localities when it has the power to legislate the structural changes it has agreed to seek.

Fortunately many states have worked out ways to stimulate intense lay participation in reorganization studies and the people--where there is good state, regional and local leadership--have acted responsibly by reducing the number of districts in the United States from approximately 80,000 in 1952 to approximately 35,000 in 1962.

When the writer was a regional consultant for the Iowa State Department of Public Instruction the need for school district reorganization was evidenced by several small high schools which offered less than 30 courses. Some very small schools offered as low as 12 courses. The tragic lack of opportunity was unreasonably expensive. Except for the schools represented by line 11 in Table 1 (following page) there was generally an inverse relationship between the cost of the educational program and its quality and range.

Illinois, Iowa, New York, Ohio, Washington and several other states have made notable progress in reorganization but special mention is due Colorado because it is a marked exception to the "all-the-eggs-in-one-basket" approach. While making great progress in reducing the number os districts a vigorous project in small school improvement has been in effect since 1957 involving cooperation between the state department of education and the Fund for the Advancement of Education and the Ford Foundation.

"NECESSARILY-EXISTENT" SMALL HIGH SCHOOLS

Perhaps this balanced progress was one of the influences which led the Fund for the Advancement of Education to request Dr. Elbie Gann, Assistant Commissioner of Education in Colorado, to make a 1960 survey to determine the extent of occurrence of "necessarily-existent" small high schools in the United States and to assess the interest in and commitment to experimentation designed to improve them.

Dr. Gann contacted 35 states and visited 20. Most of them expressed interest in developing proposals for small school improvement. Despite the following content of Dr. Gann's initial letter of contact, some states reflected a fear that small school improvement efforts might perpetuate small schools not "necessarily-existent."

> "It is important to note that this project (the Rocky Mountain Area Project for small high school improvement) has been operated as a complement to school district reorganization and has served to facilitate it in several instances. The Colorado State Department of Education's aggressive reorganization program and the RMAP have operated at the same period of time. During the 3-year term, the activities of reorganization have resulted in reduction of the numbers of school districts to fewer than 1/2 of those which existed in September, 1957. We have found that rural citizens, when they realize that the Department of Education is taking positive steps to assist the necessarily existent small high school, have been more willing to vote favorably for wise district organization plans."16/

For survey purposes Dr. Gann regarded small schools as those with less than 200 in the upper four grades. At the time of his survey approximately 8500 such high schools existed out of a total of more than 25,000. Significantly, fourteen of the states visited had a total of 5500 small high schools and state officials reported 3500 of them to be necessarily existent. 17/

Thus, we have perhaps the best documentation to date for the necessity for renewed attention to small high school improvement.

TABLE 1

PUPIL TEACHER RATIOS AND HIGH SCHOOL TUITION COSTS IN THE 745 DISTRICTS MAINTAINING APPROVED HIGH SCHOOLS FOR THE 1957-1958 SCHOOL YEAR*

These annual costs are computed for the 1957-1958 school year but are based on costs for the preceding school year as provided by Sections 279.18 and 282.20, Code of Iowa, 1954. These are actual costs and in some cases may exceed the maximum tuition rates as determined by the Department of Public Instruction in accordance with Section 282.24.

Line No.	High School Enrollment	Number of Districts	Average High School Pupil-Teacher Ratios	High School Tuition Costs Grades 9-12 Inclusive		
				High	Low	Average
1	0-24	11	6.0	$1,169.22	$574.34	$786.17
2	25-49	135	9.4	1,067.71	305.60	587.97
3	50-74	146	11.2	968.00	277.03	545.13
4	75-99	106	12.9	846.72	343.54	499.76
5	100-149	147	13.8	957.24	324.68	488.80
6	150-199	58	15.3	695.99	292.14	474.27
7	200-299	60	16.0	639.90	323.75	451.80
8	300-399	35	18.4	562.88	282.42	432.48
9	400-499	12	20.2	515.07	371.08	418.90
10	500-599	10	21.1	493.00	350.28	410.02
11	600-above	25	22.2	681.76	318.00	452.53
	Totals or Averages	745	16.4	$1,169.22	$277.03	$512.71

PLEASE NOTE: This study shows that per-pupil costs tend to decrease as the size of the school increases. An important factor, which is not shown in the study, is that larger schools, since they make more efficient use of teachers, invariably offer a broader and more comprehensive program for all the pupils. Schools having an enrollment of 600 high school pupils and above usually pay substantially higher salaries for teachers, which accounts for their slightly higher costs.

*Educational Bulletin, Department of Public Instruction, State of Iowa, January, 1958

TEACHERS OF SMALL HIGH SCHOOLS

Iwamoto's article, "The Picture Brightens for the Small High School,"18/ indicates that ". . .a few years ago small high schools. . . were staffed by teachers who were younger, less experienced, and less well educated than teachers in large schools. Further, these teachers received lower salaries, had heavier teaching loads, and had a higher rate of turnover that their large-school colleagues."

In Iwamoto's survey for the NEA he found the following comparisons:

TABLE 2
Teacher Comparisons, 1960-61

Item	Small High Schools (less than 300 enrollment)	All Schools
Median age	34	36
Percent of men teachers	60.3	56.8
Median age, men	31	38
Median age, women	43	43
Percent with Bachelor's degree	99	98
Percent with Master's degree	23	36
Median years' experience	7.8	8.9
Percent holding regular certificates	96 (1956)	95
Percent teaching uncertificated subjects	14 (1956)	11.4
Hours worked per week	51	45
Median salary	$4712	$5543

The differences in the table would appear more significant if the small school sample had been removed from the "all school" figures. This is true also of percentages cited later with reference to principals.

Teachers of small high schools rated themselves strongest in discipline, knowledge of subject matter, ability to work with students in activities and ability to help students develop responsibility. They deemed themselves less able to handle brilliant or very slow students who are in classes with students of average ability.

More than 40 percent of teachers of small high schools taught in two subject fields in 1960-61, and 18 percent taught three or more subject fields. Ninety-six and one half percent of the teachers taught two or more subjects and more than 75 percent taught four or more different subjects. Eighteen percent taught six or more subjects.

Though the number of preparations the small school's teacher had was great, his student load was relatively small. One teacher in eight taught fewer than 50 students per day and less than one in five taught more than 125 students. The median load for teachers in small high schools was 88 students per teacher.

Many teachers and others believe that the small student load compensates for the several preparations and many classes taught by the typical teacher in the small school. The identity of each student and each teacher is great and there is opportunity for them to know each other well. The word "opportunity" is emphasized here because observation of many small schools has led the writer to the opinion that the potential advantages of identity have not been pursued in the majority of small schools. Even in some small schools where some creative teachers have built small group and individuality into fertile learning settings, many other teachers rely upon the pedantry of "class-oriented" lectures or "question-answer-next-question" discussion. Like other characteristics of smallness, identity is not a strength unless appropriate use is made of it. Identity in small villages and rural areas can harm constructive education efforts or other worthwhile community endeavors. Will the increased identity of invividuals in the rural South enhance or retard desegregation efforts? Where will desegregation proceed more smoothly or more rapidly - in Atlanta, or in remote rural areas and small villages in Georgia where the white-negro ratio is approximately the same? Is it more likely in small schools or large ones that the janitor, or the first-grade teacher, or the school board cherk or the wife of the chairman of the board of education has more influence on educational decisions than the administrative leader or the corporate body of the board of education?

The small intimate community is natural setting for the development of wonderful interpersonal relationships. It can also be a haven or refuge for bigots or demigods who lack the confidence to succeed in more populous places where their public visibility would be obscured. It can happen in the small school unless the school and community are conscious of potential strengths and eager to develop them constructively.

Recently, Ralph Bohrson, Coordinator of the Western States Small Schools Project identified as an invalid assumption that because of small numbers the small school has inherent strengths.

> "Teachers have only a few students, and since all personnel live in and around the small community, the teacher automatically knows the strengths, weaknesses, needs, interests, and potential life span of each student. Because of this closeness, the small school achieves all the maneuverability of the small family which can travel in one car, live out of one suitcase, and by casual conversation and random discussion, solve all life's problems.
>
> "Of course, observation and study of the data belie these allegations. The teacher frequently accepts without scrutiny his instantaneous insight into the needs of each student and forgets to seek supporting evidence from the files, the parents, previous teachers, or his own orderly observations. The recent Greer-Harbeck study on high school programs supports this by indicating the small enrollment school less likely to adjust the number of credits and amount of academic subjects to the ability of the student.

"For those who claim organizational flexibility as a strength, let's look at the class schedules. A sample of the schedules of small high schools a few years ago revealed little deviation from the classical checkerboard. Standard-length periods, carefully organized, positioned and labeled often fit the psychological and administrative needs of the teachers and the administrators."19/

However, Bohrson claims that any failure of small schools to develop appropriate learning settings for students is not primarily attributable to relatively poor teachers.

"I would here challenge those who have worked in a small school to show me how teachers can be of low quality, an administration a good one, and have the condition of low quality persist. Surely the principal and/or the superintendent have some influence on the quality of the school and its programs. If the above assumption were true 'that low quality comes from unfit teachers in small schools,' I would propose the fastest way to treat the problem would be to fire the administrator, who is usually responsible for the instructional program and cirriculum, and who recommends hiring, retaining, or dismissing the faculty members of the school. Actually, in my judgment, based upon visiting, speaking, observing and in coordinating programs for small schools, the per cent of dedicated, able, resourceful, and intelligent teachers in these schools is as high as in any other arbitrary grouping which we might analyse. But because the critical point is the leadership, the commitment and hidden excellence of the faculty are sometimes stifled or, at best, prevented from flourishing by substandard administration."20/

Thus Iwamoto, through a statistical research study for the NEA, and Ralph Bohrson, through extensive observation of and opportunity to work with teachers in small schools, support the contention that differences in the quality of teachers in small and large schools are diminishing. New York State is a good example where favorable salary and tenure legislation is helping small schools hold good teachers. The beginning minimum salary in the state is $4400 and 10 salary increments of at least $200 each is mandated if the teacher continues service in the same school system. If all the teachers in New York's small schools were on minimum scale in 1961-62, the median salary would have been approximately $6000 assuming an experience factor similar to the median experience of teachers in small schools throughout the country, and assuming none of them has Master's degrees. Those with Master's degrees in New York are guaranteed $200 more. It would be interesting to see what influence this favorable salary policy has on the immigration of teachers from other states. Observation leads to the opinion that the influx from other states -- particularly the New England States -- is great, the teachers are well-prepared and many have advanced degrees.

But individual examples of good teachers in small schools will do little to bring new design in programs unless there is excellent school leadership and excellent consultative services. The spread of good practice will occur only where there is community support for a changed program and wise leadership which enlists the participation of all teachers in the planning and implementing.

Every teacher can improve, every teacher can learn something new in the use of mechanical aids, new materials, new content. Every teacher can learn to work with school aides and profit from good consultative service. Every teacher can learn more about individual students.

A few years ago the coordinator of the Catskill Area Project in Small School Design contended that only an excellent teacher could teach multiple classes successfully and he discouraged a project associate from encouraging apparently poor teachers to start multiple classes. But the wise associate said, "Why should we not encourage them to change -- especially when they are apparently not succeeding with present methods?" And, of course, good things happened. The teacher who had previously dominated classes with lectures could no longer do it. She had to let part of the multiple class work independently while she worked with the rest of the students. Some teachers who may not have been classified as talented according to traditional criteria found the new life exciting and made great improvement in their effectiveness with students.

The small high school can be a wonderful place for staff and students if the staff realizes that the strengths of smallness have to be sought out and constructively exploited.

Iwamoto and Bohrson also provide background and important information about the administration of small high schools. Direct comparison of the former's statistics to the latter's observation is inappropriate because the survey deals with "principals of small high schools" whereas Bohrson discusses the "chief administrators" of small schools. These persons are not always the same.

". . . the typical principal of a small high school is a man 40 years old, who has a Master's degree and 14 years of school experience. His work week is 55 hours long, and he is paid $6,181 a year. His school enrolls 145 students and his staff includes nine classroom teachers, one part-time librarian, one part-time secretary, and one full-time custodian. He has no other assistants or school aides. He did not conduct inservice training in 1960-61 but conducted a preschool workshop and called an orientation meeting for his new teachers. He believes that the consolidation of his high school with other schools would be wise and favors such action. The nearest high school is 9.5 miles away, outside of his own school district, and has an enrollment of 110 students. This picture of the median principal of small high schools is far better than what the writer expected. Generally, the median principal of small high schools compared well with the median principal of high schools in general.

"The median age of principals of small high schools, 40 years, is five years younger than the median age of principals in all high schools, 45 years, but this difference is too small to be important.

"The percentage of principals of small high schools with Master's degrees, 68 percent, is smaller than for that of high school principals in general, 81 percent, but the encouraging point is that in 1960, 42 percent of the principals of small high schools went to school for which they received one or more college credits, and 84 percent of the Master's degrees held by the principals were obtained in the field of education, including school administration and secondary education.

"Principals of small high schools had a median of 14 years of school experience. The average of such experience for high school principals in general was 23 years . . . . One point of concern is that only two of the 14 years accounted for experience as supervising principal.

"The following characteristics of principals of small high schools did not vary with size of small high schools, school accreditation, or pattern of school organization: the median age, proportion of men and women principals, recency of training, years of experience, and the median hours or work week.

"The following characteristics increased with school size: percentage of principals with Master's degrees; median number of years of experience as supervising principal; salaries paid; percentage of principals conducting inservice training and preschool workshops; and the availability of assistant principals, secretaries, custodians, and librarians."21/

One of Bohrson's main concerns is that, "The chief school administrator of the small school is the only one who can really do anything about true improvement." And Bohrson claims that most small school administrators are not proficient in this task of school improvement.

"In every case which I've observed, where there is forward motion, a vigorous educational climate, and a spirit that school work can be a combination of high adventure and contribution to mankind, there is an excellent administration available. Where the opposite is true, there is an educational undertaker in charge. My observations and studies have demonstrated to my satisfaction that there is an adequate supply of good teachers who will do the job, if shown the way and given the incentive.

"But the supply of able leaders is woefully lacking. There are too few good leaders and too many who worship at the temple of mediocrity."22/

No one would quarrel with the importance of excellent administration. And leaders in rural education must heed the challenge for finding and developing better administration in schools serving rural areas. Yet it seems a bit inconsistent to say that there is ". . . an adequate supply of good teachers who will do the job, if shown the way and given the incentive," and to ignore the possibility that the administrators in small schools might have the same opportunity for improvement ". . . if shown the way and given the incentive."

School boards much share responsibility with the administrator when there is insufficient clerical and secretarial assistance and when the administrator's teaching duties relegate school leadership to secondary importance. Good leadership demands more help and more time.

What about the re-education and the stimulation of existing and oncoming administrators? Where does such help exist for rural administrators? Prior to 1957 it was practically non-existent. The Rural Department of the NEA did a good job of encouraging administrative statesmanship for school district reorganization and it went far beyond state departments of education in gathering,

disseminating and providing references to literature on new practises in rural education. But there was a dearth of new practice to write about and these administrators and the teachers lacked appropriate guidance. But in 1957 some highly significant projects were initiated. The Rocky Mountain Area Project in Colorado and the Catskill Area Project in Small School Design were inaugurated with the assistance of the Fund for the Advancement of Education. Professor Frank W. Cyr, of Teachers College, Columbia University, and his former student, Dr. Elbie Gann, Assistant Commissioner of Education, in Colorado, were leaders in planning a new small school design which departs from imitation and recognizes the uniqueness of smallness. No design in a dynamic setting should be final, but there was effort to get small school educators to forsake program rigidity and formality. "Flexibility in program is the key to small school design."23/

The Colorado and New York Projects each reflected design elements identified by Cyr, Gann and others. The elements of the Colorado Project grew from the identification of rural school problems, and the Catskill Project first identified the characteristics of the small school. Both projects experimented with multiple-classes (one teacher working with two or different "classes" in the same time), correspondence courses, flexible scheduling, and technological devices and materials. The Catskill Project also used school aides (an aide who helps more than one teacher) and shared services whereas the Colorado Project worked on small group techniques (grouping within a single "class") and use of community resources. Both projects developed programs for talented youth.

Of course the ideas in the projects were not absolutely new, but with the exception of shared services and correspondence courses they had little visibility among small rural schools and they had never had opportunity for the development made possible through the support provided by the Fund for the Advancement of Education. The Fund also sponsored the Goddard College program where college students were sent to remote rural schools to bring new opportunities to them. Art, music, physical education, foreign languages and other subjects where youth were without trained teachers were suddenly made available to rural children and youth.

The subsequent development of the Texas Small Schools Project and the Western States Small Schools Project evidence the success of the endeavors initiated in 1957 to help rural secondary education. Today there is far more material to read, more schools to visit, more practice to observe for the rural administrators and teachers seeking ways to a new school design. The potential for improving administration is greater than it was six years ago -- but it needs further and better development.

Educational leadership for rural schools is not isolated to the local chief school administrators. Some teacher education institutions should specialize on programs for teachers in small schools, at least a few graduate schools should specialize in the preparation of administrators for rural schools. Consultative services from state education departments should recognize the uniqueness of smallness and learn how best to help rural schools. (An example: the Bureau of Business and Distributive Education in the New York State Education Department recently - 1962 - published a booklet entitled, "Multiple-Class Teaching Procedures Used in Small Group Experimental Business Education Classes.")

But if drastic improvement is to be made in the administrators of small schools two considerations are vital.

1. Experimentation in small school improvement must continue and published reports of the work must be more numerous. Though a great deal of mimeographed and spirit-duplicated reports have been made by teachers and administrators in small schools, they need editing, large quantity printing and distribution and -- most important they need to be vastly supplemented by special resources which should emanate from at least one resource center for developing materials for rural schools. Perhaps this could be the Rural Department of the NEA or the U. S. Office of Education.

2. The combined leadership of the state education departments and the intermediate or county units must be much improved if substantial improvement is to be made by local administrators. Chief administrators of local schools need to share more than teachers and facilities -- they need to share ideas, share responsibility for the improvement of education beyond the provincial concept of the single district. They need opportunity to work with excellent administration of an intermediate or county superintendency so that the resources of the entire area can be properly used to supplement local programs. There needs to be further study to find better ways to enhance cooperation among districts and among administrators in these larger areas. If present intermediate units are too small to provide needed services to local schools the units should be merged and enlarged.

Even in the county unit systems (the structure which supposedly has inherent strengths for the promotion of efficiency and equality of educational opportunity, and where all administrators are part of a single administrative unit) there are obvious communication problems among schools. There is often lack of materials, lack of supervisors, lack of clarity in job definitions. (What is the relationship of the county office supervisor to the building principal? How does the counselor's relationship to the local principal differ from his relationship to the county director of pupil personnel services?)

The substantial differences which often exist from school to school are not limited to the so-called "separate-but-equal" schools. The compromise between tradition-culture and desirable educational objectives mentioned by Krathwohl are too often skewed heavily toward tradition-culture when attendance areas are designed. In the opinion of this writer the calibre of local building principals and appointed county office personnel in the South is above that of the county superintendents in those states where the county superintendent is elected and his educational qualifications are of less importance to the people than his political party affiliation. (There are three "pure" county unit states where all districts are county systems -- Florida, Nevada and West Virginia. Maryland has one city district and Louisiana has three. The typical administrative unit in 10 other states in the Southeast is the county unit, but the units are more liberally interspersed with city systems. Most of these states have popularly elected county superintendents, seven have elected state superintendents.)

The comparison of quality is even more unfavorable to the elected intermediate unit superintendent. The weakest intermediate units throughout the Midwest are those where the county superintendents and the state superintendents are still elected. (Six Midwest states elect state superintendents or commissioners of education by popular vote. Some of these states elect the intermediate - county - superintendents. So strong is the conviction that election of education officials is wrong that the Wisconisn county superintendents drafted and recommended legislation that the elective process used for their own selection be dropped in favor of board appointment.)

Give local administrators the assistance and incentive -- give them the benefit of new materials, new resources for rural education and better leadership at the state and intermediate or county level -- and a substantial number will measure up to the demands of secondary education in rural America.

FACILITIES

Many of the rural high schools which were built prior to 1930 were relatively poor structures with limited space within and limited grounds without. The primary weaknesses in facilities related to libraries, science laboratories, shops, office space, gymnasia and related facilities, lunch rooms and small playgrounds. The small and inadequate facilities were often shared by elementary and junior high school students in the same building. But the Public Works Administration of the 30's and new buildings demanded by school reorganizations have greatly improved the facility situation for many rural high schools. Also, the post-war affluence of farmers in the late 40's encouraged the passage of bond issues which would have likely been defeated in other times. Thus, the facility situation has improved -- but it is far short of the facilities needed for a modern education.

There are four major reasons school building needs in many rural areas are critical. (1.) There is still widespread need for school district reorganization and many needed new buildings cannot be financed unless the resources of the potential new district are pooled. But reorganization does not guarantee new and needed buildings. Even enlarged rural districts often have limited resources for buildings. Sometimes, after a combination of local and state leadership and pressure has resulted in the creation of a new district, the district lacks the ability and/or the willingness to marshal the resources for building. The writer knows of newly reorganized districts where bond issues have been defeated several times just because the various parts of ghe new district could not agree on the location of the school or upon the amount of money it takes to house the new educational program properly. (2.) There are legislative and regulatory provisions at the state level which prohibit buildings where local financial resources are minimal or numbers of students to be enrolled are small. (3.) There is drastic need for state and federal financial assistance to assist local communities to erect needed school buildings. (4.) Even where new buildings have been erected or approved by the voters, the designs are too often not adapted to the uniqueness which should characterize modernized programs in small high schools.

The most hopeful signs with respect to buildings for rural youth today are the continuation of school district reorganization where it is needed and reasonable, and the interest in new design for small high schools. The 1955 Yearbook for Rural Education 24/ indicated that new buildings in rural communities should be (1.) planned for community use, (2.) designed for multiple use and flexibility of space, and (3.) built on large sites appropriately located to facilitate transportation. (Sites should be a minimum of 10 acres for each high school, plus one acre for each hundred students. But this minimum would be unacceptable in some states. Wherever reasonable and possible, Engelhardt, Engelhardt and Leggett, Educational Consultants, recommend a minimum of 30 acres for a rural high school.)

In Designs for Small High Schools, 25/Glendon Nimnicht and Arthur Partridge have produced the finest publication available for helping planners of rural high schools avaid the pitfalls of imitation of large schools.

Through the support of Educational Facilities Laboratories, Inc. and the agency of the Educational Planning Service of Colorado State College, the authors have developed suggestions and schema and they show examples of small school facilities for multiple-classes in various subject-matter areas, and they deal effectively with design problems for music, shops, gyms, auditoria and other portions of the school. The importance of this publication is illustrated by this excerpt.

> "Actually the problems in planning a good small high school building are more complex and difficult than those presented in planning a large school. For example, a large school can be planned to include a laboratory for physics, one for chemistry, and one for biology, while the smaller school is limited to one laboratory and that must serve all of these functions. The same kind of problem is presented by all subject fields, that is, teaching stations cannot be as specialized in small schools as they are in larger ones. While the problems are more complex in small schools, less systematic study has been given to planning them."26/

In further demonstration of their insight into the small high school problem, the authors wrote:

> "In order to offer advanced courses in science, mathematics and foreign languages, schools are scheduling different courses under the same teachers in the same room at the same time. Such combinations actually increase flexibility of scheduling because students may have more than one opportunity during the day to take a particular course. Thus, instead of having to choose Art I during the first period only or Crafts III during the fourth period, students in all high school grades might be able to take art during any period of the day. The same is true of industrial arts, mechanical drawing and business education."27/
>
> And they should have added, ". . . and other courses."

The illustrations provided by Nimnicht and Partridge make clear concepts about multiple-use and flexibility of space. The publication is a "must" for any district contemplating the building of a new small high school.

What about the remodeling of an existing school? The above-mentioned book should be studied before embarking on the remodeling. If the district is lucky many of the existing walls in its high school building will be non-bearing and larger spaces might be developed. If the district is typical, the egg-crate school it has may not easily have space divisions revamped. Frank Anderson, Director of Colorado's portion of the Western States Small School Project, says that

> ". . . conventional rooms should be provided with resource shelves and cabinets; study centers; portable or folding partitions containing chalkboards and display boards; and ample electrical outlets for a variety of projection equipment, tape recorders and individual viewing equipment. Acoustical surfacing of floors and ceilings provides for necessary sound control."28/

If facility problems in rural high schools are to be solved it is imperative to have more school district reorganization, more state and federal assistance in financing. There has been some breakthrough on the physical design for small high schools -- a breakthrough which should facilitate the program redesign for secondary education in rural areas. The Nimnicht-Partridge booklet and the publications of the small school research projects will be of great assistance to those planning remodeling old buildings or the construction of new ones.

INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS AND EQUIPMENT

The rural high school has long been noted for inadequacy in instructional materials and equipment. Iwamoto's 29/survey investigated availability and adequacy of libraries, textbooks, movie projectors, filmstrip or slide projectors, wall maps, television receivers and secretarial and business machines. It is striking that most principals in the survey reported availability of all items except television receivers and they regarded the material and equipment as "adequate."

The judgmentof theprincipals indicates that they are satisfied with too little, because opportunity to visit a great number of small schools and compare their equipment with that in larger schools would convince most people that the former are poorly equipped. Furthermore, presence of equipment does not signify regular use. One of the discoveries in the Catskill Area Project was that teachers began to use equipment which had long lain unused on closet shelves. Movies were used more frequently but the instrument resurrected and used most was the tape recorder.

Not only are most small schools under-equipped when compared to larger schools, they should have proportionately more equipment. They have greater need to supplement staff resources with films, tapes, records and other programmed materials.

The small school should have extensive library materials available and audio-visual aids, including the newer forms of programmed learning, and all should be in daily use. The apparent indignity which some state departments

of education and many educators in small schools attach to correspondence courses deprives thousands of rural youth of rich learning opportunities. The materials of the Extension Division of the University of Nebraska are excellent. The University of Wisconsin is currently redesigning correspondence courses and several other universities throughout the country, as well as the American School and the International Correspondence School, are producing valuable materials. A correspondence course study group of the Catskill Area Project evaluated over 100 courses and made recommendations concerning their use, especially in New York State. The study group also prepared a booklet advising teachers and students how to use supervised correspondence courses.

Professor Frank Cyr has said that the small school of the future will one day shift its investment of funds as have farmers over the past 40 years. Years ago a farmer's major cost was in his laad and buildings. But now the equipment outlay for modern farming is staggering and sometimes far exceeds the cost of land and buildings. But the farm is more productive and so shall be the small rural high school when it has all the advantages which can reasonably be brought to it by modern technology. Television from an airplane flying over the Midwest is bringing some high quality instruction into the small schools in parts of Ohio, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Michigan and Wisconsin. The best instruction which can be filmed, audio-recorded or printed should be available to the most remote of America's schools.

COUNTY UNIT SYSTEMS

The advantages for efficiency in county unit systems have not eliminated small high schools in the Southeast and in Nevada. Sparsity is not a function of administrative organization and many "necessarity-existent" small high schools are on the scene. However, many other small high schools are operating because interests such as village pride or maintenance of segregation have opposed a more appropriate alignment of attendance centers. The South has three major problems with respect to rural education. How can educational efficiency achieve a higher priority than the retention of the dual school system? How can the total resources for education be increased? How can the programs for youth in small schools be improved?

It will take extremely creative and courageous administrators and school boards to cope successfully with school desegregation problems. Most of the desegregation in the South has been in the cities and towns -- the pace may be much slower in rural areas. Some systems have treated all schools alike and desegregation in rural and urban schools has advanced as one movement. Some systems have adopted a gradual course of desegregation which starts with children in the lower grades and goes progressively through the system year by year. Some have started with a few selected students at the high school level.

Desegregation is pertinent to the improvement of rural education. Not only are "separate-but-equal" schools usually not equal, but small schools in financially deprived areas do not have the resources to compensate for their size. A consultant to a rural county unit system in the South was tempted to recommend instruction by an intensive closed circuit television system or suggest the creation of one huge high school in the center of the county for all youth.

Although neither recommendation was made there would have been two immediate gains - the calibre of instruction could have been improved and opportunity for all would have been extended. But even if the problems of desegregation were miraculously solved, the South in many places would have insufficient resources to provide significantly higher quality education programs. The federal aid needed for so many years continues to be of primary importance.

Programs for small high schools in the county unit states can be improved by studying the ideas and adopting some of the practices of the small school projects. But the schools need more than redesign -- they need improved services from county offices. General supervisors should be allied with specialists in subject-matter areas, resource and cirriculum centers, central pupil personnel services, special education services, more itinerant specialists, and centers for technical and vocational education are needed. Central leadership should be more effective, central services more available to rural youth.

INTERMEDIATE UNITS

Although intermediate units are being discussed in more detail in another paper it is appropriate to mention them here because they are one of the keys to improvement of rural high schools. The county unit, though structurally geared to efficiency, has its board of education somewhat removed from the people in the small communities. Relatively closer to the people are the boards of the smaller autonomous systems common to most states. It is likely that the greater sensitivity of the people to the local systems results in a higher level of financial support and greater educational demands. To compensate for the efficiency advantages of county units, many states have developed intermediate units which are area agencies (often include most of the school districts in a given county, thus, the executive officer is usually a "county superintendent") between the local districts and the state education departments. Local districts are generally not large enough to individually provide a complete educational program. Even with reasonable reorganization on all fronts most schools would be unable to separately provide for handicapped children, technical and vocational education, data processing services, resource centers for materials development and distribution, and curriculum and administrative research. The need for sharing with neighbors intensifies with respect to the small high school, particularly in relation to itinerant teachers and specialists and some central services.

Specialized guidance services in rural areas are rare despite the vigorous efforts of the counselor training portion of the National Defense Education Act. The ideal situation for each rural school would place at least one trained counselor in each school and supplement him with specialized testing, counseling, psychological and psychiatric services at the intermediate unit level. The guidance and other specialists would travel to local schools at times and on other occasions students would be transported to the guidance center. The central guidance center is important. Since it is highly unlikely that most schools will have fully trained counselors for some time, the center could conduct in-service education programs so that some of the local teachers could become teacher-counselors.

Several intermediate units have developed programs for talented youth. Glyn. Morris in Lewis County, New York, conducts seminars in which students meet one afternoon per week for special work in literature, art, music and drama. Twnty-seven schools near the State University in Oneonta, N. Y., send students to Saturday morning classes in humanities, math and science. Teachers in the Rocky Mountain Area Project cooperatively developed a seminar for gifted students in which lectures and discussions were led by project teachers or visiting dignitaries. Students request taped lectures from authorities personally unavailable to them. All of these group endeavors are enhanced if there is an area agency especially designed to assist schools to do cooperatively those things each cannot do well alone.

The superintendent of the intermediate unit is not only charged with assisting the local districts in their cooperative program efforts, he plays an important role as an intermediary between the state education department and the local districts. In many instances he serves as a state education department official to a given area and has some regulatory duties. But these duties are becoming less and less important as the demand for leadership and services increases. That leadership which helps release the leadership potential of the local chief administrators is the most appropriate. An over-aggressive intermediate superintendent will often be seen as a competitor rather than a catalyst in the eyes of local administrators. If he does nothing, he and his office will be subject to ridicule. Effective county and intermediate units are absolutely essential to rural high schools if they are to benefit from specialized service personnel, special education centers, technical schools and data processing and other automated equipment which must serve the rural school of the future.

CONCLUSION

In the future rural youth will be served by larger consolidated schools and by small schools which are physically patterned after the schools shown in Designs for Small High Schools.30/ The schools will have every modern convenience including individual carrels where programmed lessons may be delivered instantaneously through typewriter consoles, screens and speakers. Students will be able to work in simulated environments such as university laboratories and research centers, the Library of Congress, atomic energy laboratories. They may be able to play the role of a priest-king in Sumeria and study problems of agricultural productivity, storage of crops, transportation methods, communications and technology, and they can make decisions and see the consequences of their decisions with respect to the economy and culture of the ancient country. Computerized courses are used by industry to train employees, why should they not be used in rural education?

Some students will travel to central facilities operated by an intermediate unit for special or technical education. Specialized testing will be handled by the computer and specialized counseling handled by regular staff members or by itinerant persons from the intermediate unit. Schedules of teaching-learning activity will be modular and quite irregular. Time will become the servant of the student, accommodating his need for field trips, and for remedial attention to some subjects. Short and frequent periods of practice

will be provided in skill subjects and longer periods will allow reflection and discussion of important concepts, problems and issues with peers and teachers. The French Student in a remote mountain school may see his "live" teacher only on Monday mornings (she will be teaching in three or four other schools on the other days) but he will have synchronized audio and visual practice sessions with the computer and be able to talk periodically with the teacher by phone--either by voice, typewriter, or both.

Teachers in small rural schools will be versatile and be able to assist students in several subjects, but they will be relieved of some of the information-giving tasks which can be handled automatically. They will thus have time to study individual students and their learning needs. Though the computer is at a central location the teacher can get inservice education at a carrel, and she can use the typewriter console to modify a particular computer program for a perticular student due to react to the program the next day.

Adults will continually use the school for education and retraining.

Is such a rural school likely to be possible in the future? It would be possible now if America had a more intense commitment to education. But the revitalization of rural high schools need not await miracles or computers -- redesign can spread rapidly now if administrators, teachers and citizens deliberately work for it. One last reminder. The redesign of rural high schools -- the use of multiple classes, flexible schedules, technological equipment, school aides, etc. -- should not be used as a defense against needed school district reorganization. Those who would covet smallness and use this new program to perpetuate it would do disservice to themselves and their children. The design is becoming a reality -- it offers refreshing hope for people who have not asked enough of education. But it is not an answer unto itself -- it is part of a total picture of improvement possibilities for rural secondary education.

FOOTNOTES

1. 1955 Yearbook, Rural Education -- A Forward Look, Washington, D.C., NEA Department of Rural Education, 1955, pp. xiii

2. Ibid.

3. Ibid., pp.3-13

4. UNESCO, Education Abstracts: Rural Education. Volume XIV, No. 3, 1962, p. 29.

5. Iwamoto, David, Survey and Analysis of Certain Characteristics of Small High Schools in the United States. Doctoral Dissertation, The George Washington University, Washington, D. C., 1963, pp. 22-30. The eleven studies selected from Iwamoto are NEA Committee of Twelve (1895), Rufi (1926), Roemer (1928), Combs (1928), Riddle (1937), Bent and Kronenberg (1947), Harl Douglass (1952), Morrisett (1950), Grieder et al (1955), Brown (1956) and DeGood (1960). Weaknesses as interpreted by the writer are shown within quotation marks.

6. Ibid., p. 19.

7. Catskill Area Project in Small School Design, Guidebook on Flexible Scheduling. Oneonta, N.Y., The Project, 1959, p. 1. Much of this section on "perspective" is excerpted from the writer's contribution to Chapter 1 of the CAPSSD publication.

8. Eliot, Charles W., Chairman, Report of the Committee on Secondary School Studies Appointed at the Meeting of the NEA July 9, 1892: With the Reports of the Conference Arranged by this Committee and Held December 28-30, 1892. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Bureau of Education, Government Printing Office, 1893, pp. 51-53.

9. French, Will. "The Role of the American High School." Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, 39, February, 1955, 9-10, 14 & 15.

10. Eliot, op. cit., p. 67.

11. Lovegrove, John R. A Compilation of Emerging Practices from Small Group Learning Based upon an Analysis of Small Classes in New York State Central Schools, Doctor of Education Project Report, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, 1955.

12. Professor Frank W. Cyr was Executive Secretary of the Catskill Area Project in Small School Design from 1957 to 1961.

13. Olsen, Edward G. School and Community Programs: A Casebook of Successful Practice from Kindergarten through College and Adult Education. Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York, 1949. See The Fifty-Second Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II, The Community School. Edited by Nelson B. Henry, Distributed by the University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill., 1953.

14. 1955 Yearbook, Rural Education -- A Forward Look. Department of Rural Education, NEA, Washington, D. C., 1955. pp. 349-355.

15. Catskill Area Project in Small School Design. The Project, Oneonta, N.Y., 1959, pp. 2-5.

16. Excerpt from Dr. Gann's letter of March 12, 1960 to state and other education officials. From the unpublished report of his report to the Fund for the Advancement of Education, 1960, p. 9, 10.

17. Ibid., p. xviii in the Summary.

18. Iwamoto, David. "The Picture Brightens for the Small High School." NEA Journal 51, April, 1962, p. 28.

19. Bohrson, Ralph G. "The Small School -- Its Strengths and Limitations." Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary-School Principals, 282, April, 1963, pp. 111-112.

20. Ibid., p. 109.

21. Iwamoto, David. Survey and Analysis of Certain Characteristics of Small High Schools in the United States. op. cit.

22. Bohrson, Ralph G. "The Small School -- Its Strengths and Limitations." op. cit., p. 116.

23. Cyr, Frank W. Proceedings and Addresses, 59th Annual Meeting of the Catholic Education Association, National Catholic Education Association Bulletin, August, 1962, p. 318.

24. 1955 Yearbook, Rural Education -- A Forward Look. Department of Rural Education, NEA, Washington, D. C., 1955, pp. 115-119.

25. Nimnicht, Gendon P. and Partridge, Arthur R. Designs for Small High Schools, Educational Planning Service, Colorado State College, Greeley, Colorado, 1962.

26. Ibid., p. 8.

27. Ibid., p. 12.

28. Anderson, Frank A. "Some Ideas for Small Schools." NEA Journal, 52, January, 1963, p. 21.

29. Iwamoto, David. Survey and Analysis of Certain Characteristics of Small High Schools in the United States. op. cit., pp. 235-245.

30. Nimnicht and Partridge. op. cit.