

Educational Perspectives

Journal of the College of Education/University of Hawai'i at Mānoa

CONTENTS

Dean Randy Hitz

Editor Hunter McEwan
Managing Editor Marcia H Little

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION EDITORIAL BOARD

Linda Johnsrud, Associate Dean
Kathryn Au, Professor
Curtis Ho, Associate Professor
Mary Jo Noonan, Professor
Robert Potter, Professor Emeritus
Lynn Tabata, Graduate Student Organization President

The Journal and the College of Education assume no responsibility for the opinion or facts in signed articles, except to the extent of expressing the view, by the fact of publication, that the subject matter is one which merits attention.

Published twice each year by the College of Education, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa.

Subscription Rate: \$10 per year; individual copies \$5.

Address all communications regarding single copies, subscriptions, manuscripts and correspondence about editorial material to Editor, *Educational Perspectives*, College of Education, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, Wist Annex 2 Room 131, 1776 University Avenue, Honolulu HI 96822.

This publication is available in microform from Bell & Howell, 300 N Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106.

International Standard Serial Number (ISSN) 0013-1849.

2 Editorial
Hunter McEwan

3 The College of Education in the Sixties
Robert E Potter, Ralph K Stueber and Andrew W S In

12 Two Progressives: Profiles of Robert Walter Clopton and Hubert Victor Everly
Robert E Potter and Ralph Williams

19 The Shaping of the Curriculum Research & Development Group and Its Laboratory School: A Response to Events of the 1960s
Arthur R King Jr

25 Educational Perspectives: The First Ten Years
Hunter McEwan

30 The "Stiles Report" and What it Recommended
Ralph Williams

Cover Photograph: Wist Hall, College of Education, 1932

The College of Education in the Sixties
Volume 33 ■ Number 2, Fall 2000

Editorial

Hunter McEwan



College of Education in 1965 with Wist Annex under construction. The foreground shows Building 3 of the Laboratory School (completed in 1957) and the roof of the Multipurpose building (completed in 1963) at the bottom. Building 1 (1943) and Building 2 (1948) are at the bottom left.

This issue of *Educational Perspectives* takes the Sixties as its subject: a period which has had a huge and continuing impact on the College.

In composing these articles, the early issues of *Educational Perspectives* have been an invaluable resource. But we have also profited immensely from the recollections of faculty, most of whom are now retired, who were active in the College during this critical decade and who helped shape the events that the articles describe.

The editor is especially grateful to the following people for sharing their memories and stories and helping to uncover information: Andrew In, Ann Keppel, Art Wong, Alma Cirino, Victor Kobayashi, Geoffrey Kucera, Yoshimitsu Takei, Don Leton, Walt Wittich, Hubert Everly, Loretta Krause, Fred Bail, Gayle Peiler, Aiko Oda, Peter Dunn-Rankin, Iris Miyamura and Susan Omori. We also wish to thank Warren Nishimoto and the University of Hawai'i's Center for Oral History for generously providing access to their records. The profile of Hubert Everly, especially, drew heavily on interview transcripts from the Center.

Inevitably, the articles present a particular viewpoint and highlight the work of a few rather than the many people

who were involved. Important personalities are treated much more briefly than their efforts deserve. We apologize for these "missing pages."

The full story of this period remains to be told. It is part of an even bigger narrative that traces the shaping role that progressive education ideas have played in the history of the College and in Hawai'i: a topic that calls out for a more thorough, historical treatment.

The first article in this issue describes the three main trends in the College during the Sixties and assesses their impact. The second article profiles the careers of Hubert Victor Everly and Robert Walter Clopton, who both contributed greatly to the work and prestige of the College from the 40s through the 70s. In the third article, Art King takes a personal look at the beginning of the Curriculum Research and Development Group and identifies the factors that have contributed to its success and longevity as an institution. For my own contribution, I have drawn on the early articles of *Educational Perspectives* to present a portrait of the early years of the journal. The final article by Ralph Williams is a summary of the Stiles Report, which, more than any other, helped to redirect the College's mission and goals in the 60s.

The College of Education in the Sixties

Robert E Potter, Ralph K Stueber and Andrew W S In

In April 2001, the College of Education will celebrate its 70th anniversary. During its seven decades of existence, the College has undergone many changes in its structure as programs have come and gone and as a number of sometimes radical organizational changes have occurred. No period, however, has been so critical to the evolution of the College as the 1960s. The institutional structures that are familiar to us today such as the departmental structure, the undergraduate program and the administrative arrangements in the Dean's Office with its division of functions among the Dean, Associate Dean, Assistant Dean of Student Services and Director of Finance took on their present form in that period. The Sixties also saw the birth of several important units of the College. Some, like the various departments and the Curriculum Research and Development Group, are still with us. Others, like the Educational Research and Development Center (EDRAD), and the Division of Field Services have disappeared from view, though their traces are still evident in other units and programs.

The Sixties were, of course, a period of major growth in higher education throughout the nation, and benefiting from this climate of expansion, the College of Education thrived and emerged transformed with a new organizational structure and a correspondingly diverse set of institutional aims and functions. These changes were parallel to reforms at the national level, and though they fell somewhat behind developments in other states, they represented a period of catching up with the mainland. The mood of the College in the Sixties, and in the University as a whole, was inspired with a growing sense of optimism about its future role in the Pacific. The College was beginning to adopt a greater role as a research institution with added responsibilities for international education and curriculum design. In addition to its traditional role in the preparation of teachers, a new emphasis was placed on graduate education, on the preparation of administrators and other educational professionals, as well as on the professional development of qualified teachers. A large expansion in the number of faculty, particularly with doctoral degrees, accompanied these changes.

The Sixties, therefore, may be viewed as a critical stage in the evolution of the College as an institution. It was a period that has been referred to as a "Golden Age" for the University (Alm, 1962), which was emerging as a major research institution with a redefined sense of purpose and direction.

Hawai'i had only recently achieved statehood and new voices in state government were demanding new solutions to educational problems. They looked to educational research to find answers.

The early Sixties also saw a burgeoning growth in Federal and State funding for higher education, and money came pouring into the College to support international projects, educational research and curriculum development. Thomas Hale Hamilton, arguably the University's greatest president, was charting a new course for the university. There was a building boom on campus with the construction of more than 14 buildings including Hamilton Library, Kuykendall Hall, and the Hawai'i Institute of Geophysics Building. The East-West Center was also under construction. A more modest program of building and expansion was evident in the College with the Lab School's Multi-Purpose Building completed in 1963, and the new Wist Annex 2 added in 1966. How did these forces, both external and internal, contribute to the restructuring and redirection of the College of Education? What were the models for these changes? In many ways the College was simply catching up with developments that were already well underway at comparable institutions on the mainland. Nevertheless, the uniqueness of the situation in Hawai'i was also a factor, and changes here may also be seen as a response to local circumstances as well as national ones.

College Reorganization

Departmentalization

The diversification of College functions is most evident in the transformation of the organizational structure of the College in the ten-year period between 1956 and 1966.

When Hubert Everly took over from Bruce White as College Dean in 1956, the College was simply organized around the university education department and the lab schools' teacher preparation programs. The College's education department was chaired by Robert Clopton. Roseamonde Porter served as director of the Division of Elementary Education and Robert Martin was Director of the Division of Secondary Programs.

When the Territorial Normal School merged with the University in 1931, with Benjamin Wist as Dean, the new unit became known as "Teachers' College," which it remained until 1959. It was President Snyder who suggested that since

the College was producing more than teachers, the name really ought to be changed to “College of Education” to reflect its more expanded role. The College was also beginning to organize into distinct units ordered into departments — a move that reflected the mainland trend of increasing departmentalization around distinct areas of specialization.

The role of Dean, at this time, was more limited than it is now and focused on the management of finances and the administration of the lab schools. Bruce White, for example, performed his administrative duties as Dean from an office, symbolically remote, in Bachman Hall.

Hubert Everly (1946) describes these administrative arrangements as follows:

The University of Hawai'i has a somewhat unique organization in the fact that departments are university-wide in scope and are entirely separate from colleges which, under this system, have no instructional staff... A college consists of a dean, curricula, and students; a department consists of a chairman, faculty, and courses... This organization separates the education department from Teachers College... The Dean of Teachers College is responsible for the administrative and curriculum aspects of the laboratory schools... On the other hand, the instructional personnel of the laboratory schools are members of the education department and therefore come under the supervision of the chairman of the education department... Furthermore, practice teaching as such is an education course and is therefore the responsibility of the chairman of the department (pp 187,188).

This situation was to change dramatically as the job of the dean became more complex. President Snyder, too, favored the idea of a “strong dean” with expanded powers, which would include control over personnel. In addition, the responsibilities of the Dean were also changing. The Dean was increasingly required to work in close association with the State Department of Public Instruction and maintain a good relationship with the legislature.

The first major change came in 1962 as part of a broad campus reorganization. As stated above, the demands placed on the Dean's office had grown considerably with the expansion of College programs. In addition, the Dean was compelled to work in the political arena with an often fractious legislature.

A new position of Assistant Dean was created in 1960, with Otto Beyers appointed to the post, largely to handle the College's finances and deal with internal administrative affairs; thus freeing the Dean to work on external relations.

Beyers' position was upgraded to Associate Dean in 1961. It was not until the late 70s, that the financial management of the College was transferred to a Director of Finances and the Associate Dean's position split between the Associate Dean for Curriculum and the Associate Dean for Research.

Fred Haehnlen was appointed as the new Director of Student Services in 1962. This came about as a result of Hubert Everly's move to gain control over College freshman admissions, rather than leaving things up to the unified admissions' procedures of the Colleges of Arts and Sciences.

In 1962, with his administrative team in place, Hubert Everly created six new departments. The Divisions of Secondary Education and Elementary Education became departments, with Andrew In as chair of the former and Roseamonde Porter as chair of the latter. In addition, three new departments were created out of the Department of Education. Robert Clopton became chair of the Department of History and Philosophy of Education; John Crossley chaired the new Department of Educational Administration; and Gil Sax took over as chair of Educational Psychology. Health and Physical Education (HPE) joined the College by a novel route—as a result of the reorganization of the College of Applied Sciences, where it was originally located. Applied Sciences was in the process of splitting into three separate units: the College of Engineering, Tropical Agriculture and Home Economics. HPE had the option of joining one of these units, but faculty elected instead to join the College of Education.

In 1965-66, the Department of Curriculum and Instruction (C&I) and the Division of Field Services were formed as a result of the amalgamation of the Secondary and Elementary Education Departments. Those with doctorates were assigned to C&I; those without, to Field Services. This was largely a move designed to satisfy the Graduate School which was pressing the College to ensure that faculty possessed doctoral degrees. Pressure from the education profession, especially public school principals and administrators, who were canvassing for a doctoral program, also played a key role in bringing about these changes. The moves were sanctified, rather than initiated, by the Stiles Report (1966). Not surprisingly, there was some bitterness among the faculty toward this move. Seven non-doctoral faculty were affected. They were assigned to take over responsibility for the supervision of students' field experiences, such as “Observation/Participation” and student teaching. They ironically labeled themselves “the field hands,” a measure of their resentment at the imposed changes. Andrew In was the first chair of C&I, and he was followed by Dick Alm in 1967. Torlef Nelson was the first Director of the Division of Field Services.

The responsibilities of the Field Services faculty grew quickly. By 1969, 586 students were engaged in the field and

plans were in place to build the numbers to 1,000 by 1972. In addition to supervising student teachers, Field Service faculty were responsible for the College's role in the Beginning Teacher Development Program (BTDP). This program also came into existence as a result of the Stiles Report which had recommended that the 5th year internship should be abolished. In its place, Stiles suggested that the University and the Department of Education jointly develop a program to provide "supervisory help on a noncredit basis to new public school teachers" (Yamashita, 1969, p 15). The Division of Field Services and the DOE Personnel Department started planning in April 1966 with statewide implementation occurring in September of the same year.

In 1968-69 there were 656 beginning teachers in the State of Hawai'i, 507 of whom were enrolled in the BTDP. Of this total, 56% were from Hawai'i, while the rest came from 44 mainland states, Canada, the Philippines, and Fiji.

By 1966, the College had taken on a departmental look similar to the one it has today, and faculty were increasingly taking on expanded responsibilities including teaching courses in one of several graduate programs as well as the undergraduate or "regular" program.

Program Changes

The "regular" teacher education or BEd program came into existence as a result of two studies directed to reforming the College's undergraduate program.

The first effort began in 1960 with a Ford Foundation funded experiment. Project A, as it was referred to, was designed to demonstrate the feasibility of a program of teacher education with a reduced and modified professional education core and with a correspondingly increased concentration in liberal arts courses.

The second study, *Preparation of Teachers and Other Educational Personnel in Hawai'i*, which came to be known as the "Stiles Report" after its Chairman, Lindley Stiles, Dean of the School of Education at the University of Wisconsin, was authorized by the Third Legislature in 1965. Like the Ford Project before it, Stiles operated on the assumption that "teacher education is too important to be left solely to the educators" (p 3). The Stiles Report is often portrayed as a decisive event that helped to bring about reforms that propelled the College forwards. In reality, it was a catalyst that hastened reforms and conferred legitimacy on changes that were already underway.

In the fall of 1965, following the graduation in June of the first generation of students of Project A, Hubert Everly submitted a proposed set of guidelines for combining both the experimental and established College teacher education programs. As a result, on January 13, 1966, just 4 days prior to publication of the Stiles Report, the College Senate

recommended that the program in teacher education should make full use of the freshman and sophomore years to establish a general education base, require academic majors for all prospective teachers, provide a professional sequence of educational coursework and a student teaching period, and provide a 5th year of study embodying an internship and coursework. Thus, changes were already in the pipeline. In effect, the faculty had seen the writing on the wall and had taken steps to make the necessary accommodations, rather than have changes forced upon them.

Change was a necessary concession to mounting discontent with the self-contained, teacher education program. Not only did Project A demonstrate the feasibility of a more liberal arts approach, but the trend, nationally, was in the direction of the kinds of reforms that Stiles recommended. To make matters more urgent, alternative programs such as Teacher Corps were establishing a toehold in Hawai'i. Teacher Corps was a federally funded program designed to recruit college graduates outside of the field of education to work in schools in low-income areas. It was started in 1966 and reflected a strong belief among some members of Congress that teacher education institutions were failing to prepare students for "disadvantaged" students. Clearly, the College had to act to satisfy its critics.

The proposed changes to the "regular" program also helped bring the College into closer compliance with national standards. Indeed, as In (1969) reports, the "regular" program compared favorably with the American Council for Colleges of Teacher Education standards in both general core requirements and in professional studies.

The Honolulu Project

The Honolulu Project represented an early attempt to create a field-centered alternative to the College's "regular" program: a precursor, in a sense, to the teacher education reforms that took place in the 90s, such as the Master of Education in Teaching Program and Elementary Cohort Program. The Honolulu Project was designed to provide more diversity in the College's teacher education models, relate theory more closely to practice in the first year of the program, and further cooperation and coordination among the various departments and divisions of the College. In effect, it establishes "a program that would cut across department lines" (Fruehling, 1973, p 3). The Project began accepting students in fall 1969. Each student was assigned to one of three public elementary schools (Pauoa, Ala Wai, and Ali'iolani) in groups of 35. Later, two more schools were added (Fern and Kalihi Kai). In the first year, the program catered to 105 junior year O/P students. They were supported by 65 participating teachers and three faculty from the college. The program, unfortunately, ended in 1975.

Teachers were no longer willing to accept large numbers of students at their schools; and students, struggling with the prospect of unemployment in a period of oversupply of teachers, grew increasingly reluctant to make the financial sacrifices required to devote large amounts of time to field work.

The Laboratory Schools and the Curriculum Development Center

The Sixties also brought major changes to the College's lab schools. As early as 1960 the Division of Secondary Education and the Division of Elementary Education were placing the majority of their student teachers in Department of Education (DOE) schools because the University High School could not accommodate all the students during their student teaching semester. Indeed, most of the College programs—the Ford Program, the Alternative Teacher Education Program and the Honolulu Project all involved placement in the public schools. Thus, the lab school required a new rationale to justify its existence. The happy coincidence of Title III funds for the state from the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), the recommendations of the Stiles Report, and the presence of a theoretical framework and trained faculty made it possible to re-conceptualize the lab schools as Stiles had recommended, as sites for the development of curriculum.

Teacher Shortages

Another factor that forced changes in the College was the shortage of teachers in critical areas such as Special Education. Qualified staff were also needed to teach in the new community colleges. The College responded with two new programs funded by grants from the Educational Professions Development Act (EPDA) of 1969. First, the faculty established a “fast track” project designed to meet the critical shortage of special education teachers in the state. It was estimated that in 1969, there were 18,522 students in Hawai'i with special needs and only 4,457 being served. One thousand, two hundred and fifty-six personnel were needed and only 501 employed. EPDA funds supported a “bare bones” approach designed to meet the critical needs of the DOE for special education teachers. Graduates received Class II provisional certification on the understanding that they would continue on their own to complete the necessary coursework to obtain full, Class III certification.

The EPDA also funded a joint program between the Department of Curriculum and Instruction and the Community Colleges for the preparation of community college teachers. The creation of the first Hawaii community colleges had been authorized by the 1964 legislature. In July 1965, the four state-owned technical schools became the first four community colleges (Hawai'i CC, Kapiolani CC, Kaua'i

CC, and Maui CC). Leeward CC opened in the fall of 1968 and the Hawaii Technical School in 1969. In the span of 5 years these colleges had doubled and in some cases even tripled their enrollments. The College program began with ten, two-year fellowships that required a combination of study in various fields of specialization such as history, English, special education, field studies and education courses.

Later Departmental Developments

The Departments of Educational Communications and Technology (now Educational Technology), Special Education and Counseling and Guidance were more recent creations. Initially, programs and faculty in these areas of specialization were housed in the Educational Psychology department. Educational Psychology had come into existence with the departmental reforms of 1962. The Department had undergone considerable growth, especially with the influx of Center for Education Research and Development (EDRAD) researchers who held tenure in Educational Psychology, but also through the growth of new professional programs to prepare special education teachers and school counselors. Thus, although it appeared to be a single department, faculty groups within it were organized around four different areas and programs with degrees in educational psychology and certificates in special education, counseling and guidance, and educational technology. These internal divisions within Educational Psychology formed the seed from which the next group of departments were to emerge.

The Department of Educational Communications (renamed Communications and Technology in 1975 and Educational Technology in 1986) was the first to split off from its “parent” under the leadership of Walter A Wittich who had come to the University of Hawai'i after twenty years as Director of the Bureau of Audio-Visual Education at the University of Wisconsin. Wittich was appointed Director of the Communications Center in 1962 which was influential in developing Educational TV in Hawai'i. The Center, created in 1965, formed the basic unit for the new department.

On July 1, 1975, the graduate field of Educational Psychology was split into three separate units: Educational Psychology, Special Education, and Counseling and Guidance. Dean Everly argued that this action would make for more efficient administration of missions and programs and lead to a higher degree of student welfare and faculty morale. Three new chairs were appointed by Hilmer Frank, Dean of Graduate Division and Research Administration. Educational Psychology (Learning, Measurement, and Research Methods) was chaired by Peter Dunn-Rankin;

Special Education by James Apfel and Counseling and Guidance by John Michel. Special Education had received Board of Regents approval for its establishment on November 24, 1970, to become effective on January 1, 1971. However, the University was not free to approve these changes alone. Due to Department of Budget and Finance rules and delays in obtaining final approval from the Governor's office, the Department did not achieve official recognition until 1975. The changes also prompted Graduate Division to take a long, hard look at the proposals for dividing Educational Psychology into three departments, and they placed a moratorium on admissions to the PhD program, pending a review and assessment of Educational Psychology's ability to maintain the doctoral program, which had received initial approval in January, 1966.

During the Sixties, the College also set up programs in vocational education, agriculture and home economics. The Industrial Arts Program was started in the early 70s with courses in carpentry and metal work conducted in the University High School workshops. Later, in the 80s, this evolved into a cooperative program with Honolulu Community College. The Music Department, which grew out of the program directed by Dorothy Kahananui of the Normal School, and chaired by Norm Rian, got its beginning as a program in the College though it was subsequently transferred to the College of Arts and Sciences.

Expansion of Educational Research

The Sixties saw a huge increase in federal support for educational research, which grew from \$2 million in 1962 to \$100 million in 1966. The trend towards research in colleges of education grew with the passage of PL 83-531 (Stiles, 1966). Universities began to organize research centers or "bureaus of research" headed by research specialists responsible for the administration of all research activities conducted by the faculty. This agenda lay behind the creation of the EDRAD in the College of Education. Initially, the United States Office of Education was given authority and funding to support the creation of such centers of educational research and development. This largesse provided for the rapid growth of research and the redirection of faculty energy towards research and educational innovation. As Ralph Tyler commented at the time: "Constructive innovation is not only essential to do better the educational job with which we have long been concerned; it is imperative to enable us to accomplish the new tasks which we now confront" (1966, p 24).

From Bureau of Research to Educational Research and Development Center

In 1963, the second state legislature provided funds for establishing a "Bureau of Research" at the College of

Education at the University of Hawai'i. Otto Beyers, Assistant Dean of the College, invited Don Leton to serve as the Director for the Research Bureau.

Leton had recently been appointed to a faculty position in Educational Psychology. He considered the offer briefly, but declined. He preferred, instead, to continue in an academic-research appointment. He did, however, agree to serve as Acting Director until the College could recruit and appoint a full-time Director with research administration qualifications. Leton recommended that the "Bureau" should be called the Education Research Center, and Beyers agreed. One of the Acting Director's first tasks was to set up an advisory committee with members from each Department. The purpose of the committee was to discuss the role and function of a Research Center in the College, for basic and applied research. Inevitably, several competing visions surfaced regarding the role and function of the Center. Some of the committee members felt that it should be entirely independent of the departments; others felt that it should provide direct services to departmental faculty. For example, several faculty suggested that the Center should perform library research and reference services for studies on the efficacy of curricula, for individual faculty.

During the Spring semester of 1964, David Ryans was recruited and offered the Directorship of the Center. Ryans was Human Factor Senior Scientist and Head of the Center for Research and Project Development with the Systems Development Corporation. He was author of numerous articles and his 1960 research study, *Characteristics of Teachers: Their Description, Comparison and Appraisal* was regarded as a classic in the field. He immediately discontinued the advisory committee and renamed the Center as the Center for Education Research and Development. He also extended the purpose of the Center beyond its basic and applied research functions to include evaluation studies and projects of educational development.

The philosophy of the Center was motivated by the belief that research was fundamental to the effective functioning of educational agencies (Ryans, 1966). The general objectives of the Center included a broad range of research work such as field testing instructional strategies and curricula, investigation of human learning, growth and development, design of educational systems and explanation of educational theories and practices. It was also intended that the Center should maintain a close working relationship with the school system, particularly the University laboratory schools, which would offer a "specialized environment with maximum flexibility and availability for 'first trials' and demonstrations."

David Ryans set about the task of creating a first class research center by recruiting some internationally renowned researchers. Dorothy Adkins, who had come to the College

as a visiting professor in 1964, was a noted psychometrician and chairperson of the psychology department at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. She was the first female editor of *Psychometrika*, had served as President of the Psychometric Society and President of the Evaluation and Measurement Division of the American Psychological Association. Her book, *Test Construction*, was a highly-regarded text on the subject of psychometrics. Peter Dunn-Rankin, from Florida State University, joined the faculty in 1964, contributing an expertise in research statistics and methodology. Gil Sax, who was chairman of the Educational Psychology Department, and other College faculty such as Art King, Agnes Niyekawa, and Bob Fuchigami were appointed as affiliates of the Center.

In 1968, EDRAD expanded its faculty to include a number of new researchers including Fred Bail, J Michael O'Malley and T Antionette Ryan. A number of others, such as Vidya Bushan, Bonnie Bailiff and Frank D Payne joined the Center for shorter terms of one or two years.

EDRAD was responsible for a number of important research projects during its eight years of operation. It also brought a considerable amount of extramural funding into the College.

When David Ryans came to Hawai'i, he was in the process of concluding the Teacher Characteristics Study for the Grant Foundation. In 1964, the State Legislature passed a resolution for the College to conduct a study to evaluate the Spalding Method of Teaching Reading, which provided the initial budget for the Center. Most research and development projects, however, were funded by Federal grants. Research faculty members in EDRAD were also consulted on the statistical analyses of various project data. For example, Dorothy Adkins worked on early childhood development research; Agnes Niyekawa, on bilingualism and psycholinguistic studies; Antoinette Ryan, on career development and on a study of women's prisons; Frank Payne, on values scaling and Vidya Bhushan, on educational correlation studies of student achievement, ability levels and readiness.

EDRAD faculty frequently consulted with various faculty in the College and other University Departments on research and evaluation studies, such as the DOE's 3-on-2 project, in which three teachers served two primary classes in one large classroom. They conducted evaluations of Title I programs, the Model Cities project, several testing and measurement projects in Samoa, the Micronesia teacher evaluation project, a Community College of Micronesia National Science Foundation project, and a Hawai'i DOE values education program. EDRAD also played a leading role in a number of College reforms, including the Stiles Report, which had a significant impact on the direction and organization of the College.

Unfortunately, the good times were not to last. In 1971-72, EDRAD came under scrutiny from the legislature. It was a period of state government cutbacks and an austerity mentality prevailed. In spite of a favorable report by a College advisory council, and with apparent indifference to the external funding that the Center attracted to the College and University, pressure built quickly to close the Center. Finally, during the Spring semester of 1972, the legislature cut funding completely and the Center's existence came abruptly to an end.

Other Research Developments in the College

During the Sixties, innovations in the field of curriculum were viewed as particularly important work for colleges of education to undertake (Tyler, 1966, p 26). This was especially the case in mathematics, science, foreign languages, English and some of the social studies (Tyler, 1966, p 26). The focus on curriculum development and the availability of Title III funds from the 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act, led to the creation of the Hawaii Curriculum Center (later the Curriculum Research and Development Group) which began operations in 1966.

These developments, at the national and state level, placed pressure on the College to crack the whip on research. However, the changes did not occur without pain: they produced a considerable upheaval among the faculty and displaced many people, especially women without doctorates, who had been brought up in the normal school tradition. Clinical faculty were rehoused in non-research divisions and efforts were made to recruit new research-oriented faculty from prestigious graduate schools on the mainland. The University of Wisconsin at Madison, where Stiles was Dean, provided several faculty new to Hawai'i (Anne Keppel, Ralph Stueber, Walt Wittich). Ohio State University, Hubert Everly's alma mater, was also a favored institution, especially among several faculty who had begun their careers in the Normal school (Teruo Ihara, Daniel Noda and Morris Pang). The presence of faculty who were trained researchers produced a new atmosphere in the College that led to changes in its academic culture and to the redistribution of faculty duties and alterations in personnel procedures. Pressure also built to bring about changes in programs, especially in the development of new graduate level degrees to complement the work of the new departments. Initial planning for the PhD in Educational Psychology (approved in 1966) and, the College EdD Program (approved in 1972), were made in this period.

Growth of International Programs

The Federal government played an important role in channelling resources to various international programs

during the Sixties, and this had the effect of redirecting the efforts of the College from its traditional role in teacher preparation to a more expanded role that recruited College faculty to take part in teacher education and vocational programs in other countries.

Foreign Contracts

Hubert Everly (1968) observed that it might seem strange for a state university to devote resources to “educational problems beyond the boundaries of its tax paying constituency” (p 2). Nevertheless, the College was, by this time, deeply involved in a number of educational development contracts in Micronesia, American Samoa, and Asia. An Office of Foreign Contracts was established by executive order of Dean Everly in the fall of 1965 and placed under the Directorship of Teruo Ihara.

Three major Asian contracts operated throughout the Sixties with the direct involvement of College faculty. The Pakistan Contract ran from 1961 to 1968, the Thailand Contract from 1958 to 1965, and the Laos Contract from 1965 to 1968. Each was supported by federal funds from the United States Agency for International Development (USAID). These new initiatives arose from President Kennedy’s “new foreign aid proposals and the actions which he and Secretary of State Dean Rusk have taken to elevate and accent the role of education and cultural affairs as a component of US foreign policy” (Coombs, 1962, p 3). The Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 aimed to foster economic development, encourage the growth of democratic institutions, and counter the growth of communism in SE Asia. Philip Coombs (1962), the Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs in the Kennedy administration, reported that, in 1962, United States institutions of higher learning were hosting 53,000 foreign students from almost every country in the world. He spoke of “advancing a new frontier” and pointed to the increasing demand for overseas activities that would “draw heavily” on the talent of colleges and universities (p 3).

Each of the College contracts was established as a tripartite agreement between the USAID, the University of Hawai’i, and the respective governments of the countries receiving aid. The College contract was led by a “Party Chief” who was responsible for the general oversight of the College’s contribution and a number of College faculty (the Thailand Contract, for example, made use of 11 faculty over the 6 years) who were able to lend their expertise in relevant areas of specialization. In general, the aim of each contract was designed to address the shortages of skilled labor in each of these countries by creating vocational schools, retraining personnel, developing curriculum, and procuring equipment. In addition to these programs, the College’s Office of Foreign

Contracts was also responsible for three training programs in Micronesia: one focusing on teacher training, one on administrator training, and the other on communication skills (TESL). These programs were supported by funds from the US Department of the Interior. The College also contracted with the government of American Samoa to provide upper division course work to prepare Samoan teachers beyond the associate of arts level.

The Department of Educational Administration provided training for international students in educational leadership. The program, developed in cooperation with the East-West Center, was established in 1967 with a contract to train eight Micronesian elementary school teachers in educational administration. By 1968 it had expanded to eighteen teachers. Trainees visited a number of schools on O’ahu and Neighbor Islands and engaged in seminars and field studies.

The East-West Center

The East-West Center (EWC) was a powerful engine for growth in the College. Ground breaking for the Center took place in May 1961. By 1964, as many as one-fifth (20) of all the senior specialists who had come to the EWC and more than 200 students were there to study education (Ezer, 1965). The Institute for Student Interchange, one of the three institutes of the EWC, had a particularly big impact on the College, and Dr Dai Ho Chun, Director of the Institute, played a key role in guiding many of the grantees to College courses and to field observations in the lab schools. Large numbers of Asian students pursued studies in the field of education — with a significant portion pursuing their studies in TESL (Hendrickson, 1965).

As of June 1964, ninety-four teachers had come to the EWC to pursue degrees in education, advance their knowledge of teaching English as a second language, and participate in the Academic Year Institute—a one-year, non-degree program for Asian secondary school teachers of math and science. Thirty-six grantees had been awarded degrees in TESL and twenty-six in either secondary or elementary education.

The second of the EWC education programs, the Institute for Technical Exchange, sponsored short-term, non-degree programs in technical development and was directly involved with “the retraining of Asian teachers of English in spoken English.” The program enrolled teachers, especially from Japan, who had been educated under the “old grammar translation method,” in new techniques that emphasized spoken English and language use.

As the word “interchange” implies, not all EWC grantees came from Asia. In 1963-64, 18 Americans and 18 Asians (from Japan, Taiwan, Korea, and Indonesia) participated in the program. While the Asian students focused on methods

of improving the teaching of English and learning about contemporary American society, the Americans took courses in Asian studies and explored the language, history, sociology, and economics of Asia. They also attended joint seminars on comparative education in the first semester and one on American studies in the second. The culminating event was a trip to the mainland for the Asian grantees and a similar tour of Japan for the Americans.

The Senior Specialists' Program of the Institute of Advanced Projects provided awards to professionals in Asian and American institutions of higher learning and government agencies to pursue individual research interests with the "goal of promoting mutual understanding and the betterment of mankind through the further development of an international community of scholars." From February 1961 through May 1965, a total of 108 individuals had been residents at the Center—a little over 60 from Asian and Pacific states and the remainder from the US. Twenty of the Senior Specialists were pursuing research in the field of education, including Robert Clopton, whose research focused on translating Dewey's lectures from Chinese transcripts—the original lecture notes having been lost.

Educational Television

Educational television (ETV) also had a large impact on the College during the Sixties. Interestingly, the claims made at the time about the potential of ETV as a teaching tool appear to mirror current ambitions for the transformative educational influence of the Internet.

Federal and State funding earmarked \$1,283,038.00 to give Hawai'i's children "some of the most remarkable educational advantages of the electronic age" (Wall, 1964, p 3). The expansion of educational opportunities made possible by ETV was geared to meet the needs of rural and urban students during a period of rapid expansion of the school and university population.

Public schools that served the 145,234 youngsters in 1960 are expected to serve 171,410 in 1970. The University of Hawai'i, with an enrollment of 9,300 in 1960, looks towards an enrollment of 18,000 in 1970 (Wall, p 3).

The plan was to build, in three stages, a broadcasting station on the UH campus with rebroadcast facilities on the Neighbor Islands. The program called for a system that would provide an ETV receiver to three or four elementary schools and at least one for each secondary school. Fifteen production and transmission staff would be hired in the first year, growing to 23 in the second, as the system expanded. Eight in-school teaching and utilization staff would also be hired. President Hamilton praised ETV as one of the "most effective and efficient methods through which the resources of the university can be extended to the people of the state"

(Wall, p 4). A similar project was underway in American Samoa.

Vernon Bronson (1964), Director of Research and Development at the National Association of Educational Broadcasters, declared that "the use of television offered the best hope for rapid educational development in American Samoa" where considerable efforts were under way to build the necessary substructure. The aim was to "(1) improve instruction, (2) enlarge educational opportunities for all Samoan people, and (3) to upgrade the Samoan teachers in the schools and assist them in becoming qualified and competent in their special areas of education" (p 6).

By December 1964, a Closed-Circuit TV system had recently been completed in the College and was housed in the multipurpose building on its makai side. Composed of two control rooms and a backstage area with a small television broadcast studio and control complex, the CCTV system was to be used for five major purposes:

- (1) research and experimentation in ETV;
- (2) direct observation of classroom activities in the laboratory school;
- (3) instruction in the use of educational television;
- (4) supplementary instruction in certain college classes and
- (5) recording of certain descriptive television programs reporting on current educational activities to the public (Everly, 1964, p 14).

Within the College of Education the potential of television was being explored by a growing number of faculty. CCTV system was used: "primarily by the Department of Educational Communications," (Kucera, 1968, p). Increasingly, faculty from other departments were beginning to make use of the facility in ways that permitted them to explore the medium for learner research and classroom observation and direct teaching of small units (Anthony Picard, for example, had produced a series of short programs to illustrate how to teach certain mathematical concepts). The facility was also used for micro-teaching: recordings of "scaled down teaching encounters" that were played back to student teachers for critical reflection on their performance. In addition, the potential for using recordings for direct instruction was also being tried out and tested. Thelma McIntosh, produced a series of 24 instructional films for the Foundation course in Educational Psychology.

Public television came to Hawai'i in 1966 with KHET beginning to broadcast in April and KMEB in September. By 1968 it was thriving and capable of reaching about 90% of the state's residents. The Hawaii Educational Television Network was a cooperative service of the University of Hawai'i and the state Department of Education that operated under the broad policy guidelines of a Council composed of the university president, DOE superintendent, and a repre-

sentative of the public appointed by the governor (Reed, 1968). Housed in temporary quarters in the College, (the CCTV studio in the rear of the multipurpose building) public television, as it had come to be known, provided in-school instruction for students from 8:30 to 2:30, and teacher inservice training between 2:30 and 5:00. Various cultural and public information programs were also offered for adults and children from 6:00 to 10:00. In its two first years, the use of television in Hawai'i was double that of the mainland, though teacher participation for the purposes of inservice training was disappointingly small.

Conclusion

The transformation of the College in the Sixties, viewed under the three headings above, represents from the perspective of the present day, a profound shift in thinking and a thorough reconsideration of the College's mission and role. It is the period in which the present era of the College was born and in which it still lives.

Endnotes

- Alm, Richard S. (1962) "Not so Wild A Dream." *Educational Perspectives*, Vol 1,#3, p 3.
- Bronson, Vernon. (1964). "Educational Television in the United States." *Educational Perspectives*, Vol 3, #4, pp 5-6, 20.
- Coombs, Philip H. (1962). "Education and World Affairs in the Sixties." *Educational Perspectives*, Vol 1,#2, pp 2-3.
- Everly, Hubert V. (1946). *Criteria for Evaluating and Developing Laboratory School Programs, with Special Reference to the Campus Secondary School of the University of Hawaii*. Doctoral Dissertation. The Ohio State University.
- Everly, Hubert V. (1968). "Editorial." *Educational Perspectives*, Vol 7, #4, p 2.
- Everly, Hubert V. (1964). "ETV in the College of Education." *Educational Perspectives*, Vol 3, #4, pp 14-15.
- Ezer, Mel. (1965). "The East-West Center and Education." *Educational Perspectives*, Vol 4, #1, p 2.
- Hendrickson, John (1965). "The Institute for Student Interchange." *Educational Perspectives*, Vol 4, #1, pp 3-4.
- In, Andrew S. (1969). The Colleges "Regular" Program. *Educational Perspectives*, Vol 8, #4, pp 2-7.
- Kucera, Geoffrey. (1968). TV in Teacher Training: It Works at the University of Hawaii." *Educational Perspectives*, Vol 7, #3, pp 28-31.
- Martin, Robert M. (1962). "The College of Education Abroad." *Educational Perspectives*, Vol 1,#2, pp 7-10.
- Mink, Patsy T. (1967). "The Need for Grassroots Implementation in Educational Research." *Educational Perspectives*, Vol 6,#3, pp 3-5.
- Reed, Robert. (1968). The Hawaii Educational Television Network: A Status Report." *Educational Perspectives*, Vol 7, #3, pp 32-36.



(l-r) University of Hawai'i President Thomas Hale Hamilton (1963-1968), Hawai'i Governor John A Burns (1962-1974) and Gregg M Sinclair (1942-1955) in front of newly constructed Gateway Hall

- Ryans, David G. (1966). "The Educational Research and Development Center." *Educational Perspectives*, Vol 5,#1, pp 4-7.
- Stiles, Lindley J. (1966). "Research in Schools of Education." *Educational Perspectives*, Vol 5,#1, pp 8-10.
- Turnbull, Murray (1962) A New Community Among Men: The East-West Center." *Educational Perspectives*, Vol 1,#2, pp 10-12.
- Tyler, Ralph W. (1966). "Importance of Innovations in Schools and Colleges." *Educational Perspectives*, Vol 5,#1, pp 24-27.
- Wall, A E P. (1964). "ETV in Hawaii: The Plan." *Educational Perspectives*, Vol 3, #4, pp 3-4.
- Yamashita, Pearl N. (1969). Beginning Teacher Development Program: A Survey. *Educational Perspectives*, Vol 8, #3, pp 15-25.

Andrew W S In is dean emeritus of the College of Education at the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa.

Robert E Potter is professor emeritus of History of Education at the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa.

Ralph Stueber is professor emeritus of History of Education at the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa.

Two Progressives: Profiles of Robert Walter Clopton and Hubert Victor Everly

Robert E Potter and Ralph Williams

The College of Education, unlike other colleges at the University of Hawai'i, was formed by the amalgamation of two separate institutions with quite distinct missions: the University's Education Department and the Territorial Normal School. The merger was one of the recommendations of the infamous Prosser Report of 1930 and led to a legislative mandate, enacted in 1931 by the Territorial Legislature, to roll the two institutions into one and place them together in one location. The formation of a new Teachers College, however, did little at the time to reconcile their two different functions: academic study and teacher preparation.

Although this may seem atypical of the evolution of the University's colleges and professional schools, it follows a familiar enough pattern for the emergence of colleges of education across the nation—a pattern that has left a peculiarly divided sense of mission to faculties of education. On the one hand, colleges retain a professional allegiance to the universities' scholarly communities and the ideals of academic rigor and teaching excellence; on the other hand, an entrenched vocational imperative often pulls faculty in the other direction, away from academic study for its own sake. Thus, a sense of the practical realities and politics of professional preparation and teacher education prevail over scholarly concerns.

These twin missions, though not entirely irreconcilable, often tug in different directions, produce competing allegiances among faculty and set off an often acrimonious competition for resources. Generally speaking, the results are unproductive, but they have also provided faculty with two avenues to succeed in the College.

The careers of Robert Clopton and Hubert Everly, the two educators profiled in this article, illustrate how these two missions accommodated two distinct career paths in two educators who have left important legacies to the College.

On the one hand, Clopton's career followed the academic route, and he became a respected man of ideas and an influential teacher; on the other hand, Everly became the consummate politician whose career as Dean of the College spanned 23 remarkable years of administration. It is, however, worth noting at the outset that in spite of their differences, there are some notable parallels in both men's careers. Both were ardent progressives, committed to public education and to education as a preparation for democracy. Both belonged to a generation of Hawai'i's teachers that

Lawrence Fuchs (1961) has described as “the godparents of Modern Hawai'i” (p 282). Both were part of the large influx of mainland teachers that came to Hawai'i in the 1920s and 30s: a group that remained socially distinct from the ruling *haole* elite, and who expressed a deep opposition to the educational philosophy of the oligarchy, and hostility to the private schools and the plantation system (Fuchs, p 282).

Progressive Philosopher: Robert Clopton



Robert Walter Clopton was born on November 2, 1906 in Huntsville, Alabama. After receiving his baccalaureate degree from Maryville College, in Tennessee in 1926, he moved to Hawai'i where he taught biology and algebra at Mid-Pacific Institute. It was there that Clopton was exposed to the progressive education ideals and practices of the school's

headmaster, Dr John Hopwood. Hopwood was a noted liberal and progressive educator whose aim was to prepare Mid-Pacific students for leadership roles in society. The school had “no racial quotas and was heavily Oriental” (Fuchs, p 291). During Clopton's two years, there, the school was engaged in an ongoing battle with *kamaaina* oligarchy families, who wanted to turn Mid-Pacific into a vocational school.

In 1928, Clopton returned to Alabama to work for the State Department of Agriculture and Industry. However, he was not comfortable in the segregated South, and in 1930, he returned to Hawai'i with the intention of making it his permanent home. From 1930 to 1936, Clopton taught at Kaua'i High School. Teachers' salaries in the post-Depression years were very low, and he had to supplement his meagre income during the summer months working in the pineapple canneries. From 1936 to 1941, he served in a number of administrative positions with the Department of Public Instruction, first as the principal of Ka'a'awa Elementary School, then at Waiale'e Boys School, and finally at Helemano Elementary in Waipahu. After a year's leave of absence, in

Illinois, to work on his doctorate, he was appointed, in 1942, as principal of Stevenson Intermediate School. Throughout his years of school teaching and later as a university teacher, he was a staunch proponent of Progressive Education and a leader in the profession. He was active in the Hawaii Education Association (HEA) and was among those who fought to abolish the English Standard School system. On one occasion, when Clopton spoke in favor of an HEA resolution calling for an end to the segregated system, another teacher charged him with being a traitor to his class. Clopton, characteristically, was proud of being thus accused and showed no remorse for his act of “treachery.”

Clopton earned a master’s degree from the University of Hawai’i in 1941 and a PhD from Northwestern University in 1946. His dissertation, completed under the direction of ET McSwain, was a philosophical essay on the relationship between cultural anthropology and education.

In the summer of 1943, with the university operating under wartime conditions, Clopton was hired as a lecturer to teach in the extended summer session for teachers and fifth year interns who were trying to complete their degrees. In the following fall semester, he was appointed by President Gregg Sinclair as an assistant professor of education.

In 1945, he became acting principal of Teacher’s College Intermediate School, and in 1947, he was promoted to associate professor and appointed Chair of the Education Department. He continued as Chair until the reorganization of the College in 1962, when he became the first chairman of the Department of History and Philosophy of Education.

Clopton was promoted to full professor in 1952, and finally, in 1962, he was honored with a Senior Professor appointment, a rank conferred on few faculty members and a tribute to his campus-wide standing as a scholar and leader.

Clopton was widely regarded as one of the intellectual leaders of the Mānoa campus. He was a member of a university-wide group of faculty committed to elevating the intellectual climate of the campus. Few people had a neutral opinion of him: he was greatly respected and admired by many and deeply feared and disliked by perhaps an equal number. He had little tolerance for sloppy thinking or writing and no hesitancy about stating his views. On the other hand, he was quick to praise those whom he believed were deserving of respect and eager to help those who demonstrated their commitment to democratic values. He encouraged many of his brighter students—Shiro Amioka, Royal Fruehling, Victor Kobayashi, and others—to pursue their graduate studies at mainland universities, and several later returned to join the University of Hawai’i faculty.

As a lifelong student of the works of John Dewey, Clopton was a fierce defender of progressive theory and practices. He supported the rights of the less-privileged and was a vocal critic of antidemocratic decision making and elitist biases in

education and politics. He contributed to a tradition of Progressive Education in Hawai’i that began in 1896 when Henry Townsend became Inspector General of Schools and continued with the work of Miles Cary (a close friend of Clopton) at McKinley High School and George Axtelle at Kawanakoa Experimental School. The growth of a large school population of students whose native languages were not English led to a receptivity to the new educational currents that, about that time, were generated by the work of John Dewey at the University of Chicago. Clopton found himself championing Dewey’s ideas on democracy and education at a time, during the 30s, when they were becoming increasingly under attack from powerful interests who were concerned that too many of Hawai’i’s youth were being “educated away from the plantation” (Prosser Survey, 1931).

The concept of culture was central to Clopton’s thinking. He defended the idea that cultural transmission and individual growth are not conflicting educational aims. Instead, he takes the Deweyan position that “the problem is not one of choice between the two aims, but rather one of determination and refinement of method by which the heritage may be used as a *means* to the development of creative personality” (Clopton, 1950, p 163). In relating his ideas to the situation in Hawai’i, Clopton’s research investigated the nature of culture conflict, the title of his dissertation. His work analyzed the processes of cultural imperialism and Westernization. He recognized the importance of teaching teachers to become conversant with the value systems of minority groups: “to acquaint them with the values-systems which dictate the behavior and attitudes of pupils who either ignore or reject the value systems into which their teachers have been inducted” (unpublished manuscript).

Though Clopton was never a student of Dewey, he came to know him during one of the philosopher’s three trips to Hawai’i. In January 1951, Dewey spent several weeks in Honolulu with his second wife, Roberta Grant Dewey, whom he married in 1946. Bets Lawrence, Clopton’s daughter, recalls accompanying her father on a visit to the Halekulani Hotel, where the Deweys were in residence in one of the hotel’s cottages. Dewey, apparently was enormously amused with the Halekulani’s claim that its clientele were composed of either the “newly wed or the nearly dead” as he qualified on both counts. After Dewey’s death in 1952, Clopton maintained a correspondence with his widow, and she provided access to Dewey’s papers when he later came to edit Dewey’s lectures in China.

Clopton was an inspiring teacher. Art Wong, who was in the very first class of returning World War II veterans to attend the College, recalls that though his first impression of Clopton was negative (he ‘hummed and hawed’ a lot), Wong quickly came to recognize that Clopton had great depth of thought. He helped future teachers shape a vision of

education as a force for social, political, and economic change. Clopton's technique was forensic. He did not lecture, preferring instead to engage his students in dialogue. Several students recall that though his reputation for rigor of thought was intimidating, the experience of studying with him was exhilarating. "He made me realize that my mission was to make children think, to wake up dormant minds" (interview with Alma Cirino). Clopton's teaching techniques was challenging to those who were reluctant to speak out in class, but it was also a transforming experience for many of them: "He strengthened my commitment to teaching and helped me lay down a philosophy and approach that I have sustained throughout my career in education" (interview with Art Wong).

Clopton left his position as Department Chair in 1965 to take up a Senior Specialist appointment at the East-West Center during which time he edited for publication John Dewey's 1919-1921 lectures in China. The lectures had been translated into Chinese, as Dewey spoke, "from the lectern." Clopton had discovered, on visiting Roberta Dewey in December 1964, and after a careful examination of Dewey's papers that no record of the English notes for the lectures had survived. Clopton collaborated with the Chinese scholar, Tsuin-Chen Ou, in editing a translated version of the lectures, which were published by the University of Hawai'i Press in 1973.

In 1966, Clopton served as the Administrative Director of the University of Hawai'i Peace Corps Training Center at Hilo. During his time there, someone suggested at an administrative staff meeting that the trainees who were scheduled to be in Hawai'i for their three-month training program in the summer months should be assigned to Kona rather than Hilo. Trainees, who were in teaching projects during the normal school year, had two to three weeks of student teaching in the Hilo schools. Kona School District, however, at that time, had a different school schedule than the rest of the state. They remained in school during the summer months and had their "vacation" in the Fall when families needed the children to help harvest coffee beans. The problem would be for the staff to find accommodation for over sixty Peace Corps trainees. Two weeks in hotels would be financially prohibitive. Could they be housed with local families and simulate overseas living/working conditions? Most of the staff at that meeting very quickly concluded that "local" families would not be willing to house young strangers for two weeks. Clopton disagreed. He thought that it was an excellent idea, and that the educational benefits justified the effort. He was convinced that the people of Kona would be glad to help if they were approached in "the right way." He challenged the rest of the administrative staff to do their best, and he, too, would walk the coffee fields and small villages of Kona, in spite of his own poor health. It all

came to pass. Clopton and his assistant, Aiko Oda, made their headquarters at the Manago Hotel for a week, went door-to-door bearing pastries, talked-story, and drank lots of Kona coffee in lots of kitchens and parlors (Clopton, perversely, was in the habit of drinking his coffee with a sprinkle of salt). By the end of the week, enough housing was promised for all the trainees.

Clopton continued to direct the Far East Training Center Project on the Big Island until his retirement in June 30, 1967. Robert Kamins, the Dean for Academic Development, paid him the following tribute: "The University of Hawai'i without Bob Clopton will take some getting used to. If the University awarded hash marks for service to it and to the community, you'd need a pair of sleeves trailing to the ground to carry them all."

In retirement, Clopton continued to teach as a lecturer in the Honors Program. He and President Emeritus Laurence Snyder were invited by the Office of Academic Affairs to help junior faculty members improve their teaching strategies. The program was voluntary. Clopton mentored the assistant professors of English, the social sciences, humanities and foreign languages; Snyder helped those in the sciences and math. Their duties involved meeting with his proteges on a regular basis, visiting their classes, and offering suggestions to improve their teaching.

Clopton was persuaded to come out of retirement in 1970, his health having greatly improved, to assist the Liberal Studies Program with the students being transferred from the discontinued New College. Upon his second retirement in 1973, Clopton was made an Emeritus Professor of Education. In an unprecedented move, he was once more invited to come out of retirement in 1976 to teach in the new EdD program.

Clopton gathered many honors at the University of Hawai'i. He was the first recipient of the Willard Wilson Award for Service to the University in 1974. He was active in the Democratic party and on one occasion was invited to make the keynote speech to the state Democratic party convention. From May 1946 until August 1953, he wrote daily editorials (approximately 2000, in all) for the *Hawaii Hochi*, a bilingual Honolulu newspaper. Finally, in recognition of his own record of community service, the University established the Robert W Clopton Award for community service which is awarded to faculty members who have provided exemplary service to the community. He died at his home in Kalihi Valley on September 13, 1981.

The Progressive Politician: Hubert V Everly

Hubert Victor Everly was the third Dean of the College of Education. He succeeded to the position in 1956 after Bruce White, his predecessor, accepted the post of Dean of Faculties



in Bachman Hall. Everly's term of office as Dean spanned a remarkable 23 years: three years longer than his father-in-law, Benjamin Wist, who was Dean from 1931 to 1951.

Hubert Everly was born in Los Angeles on March 27, 1915. In 1916 his parents moved to San Diego and then to La Jolla where he lived until he

was 18. Everly's mother had been a schoolteacher in a "continuation school"—a school designed to bridge the gap between high school and employment. She had two years of college and taught home economics and certain job skills to girls. His parents divorced when he was quite young, and he has no recollections of his father. In fact, he spent most of his childhood being shuttled between the home of his grandparents and his mother.

Everly describes himself as "occasionally obstreperous" and as a "troublesome child" who was disruptive in school and frequently misbehaved in class. He was also "bored with school and resentful of authority." Because of his rebellious streak, he was placed in a "military academy" which focused more on discipline than academics. In spite of these shaky beginnings, however, Everly applied himself and completed his high school education, developing, in the meantime, a keen interest in track and football. In 1933, he won an athletic scholarship to the University of Southern California, but he revised his plans during a trip to Hawai'i. His initial aim in coming to Hawai'i had been to study volcanology. He enrolled in a summer session course on volcanoes that was held on the Big Island, but, as it turned out, the course was designed for teachers, and he found himself taking education classes, as well.

During his summer on the Big Island, Everly met Dr Benjamin Wist, Dean of Teachers College. About the same time, Everly made the acquaintance of Wist's daughter, Zoe who was working as the summer session librarian. These acquaintanceships convinced him that he should abandon his track and football scholarship at USC and remain in Hawai'i, where, at Wist's urging (Wist was eager to recruit more men into the teaching profession), he decided to pursue a program of teacher training and dedicate himself to a career in public education.

These were the years of the Depression, and Everly had to work to make ends meet and pay for his schooling. Fortunately, even with the Depression, there were menial jobs available. His first job in Hawai'i was at Dole Pineapple, where he worked as a platform trucker, pulling wooden

boxes of pineapples off flatbed trucks, loading them on a hand truck, and running them down the platform to the machines that would peel the pineapples before they were sent to the trim tables inside the plant. For this, he was paid twenty cents an hour. At that time, tuition was seventy-five dollars per semester. Later, he was a dishwasher and housekeeper in Atherton House, which used to be a dormitory. He received a BEd from the University of Hawai'i in 1937 and an MEd in 1939.

From 1937 to 1940, Everly taught on the island of Hawai'i; first as a substitute teacher at Konawaena and then as a social studies and mathematics teacher at Honoka'a, where his wife, Zoe, whom he married in 1937, served as school librarian. During these years, Everly experienced at first hand the hostility of the plantation managers, who rigidly opposed any effort to extend educational opportunities to the children of plantation workers. This period might be said to represent Hubert Everly's introduction to the politics of education in Hawai'i and to the pragmatics of power. It helped to shape his commitment to the public schools and to the teaching profession—a commitment that he has sustained throughout his professional life and into retirement. Everly was influenced at this stage by the democratic philosophy and progressive educational thinking of John Dewey, in contrast to the authoritarian practices of the plantation owners. Everly was especially influenced by George Counts' work, *Dare the School Build a New Social Order?* (1932) and *A Call to the Teachers of the Nation* (1933) (Nishimoto, 1997). Counts appealed to schools and teachers to become agents of change during the difficult years of the Depression. Everly and other teachers at Honoka'a heeded the call. They showed students how to vote, how to put a bill together, and how to see it through the legislature.

In 1940 Everly was transferred to Kalakaua Intermediate School on O'ahu as an interim vice principal. He did not enjoy the experience. His duties required him to address disciplinary problems, which were dealt with at the time by means of corporal punishment—a practice that he was obliged to continue, in spite of his detestation of it. Eager to escape this kind of work after one year, he took a leave of absence and traveled to Ohio State University, shortly before the outbreak of war, to work on his doctorate. A few years earlier, while studying for his masters degree, Everly had taken a class from Harold Alberty, who was on sabbatical leave from Ohio State. Alberty, a well-known progressive educator, became Everly's advisor during his spell in Columbus.

The war delayed Everly's plans to complete his doctoral studies. He applied to the army but was rejected for poor eyesight. He then went to work at the Curtis Wright aircraft factory in Columbus, Ohio making navy dive bombers, and studying in his spare time in order to complete his doctoral

studies. In 1943, his draft number came up, and he returned to Hawai'i to join the U S Army in the Armed Forces Institute: a job that drew on his skills as an educator, as it involved organizing correspondence courses for officers who wished to continue their college education. He left the army in 1945 and returned to Ohio to work on his dissertation, a survey on the roles of laboratory schools with special reference to the University of Hawai'i lab schools.

After receiving his doctorate in 1946, Everly was offered the post of principal of the Teachers College Intermediate School at the University of Hawai'i. In his dissertation, he had made the case that the University of Hawai'i lab school should be expanded to include a senior high school. In 1947, Dean Wist assigned him the responsibility of creating a new, laboratory high school for the Teachers College. Space was limited and new buildings urgently needed. Everly solved the shortage in an enterprising way. He was able to buy a war surplus theater at Kipapa Gulch for one dollar and have it transported to the College, where the "barn," as it was familiarly referred to, served as the high school gym and auditorium. It was located on the site of the basketball court on the ewa side of the College. When the school needed room for the new music department, Everly purchased a surplus mess hall from the army, also for one dollar, and had it transported and set down on the site currently held by the KHET studio, at the corner of Dole and University.

In 1956, the position of Dean became vacant, and as Director of Secondary Education, a position he had held since 1950, Everly happened to find himself in the right position at the right time. He was first appointed Acting Dean and later, when Paul Bachman was succeeded by Laurence Snyder as President, the appointment became permanent. As Everly is keen to point out, Wist had nothing to do with the appointment as he had died in 1951. Everly does concede, however, that his father-in-law had been very helpful in showing him how the job was done. "I certainly had a rare opportunity to see how the educational establishment functioned in these islands, see how the university functioned, see how the political system functioned—because Wist was very political" (Public Education in Hawaii, p 297).

Everly characterizes himself as an ardent and lifelong supporter of public school teachers and of the school system. Even as Dean, and at the risk of imprisonment, he walked the line with teachers during the 1971 teachers' strike. His position as Dean, as an office holder in the Hawaii Education Association, and his many years on the Board of the State Retirement System were simultaneously dedicated to improving the lot of public school teachers in the state. These three jobs, in combination, placed him in an advantageous position to influence educational policy and decision making. In his own words, "There's no way to do anything in

Hawai'i, structured the way we are, on a single-district statewide basis, without involving yourself in the legislature and politicians" (Public Education in Hawaii, p 316).

The source of Everly's views on the *realpolitik* of educational change is his understanding, learned from Wist, of the political forces that shaped educational change in Hawai'i. In addition, Everly attributes his skill in lobbying to the guidance of James McDonaugh, President of HEA in the 30s and 40s. Everly was closely aligned with the postwar Democrats that were now remaking government and decision making in Hawai'i. As Dean, he was able to maneuver himself into a position of influence that he was able to sustain for many years. The role of College Dean placed him in an advantageous position to be elected as head of the teachers' union (HEA), and as head of the teachers' union, he was eligible for stand for the union seat on the board of the State Retirement System. These three positions, when combined, provided him with a persuasive bargaining hand in the legislature for it placed him in three important strategic positions: as Dean, he controlled an important entry-point into the teaching profession; as head of the union, he represented the teachers in their negotiations and as chair of the Retirement Board, he helped oversee a system that was connected to every district in Hawai'i. He was also supported by other well-connected educators in the College such as Teruo Ihara, the Director of the Office of Foreign Contracts. These connections gave him the power to get things done and to support the educational mission of the College. His standing with the legislature was thus enhanced, and he was frequently able to seek legislative support for College projects over other university priorities.

The College in the Sixties was ripe for reform. The old normal school model was increasingly viewed as inadequate and lacking in academic rigor. Several groups, including faculty in the College of Arts and Sciences, legislators, and union leaders were agitating for changes. These pressures mounted over the period and led to considerable structural changes in the College.

Everly was responsible for organizing the College into separate departments—a process that continued throughout the 60s. Departments of History and Philosophy of Education, Educational Administration, and Educational Psychology were among the first. Later, the Department of Educational Communications (later Technology) was spun off from Educational Psychology, under the chairmanship of Walter Wittich who was recruited from the University of Wisconsin. Everly used his influence in the legislature to lobby for positions so that Wittich could hire the necessary specialists.

Although these structural changes had begun early in Everly's years as Dean, the whole process of reorganizing the College and its programs came to a head with the Stiles

Report (1966). In Everly's view the Stiles Report began as a punitive attack on the College instigated by David Trask, the chair of the Senate Education Committee. The Report, authorized by the third legislature of the State of Hawai'i, requested a comprehensive review of the College's teacher education programs. The University of Hawai'i President, Thomas Hamilton, set up a study group and acquired the services of Lindley Stiles as a consultant to the group. Arthur Conant, their first choice, was unavailable. Stiles was dean of the College of Education at the University of Wisconsin, Madison. The study group were unaware that Everly and Stiles were personal friends and that they had exchanged jobs for a brief time in 1957. Stiles' message to Everly was that the College had to cut back on the number of education credits that it was awarding. In effect, the College was required to give up a four year program (five if the internship is included) for a two year program. The College of Arts and Sciences would take over the freshman and sophomore years that were now lost to the College.

Philosophically, Everly thought the "publish or perish" policy of the university was shortsighted and that it discriminated against 'able' people who support the College's teacher education program. "Frankly, I did not want people spending a lot of time ... with their noses in a research project. I wanted them looking at the problems of the DOE" (Public Education in Hawaii p 304). It was useful to the College programs to recruit people who had risen through the DOE ranks. This policy helped to secure a much greater ethnic diversity among the college faculty than at other colleges in the university. Nevertheless, it was important for faculty to publish in order to get promoted. One of the main reasons for starting *Educational Perspectives* was to use it as an outlet for the professional writing of the college faculty.

In terms of recruiting students to the College, Everly took an open door approach. He did not make a special effort to recruit under-represented minorities, nor did he attempt to discourage the enrollment of those groups who were overrepresented. As a result, a large number of *nisei* were admitted into the College during his tenure as dean (Nishimoto, 1997). His position was that there was no need to control the numbers as long as enough students applied to produce 1,200 good standard graduates a year, whether they could be placed in teaching jobs or not. He felt that the College provided an excellent education that offered many graduates a good start in life, even if they were unable to find work in teaching. He did not believe that educational opportunity should be controlled by social demands and applied the argument to the education received in teacher education.

Setting up a Student Services Division was an important step in gaining College control over admissions. Prior to 1962, all admissions were centralized and limits imposed externally on the College. Everly wanted unrestricted

admission. His strategy for accomplishing this reveals a lot about his approach. He knew that he would be barking up the wrong tree if he tried to work with the university administration with such a proposal, so he took his case directly to the legislature and convinced them that by giving the College control over admissions they would be taking a positive step that would bring more people into the profession.

A policy of unrestricted admissions was unproblematic in the Sixties but when the teacher shortage quickly turned into a surplus in the Seventies, pressure was placed on the College to limit admissions. These were difficult times for the College and its graduates. For many, there was nowhere to go but outside the profession and many took jobs in industry or in other professions. Some became lawyers and managers, but many more became clerks and stockboys. In spite of the difficulties, Everly was able to use his political clout to retain faculty and to redirect college resources to professional development efforts, including DOE workshops.

One of Everly's enduring legacies to the College was the addition in 1966 of Wist Annex Two. Although the Annex was not a University priority, Everly was instrumental in getting the funds (\$453,000) from the legislature. The title "Annex" came about as a result of one of these peculiarities that often require administrators to adapt regulations to meet their ends. The legislature would be more easily persuaded to make changes to an existing building (Wist Hall) than to fund a completely new building. In the end, Everly got his new "annex," though the buildings really are not connected, as anyone who has tried to find their way to the Annex from Wist Hall will eventually discover.

During his tenure as Dean, Everly was twice elected president of the Hawaii Education Association, when it was the local teachers' union. This connection with HEA gave him an important link to the legislature, which he saw as the true source of power over education in Hawai'i - both over the schools and the university. HEA also helped Everly establish links with other unions and their leadership, and maintain contact with politicians and community leaders.

During the period between the late 60s and early 70s, Everly served as a state representative on the National Education Association during the period when teacher organizations were debating the merits of unionization. With unionization came the realization that administrators and teachers could not be on the same side for bargaining purposes. This led, in Hawai'i, to the separation of the HEA in 1973 into three unions: one for teachers (The Hawaii State Teachers Association), one for principals (The Hawaii Government Employees Association) and one for higher education (The University of Hawaii Professional Assembly). After the break up into three new unions, HEA hoped to retain a role as a sort of umbrella organization; however, this

did not work out. Everly has, however, been instrumental in finding a new role for HEA as an organization that represents the interests of retired educators at all levels.

Everly led the HEA Retirement Committee in the successful drive to establish the State Employees Retirement System and served with the Hawaii Employees' Retirement Board from 1956 to 1979. His position on the board put him in a good position to gain insight and understanding into the power structure of the state as the Retirement System was an important source of funding for many state schemes. It also put him in a position to help other union members in the state, such as the police, firefighters, and the Hawaii Government Employees Association (HGEA) membership. This, in turn, allowed them to help him when the time came. This access to power and decision making in the state was, in Everly's view, vital to the interests of the College and the operation of an effective educational role for the College and its faculty. It was important to have support in the legislature. In fact it was important to get around the people between the Dean and the legislature. In Everly's view the university establishment – the regents, and administrators selected by them – did not offer the College the kind of support it needed. For example, when the College needed new office space: "I had to lobby that through the legislature. And I had to find the funds. I had to lobby for the buildings. The university gave me absolutely no help. In fact, they were opposed to it. We got our buildings by using local pork barrel. The system in those days was that every legislator had a certain amount of money for pork barrel, and ... that's why our campus looks so hodgepodge because the buildings were put up one at a time" (Public Education in Hawaii p 285).

The term of office of a College Dean is often no more than a few years. Everly's 23 years of service as Dean is therefore a remarkable achievement, especially as it covers a period of considerable tension and change. When he took over as Dean in 1956, the College and the lab schools were still tied to the old normal school system; when he left office in 1976, the College had become transformed into a modern education institution focusing on research and graduate education in addition to teacher preparation. The College, in addition, possessed seven departments, each with its own graduate

specializations, and awarded two doctoral degrees.

Everly also helped to expand the role of the College in the Pacific region. As a member of the Trust Territory Advisory Committees for the Departments of Navy and Interior, he had visited Micronesia in 1947 and 1949 to survey the public school system and make recommendations for reorganization. He was Staff Representative for the Special U S Senate Investigating Committee for American Samoa in 1960 and participated in the 1963 and 1964 Educational Training Conferences held by the U S Army in Japan.

The University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, in recognition of his many years of service to the University and College, conferred on him the degree of Doctor of Humane Letters in 1991. In May 1997, the University of Hawai'i Alumni Founders Group awarded him its Distinguished Lifetime Achievement Award. Likewise, in 1998, the College of Education Alumni Association presented him with the Distinguished Alumnus Award.

References

- Clopton, Robert W. (1950). "The School, the Culture, and the Individual," *The Educational Record* Vol XXXI, #2, pp 157-167. *Additional lectures in China, 1919-1921 of John Dewey*; (1970) translated from the Chinese and edited by Robert W. Clopton and Tsuin-chen Ou. Hawai'i: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Clopton, Robert W. (1947). *Culture conflict and the school*. Doctoral Dissertation, Northwestern University.
- Everly, Hubert V. (1946). *Criteria for Evaluating and Developing Laboratory School Programs, with Special Reference to the Campus Secondary School of the University of Hawaii*. Doctoral Dissertation. The Ohio State University.
- Fuchs, Lawrence. (1961). *Hawaii Pono: A Social History*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich.
- Nishimoto, Warren (1997). "Building a New Social Order: Dean Hubert V Everly and Progressive Education in Hawai'i." Unpublished manuscript.
- Public Education in Hawai'i, Oral Histories. Hubert Everly Transcripts, Volume 1, pp 248-234. Center for Oral History, Social Science Research Institute, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, September 1991.

The Shaping of the Curriculum Research & Development Group and Its Laboratory School: A Response to Events of the 1960s

Arthur R King Jr

The formation and continuing evolution of the Curriculum Research & Development Group (CRDG) and its University Laboratory School are part of Hubert Everly's legacy as dean of the College of Education. Built from three laboratory schools—preschool, elementary, and secondary—founded variously from 1890 to 1948, the CRDG now exists in a form that emerged during the mid 1960s. The unit would not exist in its present form, or even exist at all, without Hu Everly's vision, guidance, and political skill.

What happened, why, and how? And what did we learn during the Everly era? To answer these questions is my challenge in this article.

What Do the CRDG and Its Laboratory School Do?

Today the CRDG, with its laboratory school, is known as one of the nation's major centers for curriculum research, development, and assistance to schools. From its roots in Hawai'i, the unit's influence has expanded across the nation and beyond, with more than 600,000 students being schooled in CRDG-developed programs. Several foreign countries have translated and adapted CRDG's curricula for use in their own schools.

The CRDG improves educational practice by expanding the ideas and the number and quality of tools that teachers and students use. The CRDG has developed, evaluated, and disseminated over 600 educational tools in its thirty-four-year history. These tools comprise published books, multimedia materials, and educational practices intended to draw children and youths into reflection, inquiry, thinking, and solving problems. They also include materials and professional development activities that help teachers communicate the nature, potential, and strategies of the curricula, plus materials for parents and school administrators. At present, some twenty projects are either on the drawing board or under revision. Many tasks await the energy and the funds to complete them. Over the years, the CRDG has made excursions into new educational technologies, with new initiatives being explored and developed.

Forces for Change: The Educational Environment of the 1960s

The Curriculum Research & Development Group and the laboratory school of the University of Hawai'i, in their current forms, emerged from conditions and events during the 1960s that stimulated a reshaping of educational institutions in Hawai'i and in the nation at large. The time was ripe for a paradigm shift.

By the standards of the time, the nation was prospering. Veterans of World War II were emerging as leaders in their communities; their children were attending the nation's schools. The United States was working out its role as a world leader. And President Johnson's "Great Society" initiatives expressed a new national purpose embedded in a program of action. This program launched large and long-enduring enterprises in education, along with unprecedented funding for reform and research. Much of the money had been flowing into universities for developing curricula and instructional materials for elementary and secondary schools. Among examples of such programs were the School Mathematics Study Group (SMSG), the Biological Sciences Curriculum Study (BSCS), and the Physical Science Study Committee (PSSC). The nation's major scientific organizations, such as the National Academy of Sciences and the American Association for the Advancement of Science, were leading the advance. The Carnegie Corporation and the U S Department of Education also participated. (Jerome Bruner's important little book, *The Process of Education* [1960], is an insightful introduction to this exciting work.)

Hawai'i too was demanding educational reform and new programs to upgrade schooling. The Democratic Party had assumed control of both the legislature and the governorship. Their message of creating quality schools as the avenue to social betterment and upward mobility was political magic, especially to military veterans and organized labor.

These sentiments were expressed powerfully by David Thompson in an article entitled "ILWU and Decision-Making in Education," published in the December 1966 issue of *Educational Perspectives*. Thompson, the education director of Hawai'i Local 142 of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, reported a 1962 policy statement of the union, which represented 22,000 members in Hawai'i's

sugar, pineapple, longshore, hotel, and other industries on all islands (p 14). Thompson presented a clear view of the labor movement's educational goals for its members and their children—a view held also by the Democratic Party of the time.

We live in a democracy. Every child must have an education, which gives him the power to share in policy making, and the wisdom to shape a good life. He must have the liberal academic education which is traditional for rulers: instruction in reading, writing, speech, literature, history, government, logic, mathematics, natural science and fine arts. (p 14)

Thompson remarked further that “a sound preparation in the academic disciplines is now the best preparation for work” (p 15).

Federal money to improve education and other social programs was coming into Hawai'i in phenomenal amounts. Through its control over appropriations, the Hawai'i legislature took direct action on education, debating many school issues and programs in the halls of 'Iolani Palace.

Public education was on the move. The first elected school board was taking control of the state's Department of Education. The statewide university system was emerging, and the Mānoa campus was taking shape as a major research university on the U S land grant model.

The College of Education was also responding to the demands of the times, adding new faculty, many with research credentials. Faculty members were creating and implementing a number of experimental programs of teacher education, such as the Ford Program and the Honolulu Project, and revamping existing ones. They were also becoming involved in some international contracts. On the research side, the College of Education, with support from the university administration and the state's legislature, formed the Educational Research and Development Center (EDRAD).

The three laboratory schools and their staffs, with their limited resources (most staff were at the instructor level, fully occupied with their regular duties of teaching and teacher training), were also redirecting their efforts toward research. By 1965, the schools' faculty had made nineteen contributions to research and program innovation, dealing with such topics as individualized instruction in high school English, independent study in the teaching of spelling, radio astronomy, behavior rating scales, the Montessori program, the Initial Teaching Alphabet program, creativity development, Japanese language, programmed learning, audiovisual aids, educational television lessons, and remedial reading. High school teachers/supervisors were experimenting with the new curricula in math and science developed by the major national curriculum projects noted above.

The vision of a new role for the college's three laboratory

schools was evolving in the early 1960s. Dean Everly, the former principal of the high school and a longtime student of lab schools, took the lead. He commissioned David Ryans, the director of EDRAD, to solicit the views of leading researchers on the potential of laboratory schools as centers for educational research.

The laboratory schools had become a subject of concern in American universities, including the University of Hawai'i. Many major universities were closing down their laboratory schools. Why?

In the early twentieth century, laboratory schools were considered an indispensable part of teachers colleges and of schools and colleges of education in universities. But conditions changed. The demand for teachers was outstripping the capacity of campus laboratory schools to accommodate them, so most clinical practice was accomplished in regular schools. The quality of American schools had improved substantially over the years, so that regular schools could supply mentor teachers and quality programs. Furthermore, as teacher education became more integrated into the growing universities, schools of education had to compete for funds with arts and sciences and other programs, and laboratory schools often lost in the competition. .

But Everly was committed to preserving Hawai'i's laboratory schools. He believed, along with many others, that changing the schools' function from teacher training to research and development was a good strategy. A major study of the College of Education in 1966 produced a report titled “Preparation of Teachers and Other Educational Personnel in Hawaii,” later known informally as the Stiles Report, reflecting the role of the study's director, Lindley Stiles, dean of the School of Education at the University of Wisconsin. Stiles was the leader among a group of college deans from major universities who were lobbying Congress for funds to support educational research. The report carried a section with the title “Role and Function of the Laboratory Schools.” In it, Stiles offered an appealing combination of educational and economic reasons to justify reorganizing the laboratory schools as a curriculum research center.

The cost of operating the Laboratory Schools as facilities for research and school improvement should be looked upon by the University and the people of the State as a basic “seed corn” investment to attract outside support for education research and improvement operations. . . . Programs of research and innovation now being planned by the faculties of the Laboratory Schools are directly related to the objectives of a number of federal programs from which research grants may be forthcoming. All kinds of research, both basic and applied, have the potentiality of being supported. . . It [federal money] would also support a proposal

for a research and development center. Discussions under way that may ultimately link the Laboratory Schools' research facilities with the plans being made by the State Department of Education to provide a supplementary service center to the State might well make these schools eligible to utilize funds from Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (pp 66–68).

Stiles further argued that laboratory schools could be ideal facilities for “keeping teachers abreast of latest educational improvements.” He also noted that certain educational problems in Hawai'i are “unique to its own cultural traditions; hence, research is needed in the local setting if workable solutions are to be achieved” (p 69).

Stiles's arguments helped convince legislators and university administrators, if they were not already convinced, that the lab schools should be transformed into facilities for research and development to improve schooling. The prospect that such an enterprise could attract money from the federal government, philanthropic foundations, business and industry, and state governments was especially seductive. “Thus, new opportunities and new sources of support for educational research are becoming open just when the Laboratory Schools are changing their role and function to take advantage of them” (p 69).

My Participation

My own participation in the CRDG story began in 1965. I was acquainted with education in Hawai'i, having taught at Punahou School from 1946 to 1949 while studying at the College of Education evenings and summers.

In 1965 I was an associate professor at the Claremont Graduate School in California, specializing in teacher education and curriculum studies. David Ryans, director of the new Educational Research and Development Center (EDRAD) at the College, invited me to return to Hawai'i to take a position in the center and on the faculty of the College. I had not been in Hawai'i long when Everly asked me to consider heading the lab schools. (Unbeknownst to me, a college committee and Dean Everly had considered me for the position before I arrived in the islands.) At first I declined the invitation.

Later, in the fall of 1965, with others in EDRAD, I did staff work for Lindley Stiles on the Stiles Report. This work convinced me of the schools' potential as a curriculum development center. Although Stiles had presented a potent rationale for a new mission for the schools, no details of philosophy and approach had been worked out.

My work with a longtime associate, John (Jack) Brownell, was important in what was to come. Brownell and I had been fellow teachers at Punahou School in the late 1940s, had

known each other as doctoral students at Stanford, and had been colleagues at Claremont Graduate School. In 1965 we were completing our curriculum book, *The Curriculum and the Disciplines of Knowledge: A Theory of Curriculum Practice* (Wiley 1966). Our work aimed to be a theory of practice, that is, a practical guide to designing and developing curriculum based on our theory. After reviewing the claims of social, occupational, religious, political, and intellectual domains on the curriculum, we concluded that the intellectual goal held the prime position for general education. In contemporary language, the general, liberal curriculum was to be discipline-based. The remainder of the book set out guidelines for developing curricula to fulfill the intellectual claims of the disciplines of knowledge, conceived as communities of people committed to working toward shared intellectual goals within their own domains. These communities would consist of practitioners of the disciplines, including academic scholars, teachers, educators, and finally students themselves, when their school courses would cast them in roles of community members, engaging with each other and their teachers in doing what members of such communities do—thinking, inquiring, learning their language, communicating, collaborating, using their methods of discovery, and so on.

My decision to accept the position of lab school director and to become engaged in converting the lab schools as envisioned in the Stiles Report was influenced by several factors: (1) my professional interest in curriculum design and development, as stimulated by the work with Brownell, (2) the emerging culture of educational change in the 1950s and 1960s, which made new approaches and developments possible, (3) the success of university academics in curriculum development—a hallmark of successful work in major curriculum projects in the 1950s and 1960s, and (4) the availability of fifty-five university-funded positions assigned to the lab schools—resources that to my knowledge were unavailable to any other curriculum design unit. With university scholars participating in curriculum practice, the revamped laboratory schools could become an organizing point for university faculty members and school people on our development teams.

Internal Reorganization

Converting the Laboratory Schools into a site for curriculum work entailed organizational changes—a continuing phenomenon in the unit's life. In 1966 we merged the three independent lab schools into a single University Laboratory School (ULS), along with their budgets. One principal replaced three, and a single cafeteria, rather than three, now served the whole student body. Three school nurse positions were directed to other needs.

The size and composition of the student population

changed. To accommodate the conversion of full-time teachers to curriculum developers, we reduced the student body by attrition from over 900 to 365. To carry out the research mandate, we selected students to represent the state's population in ethnicity, gender, level of school success, and families' social standing. Because changes were made by attrition, no students were eliminated. There was some early criticism of adding students from the great variety of walks of life, but it vanished when the school proved successful, safe, and attractive.

Staff roles changed from classroom teachers and supervisors of clinical practice to teacher-researchers. Only a few of the school's staff members accepted the opportunity offered to prepare for their new roles. Most chose to apply for other opportunities available, either in the Department of Education or in the College of Education. A number of those on the brink of retirement chose to leave. Thus we were left with a major job of staff building—recruiting educators and content scholars from Hawai'i, the U S mainland, and other countries.

Developing Partners

In building this applied research and development enterprise, we discovered step by step that we needed a large number of connections to individuals, groups, and institutions. Some of the connections were there from the start; others were cultivated later.

1. *The Hawai'i Department of Education (DOE)*. The Department of Education has been an important partner and client through the years. Although interactions have varied in type and intensity with the times, and particularly with the views of the superintendent, the links have always been maintained.

Partnership with the DOE was one of Hu Everly's hallmarks for the prosperity of education in Hawai'i, and it proved to be so for the new lab school and for the curriculum development unit that was to follow. It all started in an informal way.

At a Phi Delta Kappa meeting, I had met William (Bill) Savard, then head of research in the DOE. We promptly began exchanging ideas on improving education. I talked about the lab school and the possibility of collaboration by members of the university faculty; Bill talked about DOE interests, including the research program under way at the DOE, and about the funds for educational innovation that had come to the state under Title III of the 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). We came to an immediate and enthusiastic meeting of the minds on what could come of joining the efforts of the state's two major educational establishments, both bringing substantial resources plus entree to the schools and the university.

Dean Stiles's report had noted the potential of joining in a partnership with the DOE-controlled Title III (Educational Innovations) program. This is just what happened.

We now saw that we had to move quickly. The state had to organize to spend its annual federal allowance of some \$400,000—big money in those days. ULS people were eager to get moving along the lines suggested by the Stiles Report, which had been well received by the legislature, the university, the DOE, and the Title III Advisory Council, a body of community members that included Dave Thompson of the ILWU, cited earlier.

We proposed a jointly operated unit to be called the Hawai'i Curriculum Center (HCC). It would have resources from both the DOE and the university and a commitment to work on projects of high priority to the schools—first, English language arts for the elementary school, science, and the arts.

The original leadership group was drawn from both the DOE (Shiho Nunes, Joe Cherry, and Bill Savard) and the university (Gladys Koo, until then principal of the university's elementary school and Jack Brownell, new from Claremont Graduate School and me). I assumed the role of director; Savard of co-director, both of us expecting that these roles would either change regularly or that new leaders would be found. In my case, it never happened, and I have remained in a position close to the one that I accepted in 1966.

The combination of new and continuing staff was an energetic, creative, and hard-working lot: Leon Burton (arts); Jerry and Charlotte Dykstra, Richard and Ann Port, Florence Maney, Donald Sanborn, and Ted Rodgers (English); Ron Mitchell (social studies); Frank Pottenger, Don Young, Will Kyselka, Sister Edna Demanche, and Reed Brantley (science); Edith Kleinjans, Loretta Krause, Morris Lai and others too numerous to list here. They were an energetic, creative, and hard-working lot. When the work teams assembled, with faculty drawn from the DOE, from the University of Hawai'i, from mainland institutions, and from New Zealand, we witnessed the synergy of teachers and scholars collaborating to meet common goals. No one really knew which team members were drawn from the DOE, the university, or elsewhere, and if they did know, it wasn't important.

Because of Hawai'i's unique single statewide school system, the resources from Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act supported much of the work. Where most states disbursed their ESEA funds among many small projects, Hawai'i chose to concentrate its share in the Hawai'i Curriculum Center. The policy offended some who would have preferred to put the funds into multiple pockets.

The Hawai'i Curriculum Center had a lively existence under that name from 1966 to 1969. Always a target of some controversy, the HCC's work was reviewed each year by the Hawai'i legislature under its budgeting authority. After an intensive review in 1969, almost all of the legislators came out

in support of the HCC. But one senior member, the chair of the House's powerful Budget and Finance Committee, held out for assigning full control of the HCC to the Department of Education, on the assumption that joint operations could not be well managed—hence the tension. So the unit was split into two. The university portion was renamed the Curriculum Research & Development Group; the DOE section was named the Curriculum Development and Technology Branch and assigned to the Office of Instructional Services. The two units continued to share quarters on the university campus, working together by contract or joint agreement and the professional good will of people on both sides. The DOE gradually dropped developmental work, though it kept up major support to its Hawaii English Project.

2. *Leaders in the University.* From presidents through vice-presidents, chancellors, and their staffs, university leaders also provided support, as did research officers and their staffs. Later, the Research Corporation of the University of Hawai'i (RCUH) also promoted the new activity. In the earliest days of the Hawai'i Curriculum Center, university administrative staff sought ways to expand the number of positions for the lab school. Unfortunately, their efforts were not successful.

3. *The College of Education (COE).* Hubert Everly, dean of the College, provided the initial impetus for the new mission of the lab school and maintained connections with the college and the university over the long haul. From the beginning to his retirement, he was the stable point, offering information and guidance, always delivered with good will and candor. Hu was committed to the success of the new laboratory school. He knew the university; he was a skilled lobbyist and a sensitive practitioner of local politics. He also knew his faculty and was committed to working closely with the DOE. He never discouraged an idea or an innovation, though he sometimes counseled me on timing.

College of Education faculty members had mixed responses to converting the laboratory schools to their new function. Some responses can be attributed to differences of educational philosophy, of views on teacher education, curriculum, and the wider set of issues in the conduct of schooling; to mixed opinions on teachers' roles in developing curricula, differing concepts of staff development, and even doubts about the very idea of large-scale, systemic development of curricula. Some responses reflected sympathy for teachers anxious about their changed role. Some staff members questioned severing the school's traditional ties with the college's teacher education programs.

But most college faculty accepted the new arrangements. Many staff members were welcomed by college faculty and worked with the college's academic and teaching departments. Most eligible CRDG faculty have taken appointments to the graduate faculty.

Members of the EDRAD staff offered valuable support in establishing the unit but directed their efforts to their own agendas and styles of research once it was under way. The university itself afforded access to experts in disciplinary fields to cooperate on curriculum projects. We estimate that over 600 faculty in all branches of the university have contributed their expertise to developing curricula in a variety of CRDG projects. Their assistance was especially important because of our commitment to the disciplines of knowledge as the foundation of a common, general, and intellectual curriculum.

4. *Other Connections.* Representative Patsy Mink was our link to Congress and our spokesperson with influential Washington heads, from the president down through the educational hierarchy, including administrators of the Title III program. University people and CRDG staff members often went to Washington to consult with national leaders on our behalf.

In later years, we forged effective working arrangements with many of the state's independent schools, with international schools and schools in Micronesia, and with many schools on the U S mainland. Over 7,000 schools in forty-four states now participate as partners in using CRDG-developed programs. In more recent years, we formed partnerships with sixteen mainland universities who serve as centers for disseminating and adapting CRDG programs in their service areas.

Analysis of the CRDG's Longevity

The late 1950s and the 1960s were the high point of large-scale curriculum projects in the United States, Britain, Australia, and other countries. Few of the centers that mounted these projects still exist. Even national programs of support to curriculum development have either shut down or lost their financial backing.

Yet the CRDG has persisted, even gaining in the scope of its work and in the wider use of its programs in Hawai'i, on the U S mainland, and in some other countries. Can we learn something from reviewing this longevity?

In concluding this article, I present ten conditions that I believe account for the CRDG's success and its longevity. They issue from my years as the director of the CRDG, from dialogue with colleagues, and from my contacts with and observations of the curriculum development movement elsewhere.

Condition #1. The CRDG has received predictable, long-term support.

Most projects and multi-project centers that depended on short-term government grants have folded. Few have produced a stream of income from sale of materials and services to continue their work.

Condition #2. The CRDG has benefited from its allocation of permanent university positions, enabling it to build a core staff of career professionals.

Most projects have used personnel drawn from schools and universities on part-time appointments or as consultants for the duration of their grants. They rarely devote enough time to become career specialists in what I once referred to as “the world’s youngest profession.” CRDG’s key staff members have had the time to form insights into the curriculum development process and to become skilled in inventing curriculum-building strategies. The CRDG has also been able to build a corps of specialists—editors, artists, book designers, printers—to carry projects through to completion.

Condition #3. The CRDG’s endeavors benefit from its affiliation with the university.

In addition to financial backing and personnel, the university provides the R&D infrastructure and services to carry out projects expeditiously. The CRDG’s status as an organized research unit of the university gives it standing in academic circles.

Condition #4. The CRDG’s work is grounded in a sound and internally consistent theory for guiding curriculum development.

The CRDG has found direction in my theoretical work with Jack Brownell on *The Curriculum and the Disciplines of Knowledge: A Theory of Curriculum Practice* (Wiley 1966). This work meshed intellectual knowledge (the disciplines) with the practical work of the schools. It has been the base for continued theorizing and practical application over time, and is consistent with the current movement toward educational standards.

Condition #5. The CRDG began small, developing curriculum for the state’s schools.

Many early curriculum projects were assigned nationwide responsibility from the start. But the CRDG, charged with responsibility just for a small state, found that compactness, with direct communication, eased the tasks of designing, developing, testing, and debugging curricula and adding staff development programs before expanding to the national and international arenas.

Condition #6. The CRDG has allowed ample time for development, trials, and revisions.

A typical CRDG project allows five to eight years for initial development, trial, and early revisions of a comprehensive program. The more successful programs are usually revised after five years or so by the initial and still-intact development team.

Condition #7. The CRDG has found its dedicated laboratory school vital to its mission.

In the University Laboratory School, senior and junior developers work with students until they are satisfied with the results. Once ideas and materials pass initial levels of

satisfaction, they are shared with cooperating schools. The laboratory school keeps the project models alive and serves as a base for evaluation, for visitation, for training, and for subsequent revisions.

Condition #8. The CRDG has been able to learn from the mistakes of other curriculum pioneers.

The CRDG started its work in 1966, when many American projects were available as models. The CRDG staff studied these projects, analyzing their work, their resources, their gaps, and their successes. The CRDG brought to Hawai’i a number of leaders of the still new but complete science programs to serve as members of advisory panels, and sometimes as writer/developers.

Condition #9. The CRDG has a number of independent projects.

Because most project centers completed only one or a very few programs, they had limited opportunity to learn from others. But the CRDG has had concurrent projects in several areas of the curriculum, thereby permitting staff members to learn from each other, and, as a result, shortening the learning curve.

Condition #10. The CRDG has the capacity to adapt to changing standards and conditions, adding new tasks and adapting existing ones to achieve its goals.

At first we naively assumed that once we had developed, tested, and refined a curriculum, it would find its way into schools by means unknown to us but assumed to be in place. We quickly learned that getting programs into schools is a critical part of curriculum work. So we gradually undertook other activities. Printing and publishing came first, along with professional development and follow-up support to teachers and schools. (We have had little success in contracting with educational publishers. None were willing to arrange for teacher in-service training, which we came to believe was essential for programs intended to change habits of teaching and learning.)

Circumstances favored the CRDG as it created and sustained a successful and relatively permanent center for curriculum research and development, professional improvement for teachers, and support to schools. Perhaps the lessons the CRDG has learned and the conditions that have sustained it can guide others who build experimental schools and project centers.

Arthur R King Jr is director of the Curriculum, Research and Development Group at the University of Hawai’i at Mānoa. He is the author, with John A Brownel, of the *Curriculum and the Disciplines of Knowledge: A Theory of Curriculum Practice*.

Educational Perspectives: The First Ten Years

Hunter McEwan

The first issue of *Educational Perspectives* appeared in February, 1962. It was undoubtedly an exciting time to launch a new journal. The State of Hawai'i was almost, but not quite, fully three years old. President Kennedy was entering the second year of his administration, the University of Hawaii was on the threshold of a dynamic period of robust growth, and measures contained in the National Defence Education Act of 1958 were beginning to exert their influence on schools and colleges of education.

Dick Alm, the first editor of the journal, identified several significant changes that were then taking place at the university (Vol 1, No 3, p 3). The fall enrollment had reached 9,000 students, and the summer session of that year had played host to as many as 10,000. Doctoral degrees were being offered in 16 fields and master's degrees in 50. Gifts and grants to the university, for the first time, exceeded one million dollars. A communication center was in the process of being developed offering the promise of state-wide educational television. The East-West Center, which had been established in September 1960, and housed in temporary quarters, had attracted 500 grantees, many of whom were enrolled in university programs, including a large number at the College. The University supported Peace Corp programs in Borneo, Sarawak, and the Philippines. The College had also won several federal contracts to provide vocational education training in Thailand and Pakistan. A number of College courses were being offered on Kwajalein.

The university, in the words of the editor, had reached a "turning point" and was even, he conjectured, at the point of entering a "Golden Age." The university could look forward to a new administration under the Presidency of Thomas Hale Hamilton from the State University of New York, who was due to assume his official duties in January 1963. George W Woolard has just been appointed as the first director of the Hawaiian Institute for Geophysics. And, finally, the Mānoa Senate had been reorganized with a new Charter in place that empowered the faculty to take a more active leadership role in student affairs and curriculum matters.

Reading the early articles, one is struck by the sense of faculty assurance in the prospects of the University and College. A forward thinking outlook prevails, and the authors present an optimistic outlook for the future of the College, and appear eager to accept the challenges presented by so many new projects and programs. The journal itself is another product of this expansive outlook: a viewpoint reflected in the content of two of the three issues in Volume I,

which are devoted to the topic of international education.

Planning for the journal had been under way for some years. Hubert Everly, Dean of the College at the time, refers to this period of gestation in his inaugural editorial: "In the talking and planning stages for a number of years, this journal is the product of many minds and many hands" (Vol 1 No 1, p 2). The late Albert Carr, assistant editor and one of the journal's founders, recalls that there were many meetings held to plan the journal and that it was launched with the support of Dean Everly and financial assistance from several local businesses that purchased space for advertisements. Responsibility for securing external sponsorship was the job of Lowell Jackson, who served as Business Manager. In 1964, by the time the seventh issue was ready to print, Dean Everly had secured sufficient funding for the journal, and the ads were dropped.

The group most closely involved in planning and launching the journal included Richard Alm, Robert Clopton, Albert Carr, Shizuko Ouchi, Ralph Stueber, Lowell Jackson, Thelma McIntosh, Myrtle Gustafson, and Gill Sax. They saw the journal as multifunctional. In the words of Al Carr, "it was a place for local authors; a place to deal with local issues and a place for better student writings, and writings from scholars on the mainland" (Interview). An additional, unstated aim of the planning group was to use the journal as an outlet for faculty research. The requirement to get published was made more urgent by the increasing emphasis being placed on research at Mānoa.

Hubert Everly, similarly, regarded the journal as serving several purposes. First, it was "a vehicle for the dissemination of the views of (the State of Hawai'i's) professional educators" (Vol 1, No 1, p 2). This important function aimed to fill the void left by the "unfortunate demise" of the Hawai'i Educational Review (HER) which stopped publication in June, 1954. HER was the official, professional organ of the Department of Education. Started in 1913, HER was published monthly (except for July and August) with the aim of helping teachers keep abreast of educational innovations and to help publicize local developments.

The second purpose was to provide a forum for the educators of Hawai'i. The journal was not to be viewed narrowly as a "house organ, limited to the affairs of the College" (p 2). Its aim was to encourage a broad level of professional participation and become a place where "critical educational issues could be debated and explored in print" (p 2). In addition, the journal should not be limited to merely

local concerns that would promote a solely provincial outlook, but it should raise important issues and relate matters of educational importance to the national scene. *Educational Perspectives* would connect local solutions to a broad base of informed opinion, educational scholarship and research findings.

The third purpose was to draw on a diversity of opinion to promote a conversation on educational practice and aims. The journal, however, was not to become limited by a narrow or exclusively local outlook but take advantage of “professional interchange” and learn how to profit from other educators about “‘how things are done’ in their own lands” (p 2).

The title, “Educational Perspectives”, was deliberately chosen to reflect these aims. The use of the plural, ‘perspectives,’ as Robert W Clopton wrote in the opening article, “Perspectives in Education-1962,” was to be taken seriously:

While any matter must be seen in perspective if we are to derive meaning from our observation, a subject as intricate and as complex as education must be viewed from many points of view, must be seen in many perspectives (p 3).

The diversity of outlook and opinion sought by the journal would be supplied by various disciplinary approaches and by the variety of professional viewpoints supplied by contributors from within as well as beyond the College of Education. Thus, the first issue includes contributions from several College faculty, a supervisor at the University High School, and two outside scholars. This commitment to making the journal more than a “mere house organ” has been consistently applied over the 38 years of its operation. In addition, the articles are chosen to represent a wide range of different academic perspectives.

Robert Clopton’s opening essay illustrates the view from the Department of the History and Philosophy of Education. In his scheme, educational matters can best be explored from the disciplinary perspectives of history, philosophy, and psychology. Important educational insights can also be obtained through an international comparative perspective. His article reads like a manifesto of the foundational disciplines of education at a time when the Department was soon to adopt “Educational Foundations” as its new title:

The combined efforts of all of these men and women make it possible for us to utilize new points of vantage from which to see our problems in clearer perspective (p 23).

In keeping with the theme articulated by Clopton, other authors offer their contributions from other distinct disciplinary viewpoints. Bryce Perkins, of Norwalk School District in Connecticut, describes a successful program that made use of team teaching with teachers and paraprofessionals. Robert E Grinder, Assistant Professor of Education at the University of

Wisconsin and a former member of the Psychology Department at UH, explains developments in educational technology. His article is liberally peppered with the names of exotic “teaching machines” with quaint titles that sound as if they were fetched from the pages of a Dick Tracy comic: the Atronic Tag, Autoscore, Konzept-O-Graph, Min/Max and Videosonic, to name a few. His article, written 38 years ago, is uncannily accurate about current trends:

Advances in molecular electronics and micromillimeter circuitry are destined to make obsolete the cumbersome models in use today. Simulating gigantic computers, miniature teaching machines of tomorrow will obtain vastly improved communication possibilities. Instead of a wooden desk, the teacher will sit behind an electronic console as awesome as that of a jet pilot (Vol 1, No 1, p 27.)

Walter A Wittich, who was to become the College’s first Chair of the Department of Educational Technology, writes on the subject of educational television, arguably the most important “teaching machine” of the time. He explains how it is set to transform educational opportunities in Hawai’i as it had already begun to do in other states. Ruth E M Wong’s contribution explains the new secondary mathematics curriculum and the “increased involvement of university scholars in the development of new curricula” (p 15); Albert B Carr describes various elementary school science education programs being promoted by the Inter-Society Education Council of the Hawaiian Academy of Sciences. The final article, by Francis E Clark, deals with the impact of the National Defence Education Act on guidance and counseling programs in the U S in general and Hawai’i in particular. Two book reviews complete the issue: one on language arts and one on gifted education.

Though these articles were written several years before the College adopted it’s present departmental structure, they are notably compatible with departmental specializations - foundations, technology, math curriculum, science education, literacy, psychology, counseling and guidance, and exceptionalities.

Two more issues appeared in 1962. The second and third issues were devoted to the theme of international education and illustrate the growth of programs in the College. They present a detailed picture of the expanding role of the College and University in educational development in Asia and the Pacific.

Volume 2, which followed in 1963, dealt with the theme of censorship and included a reprint of a pamphlet published by the National Council for the Teaching of English: *The Students’ Right to Read*. The report underscored “the grave dangers of censorship and suggest(ed) a positive program of action.” This was a theme close to the editor’s heart and arose out of his associations with the National Council of

Teachers of English (NCTE). Richard Alm was president of the NCTE, at the time, and in 1964 he became editor of one of its principal publications, the *English Journal*.

Volume 2, Number 2 of the journal includes a shortened version of Thomas Hale Hamilton's inaugural address as President of the University. Hamilton deals with a question that is of current interest: What makes a university great? In his address, "A City Drenched in Light," Hamilton points to four critical elements as essential to making a university great: resources; "the environment of a large community of which the university is but a part (and) a conditioning element;" time ("A university does not achieve excellence overnight") and a sense of common purpose, shared by all who make up the university community. "I shall use my influence," he vows, "as other have and will, to see the University exhibits poise, and maturity, and self-respect" (p 12).

In 1964, *Educational Perspectives* began to publish four issues a year rather than three. This established a pattern that was to continue until 1982. Volume 3, No 1 explored a variety of educational topics, including one by Alexander Pickens, who was soon to assume the editorship, entitled "Toward A New Education in Art." In Volume 3, No 2, Richard Alm presented his valedictory editorial. He reports that the journal is in good health and that 31 of the contributions to the journal have come from "College of Education faculty, 6 are from other university divisions, 2 from public schools, and 7 from the mainland" (p 2). Several articles had found their way into other publications, such as *Educational Digest* and *Occupational Outlook*. In addition, the first three years of the journal had witnessed many changes in the College. Nine new departments were now responsible to the Dean, and a Bureau of Educational Research had been established. Several more changes were on the horizon. Wist Annex Two was to be built with funds authorized by the 1963 legislature, and the faculty were "engaged in a study of the administrative structure of the College, from which, it was anticipated, a new pattern of organization would emerge" (p 2).

Alexander Pickens took over as editor in 1964. His first issue, Volume 3, No 3, included four articles: science, math, language arts, and technology education. Pickens' editorial statement in Volume 3, No 4, published in December 1964, provides some illuminating insights into the future direction of the journal. First, he credits Dr Richard Alm, using a familiar image of the time, for his persistent efforts "to provide 'lift-off' for this vehicle which has become a significant publication in the state" (p 2). Secondly, Pickens describes a direction which was to become the hallmark of his approach: instituting a system that facilitated the production of four issues each year by encouraging College faculty to become guest editors. Robert Reed, Associate Director of

the Communications Center, was to be the guest editor for Volume 3, No 4. Mel Ezer, Professor of Education in the Department of Educational Foundations, was to "carry the ball" on the following issue (Volume 4, No 1), which was to report on the early work of the East-West Center. Eloise Hayes, Associate Editor and Professor in the Department of Elementary Education, was making progress on an issue on the theme of Creativity and the Creative Arts in Education (Volume 4, No 2). Ralph Stueber, Professor in the Department of Educational Foundations, and Lowell Jackson, Professor in the Department of Educational Administration, meanwhile, were collaborating on an issue to be published in October 1965 (Volume 4, No 3) which would deal with policy issues and decision making. Other issues were planned on the theme of laboratory schools on the university campus and research in education.

The journal is notable for the variety of themes it has addressed and in the disciplinary diversity of authors that it has published, many of whom were recognized scholars in their fields. In the first ten years of publication, for example, the journal dealt with a broad range of themes on such topics as educational television (Volume 3, No 4), special education (Volume 5, No 2), the role of museums in education (Volume 6, No 1), and the student movement (Volume 8, No 2). Contributors often came from far afield: Bong Soo Eun wrote on the subject of education in Korea (Volume 4, No 1, p 6); Chanthanom Manophars, on education in Laos (Volume 7, No 4, p 7); and Torsten Husen on educational research in Europe (Volume 5, No 1, p 11). Many of the authors were internationally respected researchers in education: J N Hook contributed an article on Project English (Volume 2, No 2, p 9); Dewey, on Creative Dramatics (Volume 4, No 2, p 3); Lindley Stiles on educational research (Volume 5, No 1) and Ralph Tyler on innovation in Schools and Colleges (Volume 5, No 1).

Dewey's contribution may seem unusual, considering that he died in 1952, but the story of how it came to appear in *Educational Perspectives* is an interesting one and worth retelling. The previously unpublished fragment on the theme of creative dramatics was taken from Dewey's lectures delivered at Peking National University in China in 1919. The excerpt was translated into English by Hu Shih from notes "interpreted into Chinese, from the rostrum," and published in Chinese in the *Peking Morning Post* in 1920. The process whereby this document came to be published in English is given a fuller treatment in Clopton's article, "Dewey in China", which appeared in the issue of *Educational Perspectives* immediately preceding the one on creative dramatics. "Dewey in China" (Volume 4, No 1, pp 15-17) provides a detailed picture of the "atmosphere of receptiveness" that prevailed in China at that time for Western ideas and particularly for the ideas of Dewey, who received an

“enthusiastic public response” that persuaded him to lengthen his stay in China from four weeks to 26 months. Dewey’s lectures, held in at least 11 provinces, were widely printed in newspapers and periodicals. He spoke in English, with the lectures being “interpreted into ‘pai-hua’, sentence by sentence,” by Hu Shih, who had been one of Dewey’s doctoral students at Colombia and who was, at the time of Dewey’s visit, a prominent philosopher in China. Various people, including at least one newspaper editor, took dictation as Hu Shih interpreted. The article on creative dramatics appeared in the journal courtesy of Robert Clopton, who had visited with Dewey’s widow in 1960, and searched Dewey’s papers to see if any records remained of the English version of the lectures. He found that they had been lost. Clopton was responsible for editing the lectures back into English—a project he had undertaken with the assistance of Tsuin-Chen Ou and Chung-ming Lu at the Institute for Advanced Projects at the East-West Center.

Undoubtedly, *Educational Perspectives* represents a valuable College resource: it provides an important record of College projects and programs and offers a well-documented and sustained commentary on many of the issues that have preoccupied College faculty during a period of almost 40 years. Often, these themes have dealt with the College’s various reform efforts and offer details on new programs and initiatives, such as the issues devoted to educational research (Volume 6, No 3), the Educational Research and Development Center (Volume 5, No 1), and the College’s new teacher preparation programs (Volume 8, No 4). Some articles focus on more mundane aspects of College business, though sometimes they are enlivened by the willingness of faculty to tackle much broader and often controversial, issues such as the student protest movement (Volume 8, No 2) and educational decision-making in Hawai’i (Volume 4, No. 3).

Volume 6, No 2, edited by Ann Keppel (June 1967), explores a controversial university-wide theme on the sensitive matter of student evaluations of faculty teaching. This was plainly a *cause célèbre* for students, and an unsurprising one, given the increase in student activism of the time. Nevertheless, it was the source of considerable faculty soul searching and led to heated debate in various faculty forums. The level of cynicism and exasperation felt by students towards efforts to improve university teaching nationwide is illustrated pithily in the editorial: “The faculty is out of touch with students. Many wouldn’t recognize an undergraduate if they saw one” (p 2).

Nevitt Sanford, Professor of Psychology at Stanford University, offers a helpful introduction to the subject of the quality of university teaching, by placing the debate in the wider context of the responsibility of the university and faculty to its students. He presents a somewhat gloomy prognosis of the state of American universities, identifying

several “disintegrating forces” at work (p 9): the increase in departmentalization and specialization, absorption with research, pressure to cover content, the tyranny of grades, and the weakening of the connection between students and their teachers. He calls for a renewal of the student teacher relationship, challenging faculty to listen to students. “The student protest movements,” he adds, “are, fundamentally, a reflection of changed times, and they are a warning that colleges and universities must change” (p 24).

Robert Kamins speaks for the university administration’s efforts and explains how developments and student demands have impacted the University of Hawai’i at Mānoa. In the mid-50s a system of evaluating nontenured faculty members had been imposed by the university administration. Evidence suggested that the system was flawed and it “petered out” (p 17). Faculty, in particular, were skeptical of the validity of the rating system and felt that many students were lacking in discrimination and likely to confuse popularity tactics with good teaching.

In 1965, a presidential committee, composed of some exemplary teachers among the faculty, was set up to improve teaching at UH. The committee recommended, among other things, “student evaluation, for stimulating effective instruction” (p 17). The report provoked a heated discussion in the Senate and among the faculty. The doubters argued that students, in general, were not able to make sound judgments on teaching effectiveness, nor were they discriminating enough to distinguish good teaching from classroom entertainment. Concerns were expressed that evaluations would introduce “psychic disturbances” into the classroom (p 17). Finally, the opinion was advanced forcefully that student ratings would constitute a threat to academic freedom. In spite of these objections, Professor Abe Arkoff of the Psychology Department, who chaired the committee, drawing on work at other universities, pressed ahead in developing procedures for conducting ratings and tabulating the responses of students. Peter Dunn-Rankin and Guerin Fischer of the Educational Research and Development Center, both experts in evaluation techniques, were consulted and eventually developed a form that required students to respond to seven aspects of the completed course. In Fall 1966, faculty were invited to use the evaluation service in their courses. Only twenty-eight (out of a total of 1650) volunteered, in spite of being given control over the results. In spring 1967, 49 faculty requested the service.

Two graduate students, Linda Chang and Linda Delaney, describe a concurrent evaluation effort by UH students, which they describe as a “first and smallest step toward full student participation in academic policy and decision-making” (p 20). They condemn the idea of a one-sided conversation and present the students’ initiatives as independent of those of the faculty committee: as an effort to

“facilitate the development of a sense of an academic community” (p 20).

The ASUH set up a Faculty-Course Evaluation Committee in Fall 1966. The committee did a thorough job, reviewed a number of different instruments at use in other universities, and finally settled on the Purdue Rating Scale of Instruction (Level A) as the most suitable one for their purposes. Committee members hoped that the reputation of the form, particularly its reliability and its ease in being administered would encourage instructors to allow class time for the evaluation. If, however, this allowance was not possible, the “students would hand the forms to students as they enter the classroom and collect the forms as they leave” (p 23). The tone of the article, though restrained, suggests that the students were impatient with faculty stalling and the limited goals of the faculty committee: they point out that no students served on the committee. They were ready to set up their own procedures, evaluate all the courses, and publish the results (as students at the University of Washington had done), with or without faculty agreement.

A more conciliatory approach that represents the standpoints of both faculty and students is adopted by Ann Keppel in her article, “The Ivory Tower of Babel” (pp 3-6, 23). She asks some difficult questions about the nature of good university teaching, drawing attention to the complexity of the task and dangers involved in developing effective measures for evaluating faculty fairly. The article, nevertheless, after weighing the evidence adopts a position that is closer to the students, concluding that since “teaching is a joint enterprise” the students’ voices are important to a proper assessment of teaching” (p 24).

With the publication of Volume 10, No 4 in December 1971, on the arts in education, *Educational Perspectives* celebrated its 10th anniversary. In his editorial, Robert Clopton proudly announces that “ten years is the age of majority for a journal.” In addition, he celebrates the growth of the journal, which had endured “birth traumas, perils of childhood, awkwardness of adolescence, and had attained the vigor of adulthood (and a healthy, sustained circulation). At the end of its first decade, it can look forward to a reasonable secure existence” (p 2).

Clopton attributes the success of *Educational Perspectives* to the support - both moral and budgetary - of the College of Education and its faculty. By 1971, it had been awarded three “coveted national awards - one for cover design, one for a single theme issue, and one for photographic essays - by the prestigious Educational Press Association of America.” Clopton expresses satisfaction with the quality, scope and nature of contributions, and the diverse backgrounds of the contributors, who are made up of UH faculty and students as well as outside experts. He celebrates the growing circulation of the journal which, by 1972, included more than 200

libraries in America, Europe, and the Pacific.

Clopton alludes to the “careful advance planning” of each issue, which often occurred one year in advance. Efforts to keep the journal “on schedule” required “unrelenting nagging” from the editor. In addition, rigorous editing enabled the editor to present a range of expert opinion in each theme with an air of completeness of coverage and depth of treatment.

In sum, the journal had strived to live up to its name. It had tried hard to put the educational problems with which it dealt in proper *perspective*, in the hope that efforts to identify and expand on a theme were preferable to simplistic treatments of complex issues. Clopton is buoyant about the prospects for the journal over the second decade of its existence, and for its continuing growth.

The journal will celebrate its 40th year with the publication of the fall issue of 2001.

The “Stiles Report” and What it Recommended

Ralph Williams

In 1965, the third legislature State of Hawai‘i requested a review of teacher education at the University of Hawai‘i. At the time, considerable interest was being directed to matters of public education and teacher preparation, and this scrutiny resulted, in March 31, 1965 in an official request (House Resolution 25) to review programs at the University of Hawai‘i designed to prepare teachers and other educational personnel in Hawai‘i. The review would consider such topics as subject-matter training, breadth of education, the function and role of the Laboratory Schools, the effect of certification requirements on curriculum, and develop recommendations for improving the education of Hawai‘i’s future teachers at the University.

A Study Committee was assembled, and Dr Lindley J Stiles, Dean of the School of Education, University of Wisconsin, was asked to serve as consultant to the Committee. Dr David G Ryans and other staff members of the Education Research and Development Center (EDRAD), University of Hawai‘i, were to provide research assistance. The results of the study published by the Committee became known as “The Stiles Report.”

On 15 December 1965, the committee met to establish priorities and make plans to conduct the study based on those priorities. The final report of the committee was made on 17 January 1966. The recommendations were made under six general headings.

1. Role and Organization of the College of Education

The College of Education of the University of Hawai‘i came into existence by a unique route. Originally it was a Normal School operated by the Territorial Department of Education. In 1931, it became a part of the University and was placed under University control. The Normal School brought with it several teacher college traditions. For example, Teachers College, for a number of years after the merger, offered all the subject matter preparation required for prospective teachers. This practice was discontinued shortly after World War II. By the 60s, the trend in the College of Education was to move away from its Teachers College background toward unification within the University. The Education Research and Development Center’s interdisciplinary approach could be taken as an example of efforts by the College of Education to draw upon all the resources of the University to help to improve schools in Hawai‘i.

The report suggested that the College of Education be reorganized to become an upper division and graduate

school. The College’s role could be conceived as analogous to that of a holding company in a business enterprise, which would give “leadership to the coordination of all resources within the university to prepare educational personnel.” The report rejected the notion that the College of Education should be abolished and its responsibilities fragmented among other branches of the University.

The Committee also recommended that a university-wide council for teacher education be appointed by the President of the University and that it be composed of representatives of the various departments and schools that contribute to the preparation of teachers, with liaison representatives from the State Department of Education. This Council should become the highest policy-making body for the College of Education. The University-wide Council for Teacher Education became known as the TECC (Teacher Education Coordinating Council.) The Dean of UH College of Education and the State DOE Superintendent alternated as Chair. Representatives from BYU-Hawaii, Chaminade and UH-Hilo were added later. This Council would have the power to create similarly constituted subcommittees that would have special responsibility for making recommendations regarding courses in specific areas of specialization, such as mathematics. These sub-committees were in all the secondary school areas in which the college prepared teachers. The Business College, Agriculture College and the UH Community College System, particularly Honolulu Community College, were represented as well as the Colleges of Arts and Sciences. The College of Education Dean was responsible for recommending members for appointment by the President of UH.

2. Selection of Students.

The Report urged the university to limit admission to teacher preparation programs to those students who ranked in the upper half of the University population.

The Committee recognized the pressures on the University and the College of Education to admit a sufficient number of students to supply the teachers needed by the State, but it believed that it would be unwise and unprofessional to lower standards for professional preparation simply to satisfy market requirements.

3. The Program to Prepare Teachers

After a comparison of current programs at the University of Hawai‘i with patterns of preparation in other institutions across the nation, the Committee concluded that those programs at the University of Hawaii placed too much

emphasis on professional education course requirements, despite the fact that the amount of course work in liberal arts education and the subject fields was comparable to other institutions.

This state of affairs was based on the five-year length of the program for most teachers, and the fact that a total of 160 semester hours of credit were required.

	Before	Proposed Secondary	Proposed Elementary
Arts & Sciences	60	60	60
Subject field specialization	30-48	60	60
Professional Study			
Foundations	18	9	9
Methods	10	3	6
Clinical Experience	28	8	8
Electives	0-14	20	17-20

Of the approximately 20 hours of professional education courses, 9 would be devoted to foundational subjects (philosophy, psychology and history of education), with the remainder dedicated to subject-matter methods. The Committee did not support a course in introduction to education or a course in general methods of teaching. It was also recommended that the internship semester become a supervised induction into employment as a teacher, and was more properly a responsibility of the State Department of Education.

The College of Education was commended for having appointed a field service director to coordinate its efforts with those of the Department of Education.

4. Preparation of Educational Administrators and Other Educational Specialists.

The preparation of education administrators and other specialists for leadership in education was a growing responsibility of the College of Education and the University of Hawai'i. In 1965, 72 Master's degrees in education were awarded, compared with only one 10 years earlier. The Report found that the College of Education had followed sound principles in designing its graduate degree offerings and had acted in cooperation with the State Department of Education in developing the Professional Certificate Program for school administrators. Standards for completion of the Master's degree were prescribed by the Graduate School, and ranked high in comparison to similar standards for this degree in other institutions.

In 1965 the College awarded Master's degrees in educational administration, educational psychology, history and philosophy of education, elementary education, secondary education, and guidance. A Master's degree program in the field of communication, which included work in audio-visual education and educational television was also under consid-

eration. The graduate program in library science had recently been transferred to the new School of Library Science. The Committee considered the demand for Ph.D. degrees in certain specialized fields, and encouraged their development. It felt that the Department of Educational Psychology had the faculty strength to offer doctoral work.

The Committee recognized that the graduate programs offered by the College of Education, at the Master's degree level and anticipated to be offered at the Ph.D. level, were sound and worthy of support. In the future, additional programs would need to be developed as greater numbers of well-qualified teachers in Hawai'i chose graduate degree programs as the route to improvement in service.

The Committee suggested that the All-University Council on Teacher Education, which it had recommended be established, give attention to stimulating the expansion of graduate work for teachers and educational specialists.

5. In-service Education of Teachers.

The in-service education of teachers in Hawai'i was uniquely organized as a shared responsibility between the State Department of Education and the University of Hawai'i. A new incentive plan for teachers had been the objective of new legislation written with the aim of bringing about a rapid and substantial upgrading of the professional competence of DOE teachers. The Report warned, however, that these new requirements did not prescribe the kind of courses teachers should take beyond rather general categories; consequently, it might be possible for teachers to move from one incentive level to the next without taking the kind of training most suited to their professional assignments. The Report, therefore, recommended that the Department of Education evaluate carefully the quality of the training programs for which "B" credits were awarded. Workshops and other types of in-service experiences that offered such credits were often not held to the intellectual standards of university courses. Because many teachers would be taking courses for incentive increases in the "B" credit plan and the remainder in courses offered by UH, coordination between the two program would be vital.

The Report pointed out that no procedures existed to make certain that teachers did not repeat Department of Education workshops in the same field, e.g., reading, for "B" credits. Nor were there any safeguards to keep teachers from enrolling in a University course in the same subject in which Department of Education "B" credits had already been received. The program should not be permitted to degenerate into a credit collecting operation.

The Report offered the suggestion that every teacher in the incentive plan should formulate and submit to the school principal a long-term program of study. Latitudes for acceptable courses should be defined by the Department of

Education, in consultation with University specialists in each field, as a guide to principals. Study plans should be approved before enrollment for in-service courses. Progress toward completion of approved study plans would be taken into account in the annual evaluations of tenured teachers. The Committee endorsed the development of plans to bring teachers back to the campus of the University for a full year of advanced or renewal study.

6. The Roles and Functions of the University Schools.

The decision had already been made to change the role and functions of the Laboratory Schools of Hawai'i from a demonstration and teacher training school to a research center. This action, the Committee members believed, was needed if the laboratory schools were to continue to justify their existence.

The Committee believed that, in view of the growing emphasis on educational research and the increase in funding available for research in this field, the new roles and functions agreed upon for the University Schools were appropriate and should be supported. The new emphasis would not exclude the possibility that the lab schools would continue to provide certain services to departments of the University; but it did, however, place research and development activities as a first priority—the primary justification of the lab schools' existence. The paramount criterion for judging the success of the lab schools' new role would be the impact it would make on the quality of education throughout the State of Hawai'i. The Report recommended that operational and official links should be developed between the Laboratory Schools and public elementary schools. The purposes of these partnerships would be:

- to bring to the staff of the University the practical problems that confront teachers and school officials,
- to develop the field testing of programs and techniques developed in the laboratory schools and adapt them to the existing ranges of school situations, and
- to facilitate communication about and implement findings of research conducted by the University.

The interdisciplinary cooperation that prevailed in the Education Research and Development Center was viewed as an asset to the research that was being developed in the laboratory schools. The Committee believed that members of the subject-matter departments of the University could also contribute significantly to research and curriculum projects concerned with keeping elementary and secondary schools up to date and abreast of new knowledge. The location of the schools on the University campus would greatly facilitate the participation of professors in all fields.

The Report warned that research on educational problems, as with the research on other vital problems, may fail to produce useful knowledge. Faith and patience, and a

willingness to wait for the evidence to be accumulated, were necessary if research was to accomplish its mission. It also pointed out that the location of Hawai'i reduces the opportunities for school officials and teachers to cross state boundary lines to benefit from research conducted elsewhere. "This situation forces Hawaii to be more self-contained than is necessary in other states." The laboratory schools, centrally located as they are and attached to the University, represented an ideal facility for keeping teachers abreast of latest educational improvements.

A final reason advanced by the Committee in favor of supporting facilities for research and educational improvement within the University was the organizational character of the State and the central control of public education. The system intensified the need for research and evaluation of educational efforts by university scholars. Without research conducted by an independent agency, the dangers that educational plans and decisions would be shaped almost entirely by political forces was all too apparent.

Ralph Williams is a retired United States Navy Commander and former English teacher at University High School. His writings have been published in the *Hawaii Review*, *Rain Bird* and *Hawaii Pacific Review*.
