DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 029 352 EA 001 735

By-Reisert, John E., Ed.
The Principalship in Perspective.
Indiana Univ., Bloomington. School of Education.
Pub Date Mar 68
Note-51p.
Available from-Indiana University Bookstore, Bloomington, Indiana ($1.25, quantity discounts)
Journal Cit-Bulletin of the School of Education, Indiana University; v44 n2 Mar 1968
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.65
Descriptors-*Administrator Role, Educational Change, Educational Improvement, Educational Objectives, *Educational Problems, *Elementary Schools, *Leadership, Population Trends, *Principals, School Organization, State Departments of Education, Teacher Administrator Relationship, Teacher Militancy

Major themes related to the elementary school principal's role, responsibility, and performance are treated in abstracts of six addresses given at meetings of the Indiana Association of Elementary School Principals during 1967: (1) "The Principalship--A People Business," by Harold J. McNally, professor of education, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee; (2) "The Common School Effect," by Harold J. Spears, past president of the American Association of School Administrators; (3) "The Principal and the State Department," by Richard D. Wells, superintendent of public instruction for the State of Indiana; (4) "A Look to a Changing Future," by James E. Weigand, assistant professor of elementary education and coordinator of science education at Indiana University; (5) "Threats to the Principalship," by John E. Reisert, assistant professor of elementary education at Indiana University; and (6) "Bifocals," by Phil Eskew, commissioner of the Indiana High School Athletic Association. (JK)

BULLETIN OF THE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
INDIANA UNIVERSITY
Vol. 44, no. 2 march, 1968

THE PRINCIPALSHIP IN PERSPECTIVE

edited by

John E. Reisert

The material reported herein is a selection of edited abstracts of addresses presented before meetings of the Indiana Association of Elementary School Principals during 1967

Published by
School of Education, Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana

Price: $1.25 per copy, postpaid
(25-49 copies, 10% discount;
50 or more copies, 20% discount)

Available at the Indiana University Bookstore
Bloomington, Indiana

Subscription
$5.00 per year, for six issues
Subscribe through the School of Education
Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana 47401

Second class postage paid at Bloomington, Indiana.
Published in January, March, May, July, September, and November of each year, by the School of Education, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

VITAE

John E. Reisert

John E. Reisert earned the B.S., M.S., and Ed.D. degrees at Indiana University and did additional graduate work at Butler University and Northern Michigan University. He served as teacher, supervisor, and principal in the New Albany-Floyd County Schools of Indiana for ten years. During the next four years, he was director of teacher education and certification for the Indiana Department of Public Instruction. His service at Indiana University includes two years as coordinator of the Introduction to Teaching Program and two years as coordinator of Professional Laboratory Experiences in education. Dr. Reisert is currently assistant professor of elementary education and executive secretary of the Indiana Association of Elementary School Principals.

Harold J. McNally

Harold J. McNally received his basic teacher preparation at the Philadelphia Normal School and his Ph.D. from Teachers College, Columbia University. He has held teaching, supervisory, and administrative positions on both elementary and secondary levels in Delaware, Maryland, New Jersey, and New York. During World War II, Dr. McNally served as a Navy air combat intelligence officer in the Pacific. He was a faculty member at Teachers College, Columbia University for 18 years, director of research for Field Enterprises Educational Corporation for two years, and currently is serving as professor of education at the University of Wisconsin--Milwaukee. He is the author of numerous books and articles on elementary administration and has served as a consultant to various professional organizations and to various overseas governments.

Harold J. Spears

Harold J. Spears received the A.B. and L.L.D. degrees from Wabash College and the A.M. and Ed.D. degrees from Teachers College, Columbia University. He served as a teacher and administrator in the public schools of Indiana, Illinois, and California. He was professor and head of the Education Department at Montclair State College in New Jersey and served as superintendent of schools in San Francisco, California. He is currently serving

as visiting professor of school administration at Indiana University. Dr. Spears is a past president of the American Association of School Administrators. He has served as an advisor and consultant to many professional organizations, foundations, foreign governments, and public agencies. He has written extensively in the fields of administration and curriculum and has served as a visiting lecturer in 19 different college and university summer programs. He currently serves as editorial advisor for the Prentice Hall College Education Series, The Nations Schools, and Education, U.S.A.

Richard D. Wells

Richard D. Wells received the B.S. and M.S. degrees from Indiana University. He has served as a teacher in the school systems of Lake and Porter Counties of Indiana for 11 years. He is currently serving as state superintendent of public instruction for the State of Indiana.

James E. Weigand

James E. Weigand received the B.A. degree from Augustana College, the M.S. degree from Northern Illinois University, and the Ed.D. degree from Indiana University. He taught in the public school system of Illinois for six years and served as science consultant in the Illinois State Department of Education for three years. Dr. Weigand currently serves as assistant professor of elementary education and coordinator of science education at Indiana University. He has served as a consultant to the Peace Corps Training Program, the National Science Foundation, and the Manned Spacecraft Center of N.A.S.A. He has been involved extensively in work with professional science education organizations.

Phil Eskew

Phil Eskew received the A.B. and L.L.D. degrees from Oakland City College and the M.S. degree from Indiana University. He served as a teacher, coach, and principal for 21 years in Southern Indiana schools before becoming superintendent of schools, first at Sullivan, and later at Huntington. He is currently serving as commissioner of the Indiana High School Athletic Association. Mr. Eskew is well known as a public speaker who has addressed some three quarters of a million persons in more than 2,600 audiences.

PREFACE

The elementary school principal of today is a far different individual than his counterpart of a decade ago. Probably no role in the public school system has been transformed to the extent of the principalship. The benevolent patriarch of past generations is no more. He has been replaced by a well prepared executive who spends his crowded hours performing executive level duties in realms of instructional leadership, personnel management, pupil service operations, plant and business management, public relations, and professional improvement. He is more likely to be concerned with change strategies and development techniques than he is with instructional methodology and with group dynamics than with teacher rating. Today's principal uses a vocabulary unknown to his predecessor of even a few years past. Simulation, grievance, programming, negotiation--these are words unused by principals of the past, yet each has taken its place in his current daily conversation.

The principalship of today no longer represents a placid retreat from the real world. It is out there--with it--where the action is--on the firing line. The security which once was characteristic of the role is gone along with the comfort and the tranquility. In its place we find action, demand, pressure. But the satisfaction and the feeling of contribution still remain. The principal of the 1960's and 1970's must be a man of action for that is the primary demand of the job. The day of treading educational water is past and the non-swimmer had better steer clear of the educational mainstream.

To recount the various pressures confronting the school today is unnecessary. One only needs consult any recent periodical, newspaper, book or other communication medium. As a matter of fact, one need only look around with a somewhat discriminating glance. The evidence is everywhere and it is overwhelming. Schools and school staffs are under tremendous pressure and the primary focus of this pressure falls on the leaders of the school. This is the situation in which the elementary principal must practice his chosen profession and attempt to be productive in the effort.

With these ever mounting and ever increasing pressures, it is quite easy to lose sight of all aims, goals, and objectives. While to do so might be understandable, it would, conversely, be inexcusable. For the aims, goals, and objectives are the only hope for a meaningful order to emerge from what

might otherwise become educational chaos. While the principal might, under these circumstances, be able to perform the routine tasks associated with his role, he would abdicate the leadership role toward which he has long charted his professional commitment. Such action would result in his position becoming one of technician rather than leader. The north star by which the school plotted its journey would be gone and dead reckoning would soon replace the educational navigation system which has worked both efficiently and effectively. This document represents an attempt, therefore, for the principal to re-examine his role in terms of the pressures and changes that have recently occurred. It is an attempt to bring perspective to the principalship, a goal long pursued by the Indiana Association of Elementary School Principals.

The articles contained within these covers are abstracts of addresses given during meetings of the association during the past year. All deal with the topic of "The Principalship in Perspective." The viewpoints of the various contributors represent a wide range of opinion and suggestion. There is some conformity and a great deal of conflict. Perhaps one will even find controversy as he examines the positions in light of his own belief and opinion. If this is true, then the publication has been a success for no attempt has been made to develop a "party line equally palatable to all." The contributors were purposefully selected to bring a variety of positions and viewpoints to the membership of the association. Each has something to say and has no qualms about saying it. Each would be shocked to think that all readers accepted his statements as dogma in any sense. We are, rather, concerned with viewing the principalship through many sets of eyes. The reader shall be forced to develop his own view as well but he should be aware of the various perspectives of other educators in this examination of his role.

Please keep in mind, while reading this material, that each contribution represents an oral presentation that was tape recorded, abstracted to some degree, and then translated editorially into a written document. No doubt some of the quality was lost in the translation to a medium that does not provide for gestures, pungent pauses, re-emphasis of critical points, or oratorical prowess. As with any speech material digested into article form, the representation of the presenter may not be entirely true to life. This of course is to be regretted.

On the other hand, the ideas expressed by those speakers are worthy of preservation and dissemination to those not fortunate enough to have been in attendance when the live presentations were made. If, in so doing, we can share their ideas

with a wider audience who will consider, accept in part and reject in part, then we are truly grateful.

One point should be made clear: all presentations represent (as closely as is possible while subject to the aforementioned limitations) the viewpoints of the presenters only, and should not be considered to represent any position of either the University or the Indiana Association of Elementary School Principals.

John C. Reisert

THE PRINCIPALSHIP--A PEOPLE BUSINESS

by

Harold J. McNally

It may come as a surprise to some of us that the most deep-seated problems we face in education today seem to be essentially the same ones that John Dewey and his fellow reformers faced approximately a half century ago. The problems to which I allude are, how can we develop the kind of education that will be most effective in bringing about functioning individuals who are self-realized, self-actualized, able to deal capably with their world and the world that is ahead? How can we cope with the wide range of individual differences that we find in our schools, and deal adequately with the individual problems and individual development of children in American schools? Indeed, I have come to the conclusion that we have not yet proven that adequate attention to the wide range of individual differences among all the children in our schools is compatible with a mass system of education. That is not to say it is not possible, but it still remains to be proven. And finally, how best can we deploy teachers, children, and materials to achieve these objectives? These problems have been studied a great deal by many people in many ways. From time to time there have been many persons who have come forward with proposals to help us solve these problems.

As I think about those problems, they fall into at least two broad categories. In the first of these categories are those problems that have to do with the organization or the reorganization of that which is to be learned, the reorganization of the curriculum. We can identify a number of proposals that have been made for such work. The Winnetka Plan was developed by Carlton Washburne, superintendent, in the school district of Winnetka, Illinois. Many persons are familiar with the social functions, or areas of living, curriculum that was developed by Hollis L. Caswell and associates and was embodied most clearly in the Virginia Course of Study back in the 1930's. It had a

This address by Dr. McNally is the first annual Hanne J. Hicks Memorial Lecture. The lecture series was established by the Indiana Association of Elementary School Principals as a memorial to Dr. Hanne J. Hicks, late Executive Secretary of the Association and noted Indiana University educator. The selected lecturer shall be, in the words of the resolution, "an outstanding leader in elementary education who exemplifies those ideals demonstrated by the late Dr. Hicks." -- Editor's note

very wide influence on the field of social studies throughout the United States. Many educators are aware of the program, proposed by Florence Stratemeyer and her colleagues, built around persistent life situations--those kinds of situations or categories of situations that tend to persist throughout the lives of individuals.

More recently we have seen a new wave of proposals for the organization or reorganization of that which is to be learned. Many of these suggestions are made, not by educators, but by scholars in the several disciplines in our universities. The ones that come to mind are the new math, the new science, the new social studies, and proposals for the reorganization of our systems of teaching reading and other subjects. Many are proposed as major solutions to the problems mentioned above. Indeed, some have been proposed because they would solve the problems that teachers cannot solve. They are called teacher-proof, implying that even in the hands of teachers, children cannot be prevented from learning if these approaches are used.

In a second category are proposals of different ways of organizing children, or teachers, or learning, or all of these. The one most familiar to us, of course, is the one we have lived with all our lives, the graded school and the self-contained classroom. That proposal, which took hold and spread like wild-fire through the United States, came to characterize our schools for a hundred years and more.

We also are aware of departmentalization as a plan for organizing children, teachers and, to a certain degree, subject matter. We are aware of variations on these themes. The platoon system school had considerable popularity at one time. A more recent variation--kind of a forced marriage of the platoon system and the homogeneous grouping and departmentalization--is a dual progress plan that George Stoddard of New York University has proposed.

Many of us have heard of the team teaching plan that was pioneered by Robert Anderson outside Boston. Team teaching is another plan for deploying teachers and children toward achieving the learning objectives that we are trying to achieve. (I might say, in passing, that team teaching is not really new. My first teaching position was in 1934 and at that time I worked in a teaching team. It was called the Hosick Cooperative Unit, but it called for a teaching team very similar to the ones we have today. But it was a little before its time and never caught hold.)

Finally, we all know about the non-graded plans of organization whose most vocal advocate is John Goodlad, although John Goodlad is very much disturbed at some of the things that are being done in his name and in the name of non-graded school. All of these plans were devised by dedicated men, men who were

most interested in solving the problems of education. Indeed these proposals have helped to solve some problems, but not the basic problems that, despite these efforts, are still with us. In making progress toward solving these problems we apparently are somewhat like the farmer's mule, "kinda backward about going forward." I find that the problems that disturbed me most when I started to teach still seem to be with us.

The reason for this lack of progress, I think, is not difficult to find. No plan, no organization, no way of deploying teachers, no way of grouping children, no way of organizing subject matter is going to do the job that must be done because these approaches don't attack the basic problem. The basic problem is how can we improve the quality of the learning experiences that children have in our schools and classrooms. In this we have a long way to go. Some recent research studies tell us just about how far. A number of students of teaching have devised ways of looking at teaching and of actually describing the behavior of teachers in classrooms. What do teachers do? Results of observation and research are somewhat discouraging.

Let me quote from a report by Marie Hughes of the Utah Study. Utilizing a set of criteria enabling relatively objective observation and description of teacher behavior in the classroom, her investigators found that, except for the ends of distribution, teachers exhibited very similar patterns of behavior. Content under discussion received little elaboration. Students' questions, explorations, and personal experiences were most frequently rebuffed or ignored. There was little attempt to build generalizations, to ask for comparisons, to look at alternatives, and to look at consequences. The process of analysis and synthesis was seldom demonstrated and the situation was such that it could not be interpreted as evoking these mental activities. The most common situation found was that of a teacher asking a question that was answered by the recall of an isolated item or fact. The act of stimulating--defined as opening the field for the student through the introduction of additional sources of information, of other facets for exploration, or of other activities that could be initiated--was seldom performed. Unfortunately, one of the most telling criticisms that can be made today is that in many--perhaps most classrooms--education is infinitely the same and infinitely boring. This criticism has been made before. In fact, research tends to show us that is it widespread. There are shining exceptions to this, of course. Many teachers are engendering lively experiences in classrooms--experiences of high quality that do stimulate, that do open new facets for exploration; but unfortunately, such examples are noticeable because they are exceptions.

This is not a problem that can be solved at the national level, as important as federal programs are. It cannot be

solved at the state level, as important as the functions of the state level are. It cannot be solved at the system level, though system personnel can assist greatly. The problem is in the individual building unit, and it is a problem for the principal and his staff. It is not a problem for the scholars in the universities. It is not really a problem, in one sense, for the superintendent of schools although it is his responsibility. It is a problem which falls squarely in the lap of the elementary school principal. Authorities have repeatedly pointed out that in curriculum and instructional improvement, the logical unit of participation is the local building unit. This is one of the reasons that we cannot rely solely on reorganizing the subject matter, or on reorganizing the students, or on reorganizing the teacher to solve the greater problem. We cannot rely on any kind of prepackaged or predetermined plans for doing this job. Only teachers can improve the quality of experiences of children in classrooms. Unless this takes place, all other changes are relatively ineffective. They tend to become simply showcase gimmickry to keep up with the educational Joneses. They tend to be changes in form rather than changes in substance. Subsequently or consequently, this must be the principal's major concern!

Of course, the big questions are how to accomplish the changes and why. We can gain useful insight into what the problem is and how it can be solved by looking at some comments by students of organization. Let us examine two that are mentioned frequently these days, and that have developed some concepts that are most useful to the elementary school administrator as he approaches this task.

Getzel has told us that the school is a social organization, an organization of persons working on interrelated activities for organizational purposes. He tells us that the institution which is the school has two dimensions, one the dimension of the institution and the other the dimension of the individual. The institution is a relatively impersonal thing. It is an idea. It is there; it exists, even though those who give it life come and go. The elementary schools of the United States have been here for a long period of time. Teachers and principals have changed over the years. But the schools are still here--relatively impersonal organizations peopled with individuals. This is one of the clues to the problem. In the jobs that have to be done in the elementary schools--in the roles that have to be performed--we have people. The demands of the impersonal organization are, to a certain degree, in conflict with the needs, the personalities and the interests of the people who work in the organization. They are not the same. People join these organizations to fulfill certain kinds of personal needs. Each of us has need for self-fulfillment. We need recognition, we need feelings of success, we need a feeling of belonging and acceptance. These needs are not necessarily the same needs of the organization. The organization

frequently requires us to forego some things we would rather do in order to do things that need to be done; and it requires us to conform in ways that need to be conformed to in order to achieve the organization's purpose. This often results in conflict and sometimes in frustration and dissatisfaction. The conflict between the individual and the organization, between the individual's needs and the organization's requirements, is increased if we increase the directiveness of the leadership--if we increase the tightness of the controls--if we narrow the job definitions to the point that we hem people in and restrict their areas of job freedom.

Let us relate this to education. In our schools we have teachers. We have roles defined for these teachers and jobs that they must do. The teachers themselves have personal needs, dispositions, and personalities that do not necessarily conform with the needs of the organization. If we try to coerce teachers to do the job according to stringent rules--if we narrow the job definition of teacher, allowing him less freedom (as in the case of teacher-proof materials)--if we do these things, Getzel says that inevitably we are going to increase tension, increase conflict, increase frustration within the organization and cause organizational difficulties. We make the organization much less efficient and therefore much less effective.

On the other hand, we can exert leadership with opposite effect--meeting personal needs and increasing personal satisfactions. This, of course, brings up the problems of how to accomplish such a change. What does this require? If we are to have improved quality of learning experiences within the classrooms, we must have change in teaching behavior because, if the researchers are right, improvement in the quality of the learning experiences within the classroom will require some change--and, in many cases, considerable change--in teaching behavior. I have already said that packaged plans will not succeed. Attempts to force teachers to change their behavior will result in increasing conflict and in increasing frustration and will not engender the learning of the new techniques, skills, or ways of behaving that must be learned. Furthermore, this approach ignores other factors in the situation which influence a teacher's behavior in the classroom. Behavior is not solely a function of the teacher's skill and the teacher's own conscious decisions of behaving but a factor of many other variables.

Consequently, the principal's problem is at least threefold. The problems that we face as principals in schools today are not really concerned with the adoption of plans. We must help teachers develop new and more effective teaching behaviors in the classrooms so that a higher quality of children's educational experiences is developed. Second, we must minimize the conflict, frustration, the tension, and the hostility that

perhaps may arise if one attempts to bring about change in the organizational behavior of teachers or the teaching behavior of teachers. How can we maximize the satisfactions of teachers on the job and help them to see ways in which their own needs can be met and satisfied? Third, we must help modify the entire teaching-learning situation in the schools so that it fosters and supports educational change and the kinds of teaching behaviors that we seek.

This is no small order, of course. It never was, and it never will be. What does it demand of the elementary school principal? I think it is fair to say that our typical approach throughout most schools has been didactic and patronizing. We assume that our task is to give the teacher a new curriculum, to teach the teacher how to teach better or differently, or to coerce the teacher to conform with ways of behavior that some superordinate believes best.

A different approach makes three demands upon the principal. First, it is most important for principals to understand change. There has been a great deal of emphasis on this, but we cannot dwell upon it too much so long as we dwell upon it usefully. An understanding of change is most important. There are many questions here to be answered. What is the sociology of change that affects our social fabric? What is the psychology of change which relates particularly to the learning of new ways of behaving? What are the politics of change that directly affect us and education? There are things to which we have given most inadequate attention in our work in education in colleges, universities, and elsewhere. Everyone, principals included, must understand that environmental (social and political) change eventually means change in people. We must understand how this comes about, how perceptions really change, how understandings develop, how people learn new skills and ways of behaving, and what dynamics are involved. Again, plans of organization will accomplish the goal. They may provide a helpful framework, under certain conditions, but what we need first is to define what the job is that must be done and then how we should organize to do it. If we put organizational plans first, we have put the cart before our horse.

In addition to understanding the nature of change, the dynamics of change, and the process of change, which is indeed difficult, a second requirement is that the staff be involved in the change. This last requirement is not always fully recognized although we know that individuals change themselves. Someone else may help me to change, but only I can do the changing. Change, learning, growth, and development are very personal things. They take place in a social framework, of course, and in the midst of many forces in a given situation. But in the long run it is something that happens within the individual and the eventual change is of his doing. If we are going to bring about changed teaching behavior, then, the

teachers themselves must somehow be involved in the change. It is, therefore, extremely important that the principal understand the need to involve his staff in the changes that are brought about.

I mentioned that change in me is a factor not only of me but of other forces in the situation because my change is also an action and a reaction to other forces in the situation. Consequently it is important, as we go about involving teachers in the change process, that we study not only the teacher but the situation which includes the composite of teacher, the materials of instruction, the children, the climate of the times, and the climate of the school. It includes the principal himself. It includes the current concept of curriculum and the concept of educational objectives held by the administration of the school system, of the school, of the teachers themselves, and, indeed, of the members of the community. Paul Mort maintained that a community gets the kind of education that it wants. If this is true, what the community believes about education is an important part of the situation. All of these things must be dealt with as we try to develop better educational experiences for children. That is why the total staff has to be involved in studying the situation.

We have said frequently that the problem is one bringing about change within the teachers. But this is a gross oversimplification. The problem is to change the situation in such a way that we get a higher quality of learning experiences in the classroom. Obviously, the teacher is part of the situation and must be involved in making the change. As teachers, principals, supervisors, and other resource persons together study the teaching-learning situation and attempt to analyze it, to diagnose it, and to devise ways of improving it, the quality of children's experiences indeed improves.

In the process we achieve a number of other objectives as well. Referring again to Getzel's theory, teachers who are involved in this way work together and communication among them is improved. As a result, they better understand organizational purposes and they better understand reasons for changes that must be made because they themselves have helped to identify needs. Furthermore, because of involvement, they better understand the programs being tried out in various other parts of the school. They have opportunities to achieve self-realization and to participate in the process improving the teaching and learning situation. They have opportunities to exercise leadership. They have opportunities to experience feelings of success after improvements are made within the school.

Under this approach to change, the principal becomes not the teacher of teachers, not the person who requires teachers to change, nor the person who monitors teachers. He need

not resort to undue control, or coercion to motivate teachers to change. He becomes the professional leader and the administrative leader of a group of fellow professionals working together to bring about an improvement in the teaching and learning situation and in the quality of the learning experiences of children. His understanding of change and of the process of involvement in working toward change requires considerable skill in human relationships.

As has already been mentioned, one of the most important things a principal has to deal with is the climate that he develops within a school. This seems to be an intangible thing but it arises from a host of tangible actions. Some schools have a warm, friendly, active, experimental, exciting climate. Others have a drab, uninteresting, dull, monotonous climate. Some have a climate of excellent human relationships while others have a climate of strained and tense human relationships. We need more study to understand the factors that cause these differences among schools. I think a very tenable hypothesis is that one of the most important factors is the principal himself. It has been said that if one wants to change a school, the easiest way to do it is to change the principal. Favorable climate is one of the most important things that the principal must work toward; and he needs considerable skill in human relationships to build it. If he does not have this skill, he must acquire it somehow. Without it he has considerable handicap to overcome before he can achieve the kind of improvement we have been considering that will evolve a situation in which people are valued over budgets, people over buses, and people over bond issues, important as those alternate things are.

To summarize my comments: Our basic problem is one of improving what goes on in classrooms--the teaching and learning activities, the quality of learning experiences that children have. This particular problem will not be solved through current proposals for reorganizing curriculums and new subject matter to be learned, reorganizing teachers, redeploying teachers, organizing children, and other plans of this type. Real improvement requires change in the organizational behavior of the staff, including the principal himself. The usual approach of trying to change teachers and their behavior has been didactic and patronizing but persons who have studied organizations and the dynamics of organizational behavior tell us that such an approach has not and will not work. Neat logical plans such as those mentioned earlier have always missed the particular mark of adequately changing the organizational behavior of enough teachers to make any real difference in the educational climate. Involvement of the staff is important and can help the staff, principal, and others to see the problem better, to understand its dimensions better, and to devise strategies for changing it. But such an approach requires leadership and human relations skill on the part of the principal.

Unfortunately, this is not an easy task. It is becoming increasingly clear that the basic problem is the nature of the interactions between and among the teacher, the children, and experiences in the classroom. This is a problem of the local building unit. The principal, therefore, is the critical factor. Where elementary school principals exhibit the necessary understandings and skills, efforts at change are far more likely to be successful. Other persons outside the local school also are involved. Certainly there are considerable implications for teacher-training institutions, and they have also been like the mule--awfully backward about going forward, again with shining exceptions. But regardless of what is done in teachers colleges, in training institutions, or elsewhere, we still are going to face these problems for as long as I can foresee. Didactic, patronizing, or coercive schemes for bringing about change are almost bound to fail.

Much, therefore, depends upon the insight of the elementary school principal into the dynamics of organizational behavior. Much depends upon his ability and his skill in working with his staff. After all is said and done, and as Hanne Hicks believed and stressed in his life and work, <u>the principalship is a people business</u>.

THE COMMON SCHOOL EFFECT

by

Harold J. Spears

The educational facility that I entered at the age of six in a small Indiana town was still known as the common school, and perhaps rightfully so. The town was common, the main and almost only corner of the business district was common with a common pump on it, and chained to it was a common tin cup. If the germs were common, perhaps the ignorance of the germs was also common. The only other common pump in town was in the school yard in Swayzee, Indiana, and it, too, had a common cup chained to it. When recess was over all the kids lined up kicking the mud off their shoes, and waiting their turn for a drink.

All the youngsters were common. Of course there were differences! We considered them natural at that stage of life. Maybe the teachers did not think about them at all. No one had had any training in sorting pupils at that time. Some of the farmers did sort their cattle--into Jerseys, Herefords, Guernseys and so on--but not their children. Some of us children were better at ciphering, some at spelling, some at basketball, some at helping the teacher, some at behaving, and some at going with the girls earlier--but all that seemed natural too. In fact, there was a common acceptance of the right to be different--to be an individual.

Our common school had four rooms downstairs, two grades to a room--1st and 2nd, 3rd and 4th, 5th and 6th, 7th and 8th. Youngsters spent two years in the same room, usually with the same teacher. They didn't know what grade they were in, I can tell you that. Today we would call it an ungraded primary or something. Upstairs was the high school with five teachers in five rooms. No one got up those stairs until he had been graduated from the school below. It was a promised land, a reward for completing the lower school. Thinking back, it makes me sad to reflect on all the children who got out of school without ever seeing that upstairs.

But they were doing other things that were important and they seemed busy. Perhaps they never missed that upstairs. It was common for a small town of 400 or 500 persons to have a school. It was a focal point for pride in those days--the community's monument to culture! No one had heard about consolidation. Yes, I think the word was used once in our town, when

a stranger came in from Converse. He bought out the blacksmith shop and added a garage. He had horses in one end and horsepower in the other. That was a consolidated effort!

Since there were only five teachers in the high school, one taught us both English and history. Because of the heavy schedule in our senior year, she had to teach them together. Today we would call this core curriculum. Those five teachers, with their rooms opening on a common corridor upstairs, handling all the same children--perhaps that was team teaching in the early days. In Swayzee, they weren't trying to be imaginative, innovative, or exemplary in order to qualify for school funds. In those days such an effort, if somebody thought they were doing something crazy, would have cut off the school revenue. The terms Title I and Title III would have been foreign to our school at that time.

But they were changing times. Most of the children did not stay in school very long in Swayzee. They seemed to have interesting things to do on the farm, in the stores, in the canning factory or up at Marion, the county seat town.

No one ever heard of a dropout. I, in fact, was a "drop-in!" We went to school when there wasn't anything more important to do. We never heard of the economy of society, but there was something "out there" that needed youth--that needed young people. They blended into the town and country life as important persons with responsibilities at the ages of 14, 15, or 16. They felt important to themselves and they didn't need a diploma to attain any distinction. They never had feelings of guilt, only self-assurance about what they were doing. The only obstacle this pattern presented for us in Swayzee was the problem it posed when we tried to organize a basketball team in the middle of the winter.

But one did not need to go to school long to be an important part of the community in those days. This point was impressed on me when I ran across the 1908 San Francisco attendance records in our office files. I wondered how the city could have straightened itself out after the earthquake and fire with so few persons who had achieved high school graduation. The San Francisco school enrollment in 1908 was as follows: grade 1--10,185; grade 2--5,290; grades 3, 4 and 5--about 4,000 each; grade 6--3,388; grade 7--2,785; grade 8--1,973; grade 9--1,241; grade 10--1,033; grade 11--482; and grade 12--261.

By the time I left high school, individual drinking cups had replaced the common germ carrier that hung on the pump. The American enterprize system had caught up with the germs by producing a collapsible cup that could be carried in your dirty pocket. In looking back at the common curriculum--that went on and on like the Wabash River--that drinking cup stands out as

the most imaginative thing I can remember that came into our school. As to the common curriculum, no doubt it served its purpose, for the school was not the exclusive agent for educating people. The community actually provided, without cost to the taxpayer, parallel programs of learning on the farm, in the stores and elsewhere.

But in these changing times, what is the common school today? A few decades ago it comprised eight grades--although the average pupil did not stay the full span. The term common has been lost, but certainly the concept of common has been perfected over the years. Before the school could have ever been properly retooled to serve a shifting economy, one state after another passed compulsory attendance laws institutionalizing youth until high school graduation or age 16. California, not to be outdone in this public testimony to formal education, raised the ante to age 18.

The high school principal today is well aware that it is an affront to the American ethic for a student to leave school without his diploma. Yet, he is constantly reminded that it is downright immoral to present such a certificate of public acclaim to one who is considered unworthy of having earned it. In fact, some middle-of-the-road superintendents attempt to placate both positions by offering a so-called certificate of attendance rather than the diploma. Such a document is more an indictment of school and society rather than of the limitations of persons trying to go through school.

This past year, a California Assembly sub-committee reported that a high school diploma is virtually meaningless due to the lack of uniform standards. A and B students receive the same diploma. The sub-committee concluded that the high school diploma is virtually meaningless as a legal document or as a personal badge of honor. It recommended that all school districts set minimum requirements for graduation, including a reasonably high record of report card grades. The committee neglected to review the state education code, which establishes attendance requirements to age 18 or to graduation. About three years ago one of the reporters on a San Francisco paper wrote an article that indicated about the same thing. He has also discovered that for some reason all persons do not leave high school with the same ability. I automatically responded to his article, but I filed my reply in the filing cabinet. (I have found that nothing really is deader than yesterday's newspaper unless you try to keep it alive yourself.) But the reply serves me today. This is the reply I would have sent but didn't send. This is what I wrote to myself:

> Since starting to teach in high school years ago I've seen thousands upon thousands of children going through school. That has been my life. No two of them

ever arrive with the same potential. No two of them leave with the same attainment. Under God's system of creating people, it couldn't be different. An experienced and sympathetic teacher is shocked neither by what a pupil can do nor by what he can't do. He merely does his best to help that pupil as he momentarily passes through his classroom on the way to something else in life. In handling this never-ending procession, we don't throw back to society those who can't. Running a school is not like running a production line in a factory in which the inspector throws out the culls.

By law, California directs the school to keep youths until age 18 or until graduation. These children in San Francisco's schools range in I.Q. from 25 to 185. Teachers are there to help the children, not to stand in judgment of them. For every high school graduate whom, you think, doesn't deserve a diploma we can show you an eight grader whose accomplishment might well make you ask why we don't give him his high school diploma immediately and save him the next four years.

Yes, the schools are crowded today, reflecting not only the public faith in education and the utter dependence upon education but also an economy that no longer has a place for youth. The youth who once was assumed to be old enough to operate a store in Swayzee, work on a farm or run it for his father is now considered too immature to assume such a role in society. The entrance of youth into the American scene as a distinct population group has been within our time--coming noticeably to the public attention for the first time during the 1930-40 depression period. This population group temporarily lost itself in the hustle and bustle of the all-out war effort in which it was needed. Everyone felt important because he had something useful to do. But soon they found themselves relegated either to school or to economic oblivion.

Our nation, through the use of good brains and the active minds of the mass of citizens has got something going that ignores the bottom portion of society. I won't say where the cutoff is. When you work with these children, you can see where the cutoff is for yourself and make your own judgment.

Nobody knows this situation better than does the school administrator who follows the trails of his graduates and dropouts. The great western sweep during the development of our nation called for about one strong mind for every score or more of strong backs. Of course it took courage, determination and persistence, but these were qualities not necessarily coupled

with bright minds. No one cared who was smart or who was dull in those days. There were no intelligence tests nor achievement scores to use as brands to enable society to separate the promising from the doubtful. As long as there were trees to chop and frontiers to follow, schools had to compete for their student bodies. A people with simple social and economic systems asked only a simple system of education from their schools. But people of a highly complex society must demand a more complex system of education.

If there is any question of the complexity of education today, go to a large city and attend a board of education meeting. American society looks upon public education as a necessary vehicle to better things--and rightfully so. Consequently, in periods of extreme hope and extreme frustration, society turns to the schools with a half-blaming, half-demanding approach that makes us jump.

But retooling schools to serve the ever changing American scene is not simple. A school is not a luxury to be provided to meet personal taste or public whim of the moment. It is a necessity calling for the dedicated skills of the profession. If you and I do not stand up to be recognized as professionals, someone else will be running the schools. It is a necessity to be justified by the fruit it bears--the soil that nurtures it.

What is that soil today? We might call today the asphalt period of American man. For the great bulk of society, the "soil" on which it must grow is the hard pavement of a technological existence that permits a fast getaway for one but nary a toe-hold for another. The phenomenal thrust of scientific and technological advancement in the United States during the last 15 or 20 years reflects the interests of business and industry to meet the exploding market, profit-wise, of the mounting costs of labor and government. Costs reflect, in one case, the increase in standards of living and, in the other, the necessity of an ever-expanding network of public controls and services designed to syncronize the complications that accompany the high standards of civilization that we have achieved.

The economic machine that projects our nation forward is the enterprise system with all its ramifications. The gimmick that has recently been installed to accelerate the pace is automation. Its principle is efficiency. Its procedure is the increase of production--with process taking precedence over people. The technical process, in its perfection, tends to eliminate the active worker from participation and to replace him with an effective substitute, the automation. The field for this machine is a calculated mixture of American ingenuity and American labor. The accelerated increase in the former through technical know-how now threatens a decrease in the

latter. For instance, the overtime hours spent by an electronics engineer in his laboratory may result in the reduction of the weekly working hours of a significant number of persons, or it may result in the employment of a significantly higher number of persons. A high school principal may drool over a Merit Scholarship student in science. Yet that same lad may well intensify the dropout problem for the principal of tomorrow. It is a fast tune to which we step today.

What are the changes in our schools? The mounting difficulties of the non-college bound student are apparent. With continued increase in the percentage of high school students going to college, the secondary school tends to become more and more a college preparatory institution and less and less the distinctive comprehensive high school that it once was. This is not by plan but by chance. This gradual metamorphosis may not be apparent to those who are in there day after day to administer and provide instruction in the schools. They are too close to the operation. What is noticeable to them is the student who seems to be a misfit. For as the group into which he fits decreases, the more pronounced is his maladjustment in that school. Let us face the fact that the common index of success in mounting the school ladder from primary education to college--grade by grade--is nothing more than the ability to read a book and to write a page. This seems to be about the only way we know to teach. But there are many ways that people learn besides through reading books.

Unfortunately the school's judgment of a pupil is passed on as the total community's judgment today. There is no other community endeavor, no outside employment, by which a pupil can establish his worth in the community. In other words, unlike my boyhood associates, the pupil's civic record is his success, or lack of it, in school. That is his total civic record. Thus, the responsibility the school personnel bear is tremendous. I wonder if school personnel appreciate this point. I wonder if it is fair to place them in a position of executioner of youthful ambitions. But it remains true, if a pupil does not succeed in school today, he is dubbed a social failure--and that is a handicap hard to overcome. "Are you a high school graduate?" is a common question for placement in surprisingly low level occupations today. Strange, isn't it, since the school theoretically was established to help people get along in life. It was never set up as a court of judgment, as a screening device, or as a maze that must be run before acceptance in the community. Certainly this is not of our own making, but rather a civic commitment that reflects the shortcomings of an affluent society.

But such recognition of the situation does not absolve us of the obligation to give attention to the non-academic student. It invites both soul-searching and curriculum exploration. The question is, if a student is forced by law to spend

his youth in school, are we not obliged to provide a school that is actually meaningful for him? And how do we know that we are fulfilling this requirement unless we study our school very intensively?

The road to practical occupational preparation in school is paved with antiquated machinery reflecting the production procedures in use at the time of the Smith-Hughes Act--about half a century ago. Thousands upon thousands of high school shops in this country should be closed to students and reopened as museums depicting an industrial age that preceeded automation. The rapid change in plant equipment and the consequent skills that it demands makes it impractical for public school systems to try to keep up with the changes necessary to carry on a proper training program. Consequently, there needs to be a close coordination of effort with industry in order that plant facilities can be made available for high school programs on a work-study basis. This is certainly consistent with work-study programs for office and store employment in which half a day is spent in the field and half in school. It must also be said that the time spent in school should be meaningful to the student--his study and preparation are a far cry from what his schoolmates who will be going to college are doing. We hear labor leaders telling school officials to concentrate on general education through high school graduation, delaying introduction to trades until a later period. Educators realize the limitations of this kind of thinking. Youths have the right to feel important at any age, and should not be treated as bench warmers not yet ready to assume responsible positions in our economy. We cannot build character that way.

It is a sad commentary that in this period of peak production we sidetrack youth into government-made work programs similar to those that were properly utilized during the depression years. Such an approach indicates a limited understanding of human nature. It ignores the realities of youth. Even if it has promise, it is but an expensive drop in the bucket. Education for life in the metropolitan area cannot be learned in abandoned Army camps, in the forest, or on a barren seashore. Permitting youth to work alongside their elders is a practical entry into the world of work--as old as the apprentice programs that came out of Europe. It must be carried out in the heart of the economy where work is centered.

One last comment relevant to occupational preparation for youth. We cannot escape from the realities of the problem by rationalizing, as do some educators, that all we need is more counselors. Counseling is always ineffective if the proper courses are not offered in school or the job opportunities do not exist. An average American high school has all the counseling services that it needs, providing counseling time is used efficiently.

Americans are great believers in free public education. And they are fast judging its efficiency and success by the amount of time pupils spend in school, and by the units and diplomas they amass while there. This attitude, likewise, seems to be held by legislative bodies, judging by their actions. A case in point at the Federal level is the Head Start Program. The original qualifications for this program were so strict in some states that the money had to be spent for a pre-kindergarten program whether or not the school already included kindergarten. A case at the state level, growing out of California legislation, involved five years of college pre-training for elementary school teaching at a time when the state was short of elementary school teachers. This was passed in spite of the opposition of the superintendents of the large cities in California, such as San Francisco, who were in a position to judge the effectiveness of the existing programs of teacher training. Having observed hundreds of beginning teachers, we preferred the extra training beyond a four-year course to come after the person had acquired experience in the classroom and knew what the problems were. Then the training would mean something to him. But we are so dedicated to the idea that education is just more schooling, more classroom work, that even our associations worked at getting the requirement of five years of pre-training as a requirement for elementary education all over the country.

In San Francisco I was in charge of the elementary division for seven years before I became superintendent. I was in many schools and observed young teachers. We were hiring them at the rate of 300 a year, and they were good teachers. They had promise. All they needed was help through that first period. If someone was having difficulty getting started, we remembered the investment that had been made in that person and transferred him to another school. A new situation with a new principal often brought many changes for the better. No two principals ever agree on who are the best teachers; the success of young teachers in new settings, after they have faltered in earlier ones, has shown the value of acknowledging this.

The public thirst for schooling seems never to be satisfied. It seems the limits of the common school shall never be found as we seek more and more education. To what extent the increasing popularity of college education may reflect the person and affect the economy is hard to say. It is now easier, at least in California where I am best acquainted, for a high school graduate to get into college than it is to get a job. This points up the fact that it is easier to create colleges than to create jobs for youth. There are eight campuses of the University of California, 18 other state colleges offering the master's degree, and approximately 75 public junior colleges. Of course, these figures may not be up-to-date as I haven't been there for three months.

In America today, so many high school graduates are going on to college that parents feel a necessity of explaining, or alibiing, to their neighbors if their offspring do not happen to go. In a few years the reverse may be true. Parents may feel obligated to explain why their son has entered college and is still there after two or three years.

For the last five or ten years public education in this country has been expanding in all directions. We are starting children younger. We are holding them in school longer. We are teaching given subjects at earlier and earlier grades. We are broadening and enriching programs at every grade level. We are operating summer schools. We are providing more extra class services--lengthening the school day--lengthening the school year. We are bargaining across the counter with individual citizens and with neighborhood segments of the district for this, that, and "What have you thought of today?." For the past few years there has been a growing tendency for the public to regularly attend meetings of the boards of education (I'm speaking for the large cities because that has been my experience recently) demanding anything from lapidary classes to bilingual instruction of primary children. They want smaller classes, larger buildings, an outside curriculum survey and teacher aides.

The faith in more schooling is being demonstrated to a point of frenzy that might be likened to a run on a bank. In fact, it does have certain serious financial implications. In at least the larger cities, the budget preparation is no longer the inside job that it once was--carried on in the efficient and deliberate manner that was recommended in the textbooks that we studied. A superintendent, after watching the public in open board meetings bargaining for and receiving services never thought essential, finds himself shifting his budget position. He is not as efficient as he used to be. It becomes almost a game to try to get for the public the services it will eventually ask for and to complete that operation before it actually realizes that it wants them. Maybe in labor relations or in teacher negotiation it is not very sporting to give someone something without having permitted him the right to earn it for himself; but at least it is an intriguing side-play of school administration.

One of the increasing difficulties in financing public education is the number of separate school units that operate independently under the state legislature, the state education office, the federal government, and the local citizens at the polls. The resultant situation is roughly analagous to a poker game with only a specific amount of money in the pot and with each of the players trying to take it away from someone else. Competition for the school tax dollar is keen. A school administrator, at any given level, moans in anguish if he doesn't get his share, then he is shocked if a resident dares vote

against the latest tax measure or bond issue. There is a public will to finance education but there is bound to be a hidden limit, even if a particular segment of the public school must find it the hard way. We do not know what the limit is; but we cannot continuously go on saying, "Give us more money for education."

The educational scene is made up of millions of busy professionals and non-professionals conscientiously working at their individual assignments--at their somewhat selfish segments of the total enterprise. No one can blame them for their devotion to a limited sector of the whole or for their tenacious defense of a school, a subject area, a district, an age level, a population group. But anyone who looks upon the educational scene from the outside can well ask, "Who is to synchronize the whole operation for the sake of both educational and fiscal efficiency?".

Surely the initial recognition of the challenge falls upon the professional administrator. It is not enough for the college president, the school superintendent, or the principal to sit complacently in his office, self-righteous in the knowledge that an over-eager, ever-anxious society is expecting the impossible of the schools while withholding the funds necessary to carry out this assignment. As school operators, it is easy to look to the outside; so difficult to make the inward examination. We must beware of inflexibility and defensiveness. We are not here to protect our insularity, to become an educational Lewis and Clark Expedition.

There are areas that we certainly should study. First, for the college-bound student, a reduction of one year in the common sequence from grades 1 through 12. We would, thus, recognize the instructional efficiency achieved in our profession during the last three or four decades just as American business, industry, and the other professions have taken advantage of their research and have implemented it. The amputation of one grade could be made by curriculum specialists in the various subject fields working in a coordinated effort, but it would have to be made on a larger scale. Any one launching an effort along this line would have to work on a state-wide basis or a regional basis. Should he try to change only one school system, he would create a situation that would automatically put at a disadvantage those children who went from that school to another.

But let us examine the practical aspects of the suggestion. Since the secondary school is the middle school of today, it is not the higher institution that it used to be. We would not deprive this moving mass of young people going on to college of anything for they would still be attending school. The new system would simply change the break a little. Second, we would retain the non-college bound youth through the twelfth or

even the thirteenth grade. The school becomes his civic center, his base of operation, until he is absorbed into the economy. The types of programs, the various kinds of daily schedules, the cooperative ventures arranged with business and industry, the miscellaneous services afforded these youths tempts the imagination of school personnel in the supporting community. It would be a giant enterprise in planning and in practice.

Third, we might provide a half-day school program for four-year olds. This is cheap education compared with other levels. The program should be optional with parents and tied in with the present kindergarten program; thus, recognizing that any organized public grouping of younger children deserves the care of the professional educator. It is not a child care program that we are looking for. If it were, it should be kept in the social program. Once we assemble a group of young children, we have a group situation, and the children will interpret the school whether anyone else does or not. The profession ought to control the program. To open this program to all would be in keeping with the principle of equality of educational opportunity in this country. All children would have the right to enter school at the same time.

Fourth, remove the relentless, competitive marking system that elevates, without effort, the academically inclined child when he starts to school and brands, as misfits, those who have lost the race before they begin. This practice eventually demands extra funds for repetition of subjects and grades. Simply the teaching of reading until high school level is by no means the answer. It is an escape we are now using! The child usually emerges from the tenth grade reading at about the level he did when in fifth grade. We must accept children on their own, not by their relationship to others. The comparitive approach buttressed by achievement scores has an unfortunate psychological handicap. Regardless of how much we raise the achievement level of any particular group or class, half the class is still going to be below average and will be so marked and branded by society.

Fifth, we may establish procedures of learning that parallel the present, single, royal road to school--the reading of a book and the writing of a sentence. Yet the out-of-school world is full of interesting things which young people learn. Perhaps more of them could be used in the school. At the secondary school level, the student is never treated as a whole individual. He goes through the secondary school in five parts every year. Five different persons look at him in five different ways. We laugh, at times, at team teaching, but certainly it has benefits when all teachers can look at a child together rather than separately. This indirectly is a comment on one of the great handicaps we have in the American secondary school. Throughout the school enterprise our emphasis is on teaching the pupil rather than on helping him. If we concentrated on

the latter, subject matter and courses would then fall into a meaningful place. When a child is required by law to attend school, the question should never be, "Is he ready for school; is he ready for the next grade?". The question should be, "Is the school or is the next grade ready for him?".

Sixth, we should coordinate the funding of all public levels of education, thus determining the proportional amount of the total school tax dollar that each segment deserves--college, high school, elementary school, adult education.

The six points presented here represent a sampling of the advances that imagination could bring to the common school, a rapidly growing institution yet one clinging to outmoded practices. We must recall where it began--with the common school, and where it went--into the many facets of public education. Even though the school tax dollar has stretched to give shelter to everything from the nursery school through adult education, we can be assured of continued exploration into unknown territory. Washington has announced that the Head Start Office will conduct a pilot project, in sixteen cities, concentrating on the pre-school child and his family. They will begin with prenatal care, including even the basic skill of cooking. But we can be sure that, if this pilot program is successful, there will remain one further area to cover--the proper breeding of parents. The increasingly popular family life education course may very well be the launching pad for this venture into tomorrow's common school. A schoolteacher's job never lacks excitement!

THE PRINCIPAL AND THE STATE DEPARTMENT

by

Richard D. Wells

From the viewpoint of the Department of Public Instruction, we have much work to do in the area of elementary education in the State of Indiana.

For generations now, groups, such as the universities and some of the professional organizations and associations, have assumed the burden of providing the leadership, intelligence, and innovation that should have come from the Department of Public Instruction.

There has been some encouragement of this situation. The office of State Superintendent of Public Instruction is elective. In the past, candidates have at times been offered who had little or no connection with public instruction. Lack of leadership has left a void which was filled by the other groups in the professional field of education. It is to be hoped that educators, parents, and students will not permit a return by either party to the concept that the superintendent's office is a kind of trading spot, a place of retirement, or a reward for political service. In the present reorganization, we are attempting to do what we are obligated by law to do: to team our efforts and assume authority and responsibility that other professional groups in education have assumed because of past neglect. Sometimes there seems to be an unnecessary conflict. After all, the constitution provides for a superintendent and the statutes provide for a State Board of Education. The official educational agency in the state is the Department of Public Instruction.

All other groups and all other efforts are professional, but unofficial. It is the intent of this administration to carry out its legal responsibility in conjunction and cooperation with all other educational agencies, individuals, and associations in the State of Indiana and to provide leadership (without dictatorship), to try to combine and unite major interests of education. For an example of what happens when we fail to do this, one need only go back to the 1967 legislature in which we find the school boards association, the superintendents association, the principals associations, ISTA, IFT, the university groups, and special vested interests groups outside of education working for 61 days in Indianapolis on their individual programs. For the most part, each worked for his own benefit without any overall coordination as to what needed to be done in the State of Indiana. This is a

regrettable situation. Unless segments of the educational profession join forces and prepare in advance for the legislative sessions, and decide to work cooperatively, it will have some serious problems in the future with considerable opposition as well as criticism from groups in the state who find opposition to education in their own best interests, economically or otherwise.

As members of the Elementary Principals Association, you apparently have decided to dedicate your professional lives to elementary education. You should be aware of some problems in that field. But let us not allow many details to overshadow a few basic concepts, practices and thoughts in the field of elementary education today. One problem might be compared to the well-known practice in the barnyard where chickens have kind of a pecking order; certain chickens can peck other chickens but those chickens cannot peck back. Of course, the second pecked chicken can peck certain other chickens and so on and so forth. It seems that in the field of education we have established, unfortunately, a rather rigid, stereotyped pecking system.

At the top of the pecking system are those who are supposed to be beyond the question. Here we find the experts in the universities, colleges, and schools of education. After all, persons there have demonstrated unquestionable expertise in a constant deluge of articles, reports, evaluations, and conferences in which the universities are telling the world, and the state, of all the terrible evils found in the public schools--of all the things that we are doing wrong. There is no shortage of ability to identify the problems in public education, because we have lots of university professors who seem to concentrate their fire on what is wrong with the public schools. We are getting continually pecked, verbally, by the universities and colleges. In fact, our evils are so great that some professors of education who have never taught in a public school are able immediately to recognize everything that is wrong. Apparently the situation is so desperate that those who have not been in the classroom for 20 years still know from indelible memory what the situation is. They find it unnecessary even to visit a modern school before they publish their barrage of criticism.

Now, who is second on the pecking order? Probably superintendents. Public school superintendents certainly are a very distinguished group who have served this nation and this state well in their local schools, but they are usually the butt of much criticism. If you were a superintendent, you might wonder if you ought not be listed at the bottom of the pecking order considering the quantity of criticism. But superintendents, too, are able to peck, usually choosing the secondary principal as a target for he seems to rank third in this "barnyard hierarchy."

There seems to be a problem as to who is fourth in the

pecking order after universities, superintendents, and secondary principals: the secondary teacher or the elementary principal. But certainly on the bottom of the pecking order is the elementary teacher. And either next to the elementary teacher or close by is the elementary principal.

Why have we allowed this to happen? Why have we allowed a tragic reversal of public education? In this country we established first the common school on the elementary level, then we were able to establish the public high school, and finally we were able to have large public universities and colleges. Of course, private universities and colleges existed but I think that we would say generally that was the order of our establishment: the public elementary school, the public secondary school, and then the large public university. Why then, are the elementary teacher and the elementary principal on the bottom of the "pecking order" when traditionally they belong to the first group established by our nation?

Effects of this "pecking order" have been very detrimental. Women often look upon elementary teaching as just a way to earn some money to get clothing and a car until they get married, and they teach for two, three, or four years. The elementary area is the one for which we issue the largest number of permits and in which we have the greatest teacher shortage. In some states the elementary teacher is still paid on a different, and lower, salary schedule than are secondary teachers; and it wasn't very many years ago that this was true right here in Indiana. Why has this come about? Elementary education is the first, most basic, and therefore most important educational function. If we were, by some strange quirk, forced to eliminate all but one level of education, which levels would we bypass? Elementary education? Secondary education? Higher education? Obviously, if forced to do so, we would cling to the elementary concept and teach the basic language skills of reading, writing, and mathematics. Through education during these six elementary years we would develop a stronger nation and a more informed citizenry than we could create without elementary education. We cannot have successful secondary and higher education unless the elementary education is successful.

Why, then, are elementary education, elementary teaching, and elementary administration on the bottom of the ladder of prestige? Why is it a level from which most people are trying to go up and out? The very use of the words "up and out" implies that elementary education is somehow or somewhere on the bottom. Many persons who teach in elementary aspire to teach in secondary schools, and many persons who teach in secondary schools would like to teach in college if they could. Why do we have this concept? Why is the height of educational success designated as professor of education on a college or university campus rather than as an elementary teacher in School XYZ in the State of Indiana? Yes, this is the way we think and the way we operate--

and then we wonder why we have pupils who complete the sixth grade but read at only the second or third grade level. Boys and girls who leave the elementary school are so ill equipped that they fail in the secondary school and then drop out of school. Nearly a third of the children in the State of Indiana drop out of school. We seem not to understand why we have drop-outs and low reading levels and so on. We act as if this were a mystery. The mystery is that we cannot see the clear evidence that we are not doing an adequate job. We are not giving the interest, emphasis, attention, money, prestige, and proper image to the elementary level that it deserves and which it so badly needs.

Why has this happened? There appear to be several reasons. One that is particularly pertinent to elementary school principals is the absence of any effective spokesman for elementary education in the State of Indiana. If there is any one thing that would make this Elementary Principals Association one of the most important organizations in the state, it would be to assume this role. Through your own professional association, you as principals can become leaders in elementary education. After all, you are the leaders! The classroom teacher is busy with boys and girls. They are not generally free to attend meetings of such associations; they are back in room 107 with 25 or 30 or 35 boys and girls. They are looking to you--the logical leaders and spokesmen who have the opportunity to get away now and then, to meet and to determine policies and form concepts, and then to speak out.

The elementary teacher and principal ought to be the elite class, if there must be any kind of educational caste system--which does apparently exist. This association and the principals in this association need to tell their story to the Department of Public Instruction and to the universities. Once there is an effective organization, it must be used to channel information about the needs to the official government agency and to the leading professional areas of the campuses. It is the principal who must tell us what is wrong! For example, one of the very serious problems of our profession is the teacher shortage. Would it not greatly simplify the job of the principal if he could bring in a full staff, competent to do the job in the classroom, at the beginning of the school year? Would it not be akin to the millenium if all he had to do was meet the parents over coffee at the PTA meetings, knowing that his staff is so thorough and so complete, so competent in the classroom that it is doing the whole job without any problems or repercussions.

But staffs like that are simply dream material. We cannot get a full staff of any kind. We opened this school year in Indiana with some 480 empty elementary classrooms. Principals and superintendents had to go out in a frantic scramble for personnel (capable or otherwise) to man the classrooms.

Why do we have this critical teacher shortage? We in Indiana are in the preliminary stages of our second survey regarding teacher shortage and are comparing our shortage with other states in the Midwest. At this time it is too early to be precise, but it is clear that Indiana and the Midwest states have the greatest teacher shortage--the greatest number, percentage, etc. of vacancies. In other words, we are in the worst shape of any geographic area in the Midwest.

Now we have a defined problem that we--the Department of Public Instruction, the principals association, and the universities--can work on. But we are not moving in this area. We are not doing things much differently than we did 20 years ago when we introduced some of the basic concepts of student teaching. To meet that problem, we simply lengthened the time of student teaching and changed it from one hour a day to eight weeks, or a semester, or whatever the various universities determined. But we have completely ignored our current problem. We talk about it, think about it; read articles and hear an occasional discussion. But we take no action. We are past the stage of talk, theory, discussion, and papers. We need the laws, rules, regulations, and statutes operating today so that we can prepare for next year.

The problems are here today and require action tomorrow. Then, perhaps the next day we can alleviate some of them. For example we have paid no attention to whether the student teacher ought to be paid. We seem not to have thought of having several critic teachers instead of one. We haven't really discussed the role of the principal and the student teacher. Why can't principals do some rating and voice their opinions as to who is qualified to have a place in the certification process? Universities have not really given much attention to the quality of the preparation of the critic teachers. We might challenge the apparently accepted belief that three years of experience and a master's degree qualify a person as a critic teacher! The universities have not innovated anything nor set up any criteria, on the campus level, which the teachers must meet before they may serve as critic teachers.

In another direction, we might learn from the Peace Corps which recognizes that not all teachers should be trained exactly the same. It faces the fact that some of its teachers will go into underprivileged or poverty stricken areas, and therefore require a different kind of training and course work than do those who will go into the middle class situations.

Principals and superintendents, through their organized association, should goad the universities into innovations in student teacher training, and in the whole area of curriculum, to meet the problems of today.

Individuals in the universities are clearly competent to

respond with development of more of the leadership that has marked higher education institutions in the past. The universities can and must devise some programs for the Teacher Training and Licensing Commission that will provide practical flexibility. The Department of Public Instruction and the Commission has no intention or desire to prescribe the details of the teacher education program. But unless the programs are updated, simplified, and adjusted to today's problems and realities, university influence on the state level will disappear.

In this realm of university leadership there is an additional area that I hope the universities will explore. That is the idea that the only way that we can prepare teachers for the classroom is to bring the aspiring students to a college campus under very strict and economically punitive residence requirements, place them in a classroom, and add a lecture. For example, if a student wants credit for three hours in geography he must go to a college campus and enter the classroom with a notebook. He must take notes on the lectures and he will get three hours credit. Through this pattern he can earn a license to teach geography. But if this teacher decided that instead of going to campus he would get on a boat or an airplane and take an extensive tour for two and a half months through Central and South America, looking at the people and the terrain, experiencing the language, and observing the economic activities, and then return home at the end of the summer, this person has no rewardable competency under our concept to teach Latin American geography.

I hope the universities and colleges will come to our commission with some in-depth proposals through which individuals can earn credit for licensing other than by sitting in classrooms listening to lectures. If the universities do not move in this direction in the next few years, I suspect that the Department of Public Instruction will. While they may not count toward a degree at an institution, such pertinent experiences and learning situations are likely to receive credit toward a teaching license. I think basically that is what most teachers are concerned about.

In this whole area the Department of Public Instruction is looking to the principals and superintendents as well as to the universities for proposals and programs. New ideas and concepts must come from all appropriate areas before we can act.

One serious area of concern for us in Indiana is that of negotiations. Where do principals fit into the area of negotiations? This is a confrontation that cannot be avoided. Teachers are well organized. Recognized, negotiating units will bargain for such things as salary, sick leave, size of class, furniture, materials. The classroom teacher is quite different than his counterpart of 20 or 30 years ago. Today's teachers are a new breed. They have met high requirements. In the last few years almost every teacher has been forced to get a master's degree.

He is going to have a voice in what goes on in the public schools. Since there is a shortage of teachers, the law of supply and demand means that the teacher's voice is going to be much stronger and of greater influence than before. And these will definitely be teachers' voices.

Regardless of the often stated, "I always think of myself as a teacher, not really as a superintendent (or principal)," those who hold such positions are not teachers. And teachers, at least, recognize this. Principals generally will find themselves no longer accepted as members of local teacher associations. I suggest that administrators who want a voice in the local school organize on their own merits and be proud to identify themselves as administrators and speak as administrators. I suggest that school boards generally are going to recognize teachers groups as bargaining agents because of their size. In like manner, strong principals' associations would provide the voices through which to present ideas to the superintendents and to the school boards. Obviously, a principal is part of the administrative hierarchy and part of the superintendent's team. On the other hand, principals have their own problems that must be presented in an organized, united fashion. Such a united voice emanating from a united effort need not detract from or destroy administrative hierarchies; it might in fact, strengthen them.

In the present setup of the office of State Superintendent of Public Instruction, principals will be represented equally on every major study committee along with the school boards, the superintendents and classroom teachers.

The department believes in elementary education and elementary principals.

A LOOK TO A CHANGING FUTURE

by

James E. Weigand

During a conference at the Manned Spacecraft Center in Houston, Texas, participants were introduced to the many advances being made in science and technology and were informed about the possibilities that could become realities by the year 2000 A.D. As the conference progressed, I became more and more conscious of being truly unaware of the potential of the world of tomorrow. There is a kinship to that feeling as we consider the changing future of education. In light of what the futurists are saying about the world of tomorrow, consider the need of education in the world of today.

One of the first questions that arises is, how can we accurately predict what will occur in the future world? In regard to this it should be pointed out that tremendous amounts of money are now being spent by organizations to foresee the future. General Electric has a group called TEMPO, which is the Technical Management Planning Organization. A group of individuals comprised of educators, sociologists, psychologists, scientists, engineers, and others are paid $7,000,000 to investigate their particular areas and, based upon their discoveries, make predictions as to when ideas can become realities. Another example is the U.S. Air Force which pays Rand Corporation $15,000,000 a year to do the same thing. Many articles have been written about Rand's "think factory" or the "brain trust."

A study of past ideas reveals that it takes approximately 20 years for ideas to become reality in business and industry. I am sorry to say that in the field of education it takes approximately 50 years for an idea to become a reality. A couple of examples illustrate the point. Back in the 1920's a research project was carried out that dealt with the effects of radiation on fruit flies. At that time it appeared to be unimportant information, but in 1947 a Nobel Prize was awarded for this work and today we realize its importance to mankind. In 1930 an extensive research project was carried out dealing with the diet of the white rat. Little interest was given this project but its importance was reflected approximately 20 years later and led to the billion dollar business of vitamins. With these examples in mind, let us look at some of the predictions of the future in the areas of population, transportation, medicine, and industry.

It is predicted that by the year 2000 the U.S. population will number 330,000,000 persons. This population is to double in the year 2020. Nine out of ten Americans will live in super-cities or their suburbs. We already have in existence one super-city that stretches from Boston to Washington. Anyone living in that area or someone who has had occasion to visit that area will realize that the density of that population makes it a super city at the present time. A super-city projected for the year 2000 is the Chicago to Boston area and it is further projected that by the year 2020 this super-city will be extended to the Minneapolis area.

A third super-city will be on the West Coast from Southern California into Western Canada. Recent population studies show the tremendous growth the West Coast has had already in the sixties. A fourth super-city predicted beyond the year 2020 is the Gulf Coast region from Florida to Texas. How this tremendous population can be accomodated is a question that might be answered by other predictions.

One possible solution to the population problem is that of hibernation. Much research is currently going on in this area and after the year 2000 it is conceivable that people could be placed into hibernation. I am fully aware of the problems involved with half of the population in hibernation and the other half not in hibernation, but this possibility should not be overlooked.

Other solutions to the population explosion rest in satellite cities and underwater cities. It is predicted that by the year 2000 a permanent lunar base will have been established and that man will have flown past Venus and landed on Mars. Future space projects call for more people being placed into space for longer periods of time. The result of this would be satellite cities where large populations could be accommodated. Underwater cities have been displayed at exhibits and fairs. At the present time two submarines are being built in Florida and when completed will have the task of searching the ocean surface for possible sites for underwater cities. These subs should be ready in the early seventies and site selection should be fairly well along by 1975.

In conjunction with underwater cities it is interesting to note other predictions: frogmen will be available to farm crops in the ocean and fishmen will be able to herd fish as today's cattlemen herd cattle. At a recent meeting of the International Biologists Association it was predicted that by the year 2020 the major source of food for the world's population would come from the ocean.

In the area of transportation many new things are on the horizon. Already the supersonic transport is being developed and will accomodate 350 to 400 passengers. Other supersonic

jets are now on the drawing board and will be able to carry 500 to 1,000 passengers and fly just under the speed of sound. Because of these advances in aircraft and the number of passengers that can be transported it is predicted that by the year 1975 round trip fare to Europe can go as low as $100. Just this thought alone has tremendous implications for education.

Because of the many traffic problems that exist today the futurists are predicting possible ways by which the automobile will become less important. One suggestion is that cars could be replaced by "hovercraft" which ride on a cushion of air. We already have in existence hovercraft vehicles--as a matter of fact, we have hovercraft lawnmowers. Another way to replace the automobile as a means of transportation is the possibility of underground transportation.

One plan recently discussed in a physics journal is the development of an underground system that would have the appearance of a roller coaster. By means of a gravity system, vehicles would by able to go underground from one major city to another. Many plans for this type of system already have been placed on the drawing board.

Based upon recent developments in space exploration, engineers have predicted that by the year 2020 ballistic rockets will have been developed that will transport vehicles any place on the earth in 40 minutes. When asked to consider these far-out ideas, many persons may want to slough some of them off as being ridiculous, but they might recall how we laughed at much of the science fiction in the 30's and the 40's which today is reality!

In the area of medicine we are told that changes will occur very rapidly. Artificial organs such as hearts, lungs, stomachs, will be transplanted without the problems that are now being encountered. Not only artificial organ transplants but real organ transplants will become a reality. It is not beyond the realm of possibility that within the next year or two successful heart transplants will take place.* The blind and the deaf will have new sight and new hearing in a manner similar to radar. Electronic devices will eliminate the use of the dog and the cane. Artificial arms and legs will be motorized and computerized and linked to the nervous system and stimulated by thought impulse. Just a few short months ago a Russian doctor developed an artificial arm that was motorized and computerized. It is predicted that the linkage to the

---

*Mr. Weigand's speech preceeded by a few weeks Dr. Christiaan N. Barnard's celebrated work in heart transplant surgery.

nervous system of this apparatus will be accomplished prior to the year 2000.

The futurists also predict that by the year 2000 the fetus will be grown outside of the mother's body and that human tissues will be grown to specifications. The area of special education will change drastically because retarded individuals will be detected at birth and chemical therapy will permit them to function as normal people. It is further predicted that by the year 2030 brain transplants could become a reality. Chemical therapy will also be extended to the development of new types of pills that will be able to control behavior. Simple examples of this will be anti-grouch pills or ambition pills. It will even be possible for an electrical stimulus to control behavior. Much laboratory research is going on in this area at the present time. This laboratory work has already shown that an electrical stimulus can produce responses such as fear, affection, laughter, and sex arousal in animals.

Let us now move to the area of computers and gadgetry. The kitchen of tomorrow will be completely automated and menus will be computerized. The housewife will be able to plan meals a week or a month in advance. Household robots will wash the dishes, wash the windows, and even cut the grass. Air conditioning devices will be developed and it will be possible to place this device in the clothing and a blanket of conditioned air will engulf the body. Other items such as electronic language translators, ring tape recorders, wrist TV sets, and video phones will come into existence. The major problem of garbage disposal which currently faces the major cities of the nation will also be eliminated. Research with the laser beam shows that lasers could be controlled and used very effectively for the disintegration of garbage.

This is by no means the end of a complete recital but it conveys enough to make it clear that the world of tomorrow will be drastically different from the world of today. What, then, does this world of the future mean to children? Children presently in our elementary schools are ages 5 to 12 and the same children will all be in their forties come the year 2000. We must prepare these children to be able to live in the year 2000. Now we cannot present problems of the future world to children because they don't know what these problems are, but we can and should try to develop the thought processes of the minds of children. The child who is taught to think logically and rationally will be able to attack successfully the problems as he encounters them in that world of the future. But the child cannot develop the power of rational thought unless the teacher fully understands the role she plays in the teaching-learning process. She must be cognizant of the art of questioning that can develop components of thinking--observation, inference, classifying, predicting, interpreting data, formulating hypotheses, and designing experimentation. She must be cognizant of

the performance objectives that she is trying to help the children reach in the instructional program. The teacher must develop a style of teaching which will cause the child to become an active learner rather than a passive recipient of information. The teacher must be aware of the interaction that takes place within a classroom and be able to analyze this interaction so that it leads to improved teaching on her part.

These are but a few of the areas in which a teacher must possess knowledge. The bulk of our teachers are not informed in these areas at the present time.

This is where the elementary principal enters the picture. He has a responsibility to improve instruction. He cannot do this unless he is aware of the areas just mentioned. He has an obligation to the children to become informed in these areas and then to work with his teachers so that the act of teaching is improved. He has an important role to play, and if he plays it well, the children of today will be better equipped to live in and cope with the world of tomorrow.

THREATS TO THE PRINCIPALSHIP

by

John E. Reisert

The principalship, as we have known it, is facing a number of challenges that jeopardize its very existence. Many of us have worked long and hard to establish the office of principal as a position of leadership--not leadership in the traditional, patriarchial sense but leadership of the highest professional order. Ours has been the task of making the principal the instructional leader of the school staff--the educational leader of the school district--the professional leader within the system, state and nation as well. We have watched the role evolve from routine administrative chores and minutiae to one of decision making, operational programming, skillful implementation, and directional pacing. Inspiration has replaced mandate in pursuing our routine. We are quite pleased with the progress we have viewed during the past 20 years but still we have strived to achieve the full professional status that the office does, and indeed must, demand.

However, developments during the last several years have had a dramatic and immediate effect on the principalship. In fact, the goals we have worked toward stand a good chance of being stripped from our hands before we even have them firmly in our grip. The institution of the principalship as we have perceived it is threatened by movements that tend to be revolutionary rather than evolutionary. If we are apathetic, or phlegmatic, or anything less than vocal--or, perhaps, anything less than militant--we stand to lose more than we have gained through our long process of evolutionary development.

If there is anything to be said for the new and modern position of leadership that the principal now holds, then the time has come to say it. By remaining silent we stand to forfeit our right to status, prestige, leadership, and a voice in our professional affairs. We can revert to paper shuffling, fee counting, and receptionist duties unless we defend that to which we have aspired. The choice rests with us. It must be made, and it must be made at once.

Ironically, the forces that challenge our very existence are those to which most of us subscribe. As a matter of fact we have played a large part in the creation of these forces. Most of us would agree that they represent positive rather than

negative factors in the total educational picture. Just as we have worked hard and long in the professional development of the principalship, we worked equally hard and long to bring these forces into existance.

Inherently there is nothing wrong or threatening in these forces. By and large they have, in the long run, had a positive effect on education. The threat comes rather from the side effects, the professional fall out, that each potentially contains. Together, these side effects have developed into a combined threat that was non-existent three or four years ago. It is essential that we work toward eliminating the side effects rather than opposing the forces lest we find ourselves in the proverbial position of throwing out the baby with the bath. This latter course would have a negative rather than a positive effect on education even if we were successful, and our chances of succeeding in any real way are slight indeed. Care and caution must be our bywords in any action we take.

What are these potentially dangerous forces? Are they real or do they simply exist in our own insecurity with our new found status? Are we simply educational Don Quixotes jousting with imaginary giants who may turn into windmills? I think not, but let me present briefly my case.

It seems to me that these friendly adversaries are:

1. New curriculum developments and innovations
2. Increased federal and state involvement
3. Teacher militancy and negotiations.

I will not attempt to delineate the pros and cons of each of these developments. The literature is full of both. Each of us has his own ideas about the values involved. Therefore, rather than deal with this aspect, let us examine the effect that each development exerts on the principalship as we know it.

Certain of the new instruction and curriculum programs place the instructional leadership function in the hands of some staff member other than the principal. For instance, team teaching proposals often place the "master teacher" in the role of instructional leader of the structure. This individual now makes many administrative and leadership decisions that formerly belonged in the hands of the principal. Scheduling, materials selection and use, grouping, scope, sequence, and pacing no longer become the concern of the individual charged with the responsibility of instruction in the school. Undoubtedly the concept of "team" has room for the principal as a team member, but all too often the team is developed around the principal rather than with him or through him. When this is true, the principal has abdicated his instructional role.

Another threat brought about by recent curricular

innovations can be illustrated by the growth of special fields or concerns. It is considered important to establish a new remedial reading program in the school system. A system-wide director of remedial reading is employed and trained reading specialists are assigned to each school. The specialist is responsible to the director of remedial reading but her relationship to the principal is unclear or confused. Hence the principal feels little responsibility for the program and makes little effort to coordinate it with the regular curriculum of the school. It soon operates as a separate program with little or no influence on the total curriculum of the school. The same thing soon happens in guidance, mathematics, physical education and other areas of the total curriculum. Soon the overall program is fragmented and no real instructional leadership takes place. This is the problem of parallel administration.

Parallel administration is not new. We have experienced it often in the health, speech therapy, lunch, custodial and nursing programs of the schools. It has always been awkward but it has been tolerable because it left the basic program alone and this was the keystone of instructional leadership. Now this keystone is being affected and the threat is more than academic. It now becomes very real.

These are problems that can be solved. They do not represent insurmountable obstacles but they do demand new ways of organizing and operating. If we are aware of the problems and come to grips with them, we can find these new ways. If we ignore them, they will strip us of our role of instructional leadership.

Federal and state programs, too, are permeated with examples of parallel administration. The threat from this source is equally great with its Title I directors, Title III coordinators, Head Start supervisors, and community liaison workers. Again, this problem demands clarification of roles and responsibilities and development of new techniques and strategies for working on problems of common interests. Again, it represents a direct challenge to the leadership role.

But federal and state involvement has also posed another problem. Principals today are required by these programs to spend a disproportionate amount of time writing proposals, building budgets, completing report forms, conducting surveys, and evaluating program effectiveness. There are additional staff members to supervise and additional records to keep. These demands have not resulted in clerical and staff assistance. Rather they have been imposed on an already demanding time schedule and have caused the principal to either spend many free hours on the job or to curtail other activities important to his leadership role. If these programs are to continue and grow (and both possibilities seem likely), then the principal must receive the necessary time and assistance to

assume the new responsibilities without forfeiting the leadership functions that he currently performs.

The last and perhaps greatest threat to the leadership role of the principalship is that of the so-called "teacher militancy" movement. If, as some authorities maintain, professional negotiations and collective bargaining polarize education into two distinct camps of management and labor, then a threat to the dominion of the principal exists. He must be represented and have a voice in the bargaining process. Without this voice, his position can be damaged or destroyed by "labor" or "management" or both. His is the unenviable position of being in direct contact with both camps on an hour-in-hour-out basis. He is the one most consulted to define and interpret the position of one camp to the other. He is, in current practice, the one least likely to be consulted by either side when positions are fixed and, consequently, most likely to be uninformed about the position of either group. When grievance procedures are established, he is the person to whom most grievances will be addressed. Already principals are struggling in systems that have contractually usurped much of his authority. It is difficult to imagine exerting powerful leadership when one must receive the approval of a shop steward to hold a staff meeting. Under these conditions how can one innovate, develop or administer? The principal must have a firm voice in these matters. He must be heard if he is to survive. Procedures must be developed and initiated through legal channels lest the principal revert to clerk status.

These represent threats to the principalship. If the role is to survive, his problems must be faced squarely and with determination. The threats face us now, today. We cannot stand by passively and wish for the "good old days." We cannot rest on the progress we have made--for to remain static would bring regression to a status of decades past. There are those who would have us regress--but we must never compromise our status. There are those who would usurp our authority--but best educational practice demands we resist. There are those who remain apathetic--but a dynamic profession demands an involved membership. None of the threats are insolvable. All can be avoided with proper caution and action. But time will not wait. The time to act is now. Let us be about our professional business.

BIFOCALS

by

Phil Eskew

Elementary school principals, it seems to me, have the most important job in public schools. I know of no group of people who need more help and more understanding than the youngsters in the elementary school. Much of our future is going to depend on what you teach these children and what you get across to them in your elementary schools.

Several years ago I was superintendent of schools at Sullivan. The president of the school board was an eye doctor, and one day I was telling him about having trouble reading the new phone books with their fine print. He looked me over and decided that I needed a pair of bifocals. Well, I didn't like that, and I told him so. Why, they aren't even ground the same way. He explained, "The top part is ground so that you can see far enough to get a good perspective, and the bottom part is ground so that you can see a short enough distance to get a little application."

Now I have often thought that people see things from different viewpoints. Did you ever stop to think of the people that might see your problems a little bit different? You have 500, or 600, or 1,000 elementary youngsters. You have a group of girls teaching for you--some of them young, some of them old, some of them married, some not married, and some who would like to be married. You have a group of men. You have one curriculum all the way down. You have all kinds of subject matter. You have several hundred mama's--some of them nice, some good, some mean. You have a lot of taxpayers. There are many persons and they see elementary education from many different viewpoints. Now, I'm sure that you realize this if you've been in the school business very long. I am not so sure that each does not have some points of merit. They may not be very strong points, but they do have points.

On top of that you have all these children--some of them come to school happy and some of them come to school from homes that are not very happy; some of them have a little love and some of them have no love at home; and some of their parents are not at home. Some of them are disappointed with your school.

Let's get these bifocals out and look at this thing called

elementary education. Ben Franklin, who invented them, said that the purpose of the bifocals was to enable any man who had a lovely lady in his arms to see close enough to really get the full value of her beauty, yet far enough to see her husband if he was coming down the street.

First, let's clean off our bifocals. Did you ever see anybody wearing a pair of glasses who had just finished milking a cow? I can still see my mother--great splotches of milk all over her glasses. I see her looking sideways to get outside the barn door. Then she would take off her bifocals, pick up her apron and clear the smudges of milk from her glasses. Now, I think perhaps you and I, as educators, have a lot of unnecessary smudges on our glasses.

We have many problems, and sometimes--though they are relatively simple--we make them too complicated. Many of the instructions that we principals put out to the teachers and to the students may be quite complicated. They may be simple to the writer, but when read by someone else, they are not so clear. Sometimes I have found that rather than being complicated, they simply do not say what we intended them to say. Then we hear, "I don't understand." And this is an example of so many of our things that are so complicated and we have helped make them that way. This is one kind of splotch.

Another big splotch on our bifocals is misunderstanding. What principal has not had someone come to him because he did not understand what a situation was all about. One of our big problems, not only in your business but in mine, is communication--getting across to people what you mean. They misunderstand you. I imagine, if the truth were known, that we use this an an excuse much of the time too.

Another enormous smudge is right in the middle of many of our bifocals. And that smudge is prejudice and jealousy. When I was a boy, my father would be sitting by the fireplace on many cold winter nights. Suddenly he would rub his hands together and say, "Okay! Tonight is popcorn and apple night." The girls would get the long-handled wire basket and he'd send us two knobby-kneed boys to the cellar for apples. He would say, "Take the lantern and the apple basket and go to the cellar. Look over every barrel of apples very carefully, and if you see any apple that has a rotten speck in it, you bring it up and we'll eat it." We ate rotten apples all winter! Do you know <u>why</u> we ate rotten apples? Because that is what we were looking for!

It was this analogy the president of Chrysler Corporation made recently after he had been in Russia and Australia. He said that the first, last, and only question the Russian people asked was, "What in this world do you people in America mean by letting only a few dirty-necked long-hairs disturb the whole

country." He stated that it is hard for them to understand, and then he said, "I might add, it's hard for me to explain."

I think you people as elementary administrators can get part of this across to kids. America is a great country. If we could just get some of our prejudices and jealousies and throw them out the window, we would get these spots cleaned off our bifocals.

And then another! The first thing some of you want to do when something happens is to (in slang terms) "Blow your stack." You have teachers like that, I'm sure. The first thing they want to do is "blow their stacks;" they become very angry instead of looking clearly at the problem. I know one principal who has a couple of teachers who love to see him "blow his stack," and they needle him until he does. Let's clean our bifocals of the nervousness as well as misunderstandings, prejudices, and jealousies.

Now that we have them all cleaned off and we can see through them again, let us look at this problem of education. Let us look at the problems in our schools. We may have to move around and see them from different points of view. It may be that we cannot maintain the status quo. We may have to change things a little. (That is one of our troubles--we don't like to change.)

We will have to clean off our bifocals and get the jealousies, misunderstandings, prejudices, nervousness and anger cleaned off! Let's look at them from the point of view of the teacher, the taxpayer, the superintendent and the supervisor. And above all, let us not forget why we are having school. Our school is for those six, seven, eight hundred boys and girls who are enrolled. Let us see it from their point of view occasionally.

Let's move around and see it from everybody's point of view. If it needs changing, let's be big enough to change it. If we have problems, let's be big enough to sit down around a table, talk them over, and decide what is the best course of action; the best solution. And let us never forget that we are operating schools for the children.

BULLETINS IN THE FIELD OF EDUCATION
INDIANA UNIVERSITY

The Bulletin of the School of Education, Indiana University, was first published in 1924 and has appeared regularly since that time. A complete list of bulletins may be obtained from the School of Education upon request. The studies included in the present volume and in the two volumes immediately preceding it in date are listed below. Unless otherwise indicated, these may be obtained for $1.25 each from the Indiana University Bookstore, Bloomington, Indiana.

Volume 42 (1966)

1. Felker, Donald W., and Smith, Philip G., The Measurement of Philosophic-Mindedness on the Criterion of Flexibility, 138 pp.

2. Ashlock, Robert B., and Welch, Ronald C., A Test of Understandings of Selected Properties of a Number System: Primary Form, 74 pp.

3. Faris, K. Gene, and Moldstad, John A., Organizing a Program for Creating Instructional Materials, 52 pp.

4. Hughes, Otto, and Schooler, Virgil E., Student Activity Program in Indiana High Schools: The School Assembly Program, 52 pp.

5. Chambers, M. M., A Brief Bibliography of Higher Education in the Middle Nineteen Sixties, 52 pp.

6. Brinegar, Harold F., and Laymon, Ronald L., Functional Research in Elementary Student Teaching, 36 pp.

Volume 43 (1967)

1. Holmstedt, Raleigh W., The Indiana Conference of Higher Education, 1945-1965, 100 pp.

2. Lynch, William W., Instructional Objectives and the Mentally Retarded Child, 54 pp.

3. Chamberlain, Philip C., and Shilling, Roy B., Jr., Private Liberal Arts Colleges and Their Changing Purposes, 36 pp.

4. Shane, June Grant, Contemporary Thought, with Implications for Counseling and Guidance: A Bibliography, 106 pp.

5. Huddle, Donald D., editor, Urban Education: Four Aspects of the Problem, 38 pp.

6. Chamberlain, Philip C., and Strand, David A., The Role of Out-of-State Students in Public Higher Education, 36 pp.

Volume 44 (1968)

1. Rouse, Mary J., The Development of a Descriptive Scale for Art Products, 42 pp.

2. Reisert, John E., editor, The Principalship in Perspective, 50 pp.