

Rollins College

## Rollins Scholarship Online

---

Books about Rollins College and Winter Park

Archives and Special Collections

---

1-1931

### Curriculum Conference Proceedings: Volume II

John Dewey

Follow this and additional works at: [https://scholarship.rollins.edu/archv\\_books](https://scholarship.rollins.edu/archv_books)



Part of the [Education Commons](#), and the [History Commons](#)

---

#### Recommended Citation

Dewey, John, "Curriculum Conference Proceedings: Volume II" (1931). *Books about Rollins College and Winter Park*. 40.

[https://scholarship.rollins.edu/archv\\_books/40](https://scholarship.rollins.edu/archv_books/40)

This Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Archives and Special Collections at Rollins Scholarship Online. It has been accepted for inclusion in Books about Rollins College and Winter Park by an authorized administrator of Rollins Scholarship Online. For more information, please contact [rwalton@rollins.edu](mailto:rwalton@rollins.edu).

PROCEEDINGS

CURRICULUM CONFERENCE

Volume II

Winter Park, Florida  
January 19-24, 1931

P R O C E E D I N G S

Rollins College  
"

CURRICULUM CONFERENCE

Volume II

Winter Park, Florida  
January 19-24, 1931

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

P a g e

Index of Speakers .....	xiii
-------------------------	------

---

Wednesday Morning Session,  
January 21, 1931.

Report of the Steering Committee .....	317
Function of the College of Liberal Arts .....	324
Discussion of Mode of Further Procedure .....	325
Meaning of a Liberal Arts Education .....	334
Appointment of Sub-Committee to discuss points submitted .....	348
Elaboration of Two of Dr. Watson's Fourteen Points .....	356
Discussion .....	372
Findings Committee .....	402
Further Discussion of 5a .....	407

Wednesday Evening Session,  
January 21, 1931.

Report of the Special Sub-Committee .....	419
Statement by Dr. Dewey .....	420
Teaching and Teaching Methods .....	428
Discussion of Special Curricula .....	432
Student Interests .....	434
Number of Subjects Students Take .....	460

9/14/81 HJ + P. B. B. B.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
<p>Wednesday Evening Session, January 21, 1931 (Continued)</p>	
Antioch College .....	468
Curricular Problems .....	472
<p>Thursday Morning Session, January 22, 1931</p>	
Appointment of the Findings Committee .....	505
Requirements .....	508
Cultivating the Student's Interest .....	512
Stevens Institute .....	514
Student Interest .....	520
Necessity for change of attitude of faculty and student body .....	539
Suggestion of different approach to the problem, by President Morgan .....	543
Progress of the Conference up to this point ....	556
Definition of Question under Discussion .....	559
Point 2 under 5a .....	560
<p>Thursday Evening Session, January 22, 1931</p>	
Statement by Dr. Dewey .....	576
Discussion of Further Procedure .....	578
Discussion: The college of liberal arts should be put on an accomplishment rather than a time basis .....	579



INDEX OF SPEAKERS

DEAN ANDERSON:

Wednesday Evening Session:

Pages 487, 488.

PROFESSOR BAILEY:

Wednesday Morning Session:

Pages 335, 344, 347, 348, 349, 380, 395, 407.

Wednesday Evening Session:

Pages 438, 448, 472.

Thursday Morning Session:

Pages 505, 521, 550, 558, 563, 567, 568, 569, 572.

Thursday Evening Session:

Pages 579, 602.

DR. BANCROFT:

Wednesday Morning Session:

Page 408.

Wednesday Evening Session:

Page 500.

Thursday Morning Session:

Pages 518, 574.

Thursday Evening Session:

Pages 592, 593, 601, 606, 607.

DR. CREESE:

Wednesday Morning Session:

Page 334.

INDEX OF SPEAKERS

DR. CREESE (Continued):

Thursday Morning Session:

Pages 506, 514, 517, 518.

Thursday Evening Session:

Page 582.

DEAN DAWSON:

Wednesday Evening Session:

Pages 478, 485, 498, 504.

Thursday Evening Session:

Pages 588, 589, 594.

DR. DEWEY:

Wednesday Morning Session:

Pages 317, 320, 327, 328, 331, 335, 336, 340, 341, 344,  
345, 347, 349, 353, 354, 355, 361, 364, 366, 372,  
373, 379, 388, 390, 394, 397, 404, 405, 406, 407,  
418.

Wednesday Evening Session:

Pages 419, 420, 432, 433, 441, 444, 447, 448, 454, 455,  
456, 464, 469, 471, 472, 473, 478, 486, 491, 493,  
498, 503, 504.

Thursday Morning Session:

Pages 505, 506, 507, 519, 529, 531, 537, 548, 549, 555,  
556, 559, 560, 569, 575.

Thursday Evening Session:

Pages: 576, 577, 578, 579, 580, 581, 582, 583, 585, 594,  
600, 603, 604, 605, 611, 612.

INDEX OF SPEAKERS

DEAN DOERSCHUK:

Wednesday Morning Session:

Pages 348, 349, 351, 354, 388.

Wednesday Evening Session:

Page 504.

Thursday Morning Session:

Page 560.

Thursday Evening Session:

Page 605, 606, 608.

DR. ELLIS:

Wednesday Morning Session:

Pages 328, 329, 331, 339, 340, 349, 351, 352, 363,  
393, 394, 396, 404.

Wednesday Evening Session:

Pages 420, 453, 454, 455, 456, 457, 464, 473, 487,  
493, 497, 498, 504.

Thursday Morning Session:

Pages 505, 506, 531, 532, 538, 539, 540, 542, 549,  
555, 571, 572.

Thursday Evening Session:

Pages: 581, 583, 585, 586, 593, 595, 596, 598, 601,  
602, 603, 604, 605, 606, 609.

MR. GAVIT:

Wednesday Morning Session:

Pages 325, 405.



## INDEX OF SPEAKERS

### MR. GAVIT (Continued):

#### Wednesday Evening Session:

Pages 434, 439, 443, 447, 456, 457, 465, 468, 470,  
487, 488.

#### Thursday Morning Session:

Pages 506, 508, 510, 517, 518, 521, 525, 531, 532,  
557, 561, 568.

#### Thursday Evening Session:

Pages 582, 583, 584, 592, 593, 594, 596, 601, 604,  
605, 608, 611, 612.

### DR. GEORGIA:

#### Wednesday Morning Session:

Pages 354, 355, 407.

#### Wednesday Evening Session:

Pages 441, 464.

#### Thursday Morning Session:

Page 531.

#### Thursday Evening Session:

Pages 585, 590, 592, 593, 594, 595, 596, 602, 604,  
612.

### DR. HART:

#### Wednesday Morning Session:

Pages 322, 334, 335, 346, 351, 366, 379, 380, 386,  
393, 395, 398, 399, 400.

#### Wednesday Evening Session:

Pages 430, 464, 471, 481, 487, 492.

INDEX OF SPEAKERS

DR. HART (Continued):

Thursday Morning Session:

Pages 510, 530, 541, 547, 549, 555, 556, 562, 563.

Thursday Evening Session:

Pages 578, 579, 580, 581, 582, 583, 602, 604, 611,  
612.

PRESIDENT HOLT:

Wednesday Morning Session:

Pages 324, 329, 330, 331, 333, 335, 336, 337, 344, 347,  
348, 355, 385.

Wednesday Evening Session:

Pages 432, 438, 448, 472, 487, 488, 495, 504.

Thursday Morning Session:

Pages 506, 507, 512, 517, 540, 541, 553, 560.

Thursday Evening Session:

Pages 579, 582, 585, 586, 590, 595, 596, 603, 604, 605.

DEAN McCONN:

Wednesday Morning Session:

Pages 317, 328, 330, 344, 348, 349, 350, 351, 355.

Wednesday Evening Session:

Pages 432, 451, 465, 471, 502, 503.

Thursday Morning Session:

Pages 505, 522, 528.

Thursday Evening Session:

Pages 594, 595, 608.

## INDEX OF SPEAKERS

### PRESIDENT MORGAN:

#### Wednesday Morning Session:

Pages 335, 336, 337, 345, 366, 375, 381, 382, 391,  
396, 397, 398, 399, 400.

#### Wednesday Evening Session:

Pages 431, 439, 456, 466, 469, 470, 471, 473, 475,  
477, 478, 483, 484, 485, 496.

#### Thursday Morning Session:

Pages 536, 543, 547, 549, 550, 552, 554, 555, 556,  
563, 565, 566, 572.

#### Thursday Evening Session:

Pages 577, 579, 585, 586, 589, 592, 602, 603, 606.

### DR. ROBINSON:

#### Wednesday Morning Session:

Pages 330, 402, 404.

#### Wednesday Evening Session:

Pages 428, 438, 460, 464, 496.

#### Thursday Morning Session:

Page 526.

#### Thursday Evening Session:

Pages 578, 609, 611.

### PRESIDENT WARREN:

#### Wednesday Morning Session:

Pages 326, 334, 337, 340, 363, 365, 381, 382, 389,  
395, 396, 399.

INDEX OF SPEAKERS

PRESIDENT WARREN (Continued):

Wednesday Evening Session:

Pages 438, 450, 458, 472, 473, 474, 475, 477, 480,  
484, 487, 488, 500, 501.

Thursday Morning Session:

Pages 549, 560.

Thursday Evening Session:

Pages 586, 603.

DR. WATSON:

Wednesday Morning Session:

Pages 329, 333, 338, 345, 348, 351, 352, 354, 356,  
361, 364, 366, 368, 372, 378, 380, 381, 384,  
388, 389, 390, 392, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397,  
401, 404, 406.

Wednesday Evening Session:

Pages 442, 449, 450, 482.

Thursday Morning Session:

Pages 520, 521, 539, 551, 559, 561, 562, 563, 565,  
566, 574.

Thursday Evening Session:

Page 581.

FACULTY AND STUDENTS:

Wednesday Morning Session:

Prof. Richard Feuerstein - Page 364.

Wednesday Evening Session:

Wallace Goldsmith - - Page 444  
Charles Mills - - - " 488  
Richard Wilkerson - - " 488  
Reverend Major - - - " 491

WEDNESDAY MORNING SESSION

January 21, 1931

The meeting convened at nine forty-five o'clock, Dr. Dewey presiding.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: I will ask Dean McConn to make a report from the Steering Committee.

DEAN McCONN: The Committee has given it thought since the last meeting and has several suggestions to offer for the Conference, these suggestions being uncorrelated but representing different possible attacks.

First, at the close of the meeting yesterday afternoon, the suggestion was made that there might be some elaboration of each one of the fourteen points to get the proposals with reference to material and the presentation of that material under each of those points more concretely before the Conference. Some objection was expressed or suggested to that on the grounds of the amount of time that would be involved.

It occurred to the Committee that it might be well to ask Dr. Watson at the beginning of this morning's session to pick out and present in the manner suggested, some one, an elaboration of some one of the fourteen points, with the idea that possibly such an elaboration of one of the points might serve the purpose as illustrating what was intended in a parallel way for the rest, or that when that was

done, we might wish to proceed with having the others elaborated by different members of the Conference as originally suggested, and that could be done after one illustrative presentation had been made.

Assuming that we accepted one illustrative presentation as sufficient, or even if we should go on with the rest, after that the Committee was inclined to feel that we might be fully ripe for an attack on the question distributed yesterday afternoon and styled "5a."

The Committee has also prepared and will distribute a little later this morning a list, not of questions this time, but of topics which we have headed "Some Definite Curricular Problems," a list of topics in which we have analyzed some of the specific, detailed, mechanical problems of curriculum-making which sooner or later this Conference must attack and it seemed to us at some fairly early point in our discussion we might want to jump to that other pole of the discussion, the definite devices even which we must later be concerned with and that it might be desirable to have a tentative list of some of them in the hands of the Committee at about this date. That, as I say, will be distributed later, and at the same time we shall distribute a typewritten list of Dr. Watson's fourteen points, and a typewritten summary also of the various student interests which at certain earlier stages we analyzed. Those also are just for convenient

reference.

Certainly our most important suggestion, one which has come up again and again in the Committee, not only on the part of members of the Committee itself, but of other members of the Conference who have sat with us, is that we want to ask that at some early stage in the Conference Dr. Dewey will endeavor to sum up the essence of what we have so far explored, and contribute to it from his own philosophy in general and philosophy of education. We hesitated to spring that on Dr. Dewey, but we finally did this morning and he has, if I understood him correctly, agreed that he will do something of that sort or try to do something of the sort, probably not at this morning's conference certainly, nor probably today, but we have hopes that he will undertake to do it perhaps at the beginning of the session tomorrow morning or at some early date.

When that was sprung on Dr. Dewey, he countered with a suggestion that the various members of the Conference, going around the table, as I understood him, be asked at some early stage of the proceedings to summarize briefly, each one, what seemed to him or her to be the essential things that have come out of it so far, and the outstanding points that remain.

Those, Mr. Chairman, are the ideas which the Committee wishes to contribute as possible measures of procedure.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: You have heard the report of the Committee and unless there is objection or discussion, we will take it for granted that we will follow the general line of procedure suggested. I might say, regarding that latter point that I think it might be well in going around the table to have each person state somewhat briefly what he or she regards as the most important, crucial central point of issue for discussion, not in the form of a conclusion, but in the form of the strategic question or issue about which other questions turn more or less, the key, the issue as it is not necessarily exactly defined, but as seems to be indicated the source of differences of opinion and points that might divide or which has to be settled before we could reach agreement.

President Holt remarked to me before the Conference met at all, in fact, when he first spoke about it, that a group of people always have to spend a certain amount of time simply getting acquainted with each other intellectually, each other's points of view, and that it might be a mistake to attempt to gain an appearance of efficiency by too much definiteness before this feeling-out process had gone on, and it seemed to me that was a very sound and wise remark, but I think we all feel that we have spent these two days in that necessary preliminary process and about a third of our time is gone, so now we must, if possible, get down to somewhat more specific and definite issues than we have been considering up



to this time and the object of this morning's meeting, or at least the hope of the morning's meeting is that we shall be able to accomplish that in the trend of the discussion.

The first suggestion of the Committee was that we hear from Dr. Watson on some one point as an illustration.

DR. HART: Personally, I don't think we are even yet in any position to deal with Dr. Watson's material in any other way than would tend to make it in the long run seem to be just an analysis of certain aspects of the present curriculum. I should like to go back to a certain statement, momentarily, which President Holt made at the opening of this Conference, that the hope of the Rollins group was not that we should work out a curriculum, but that we should lay down broad, general principles within which and by means of which curricular materials might be determined, and I don't believe that we have actually tackled that job yet.

It seems to me as though this particular aspect of the subject has got to be postponed until such time as we get some kind of background such as might come out if we raised the question, not why this particular Conference was called here, but why the problem of curriculum has arisen at all. This Conference, of course, is an expression of that difficulty, and I am so profoundly concerned that what happens here shall be something that cannot be immediately assimilated to the present organized and standardized curriculum, but that it shall represent an actual creative contribution to this whole problem of college education today, that it seems to me that we get ourselves involved in the discussion of specific materials and then we will be concerned with that until the end of the week and we shall go away leaving behind no adequate

suggestion of the enormous social conditions out of which this problem has arisen or with respect to which its conclusions are to be amplified.

I don't know just how to go about bringing that about. It may be that no one else here feels that, but I feel it very keenly.

PRESIDENT HOLT: I think Dr. Hart's suggestion is very wise. I don't think we ought to go ahead to the fourteen points until we go back of them, and though this is possibly quite elementary, I should like to suggest first that we define in our own minds, if we can, what is the function of the college of liberal arts, and, merely as a matter of suggestion, I put down these five functions:

1. The transmission of knowledge.
2. The development of abilities.
3. The maturing of character.

These are manifestly something that the college gives to the students. In addition to this I believe we should have:

4. The extension of knowledge.
5. Public service.

If we should agree on some such division of the function of the college of liberal arts into these five or other functions, then it would seem to me we could take up the question of the transmission of knowledge, how much knowledge, and all that should be transmitted. The other four points would come naturally from that, and that would bring up the whole question of the conventional systems or the other systems; but if we keep these five points in mind, and they are entirely different, it seems to me those are the functions of a college of liberal arts.

MR. GAVIT: Mr. Chairman, I have one suggestion to make. It has been a disappointment to me from the beginning that we haven't had with us the man who most conspicuously represents a movement, if he doesn't himself claim to have accomplished it, the only one I know of that has taken the old conventional curriculum exactly by its motheaten whiskers and pronounced its real name. So far as I know, the curriculum of Antioch College is the only one that has pulled the thing up by its roots.

Dr. Morgan, the President of Antioch, is here this morning for the first time and he makes it unnecessary for me to do what I have wanted to do from the beginning and that is, place in evidence that curriculum. I don't know whether this is the time he would want to speak or whether you would regard it as timely, but I hope at some stage pretty soon that will be presented to us.

PRESIDENT WARREN: Mr. Chairman, I am wondering if one of our difficulties so far hasn't been the difficulty of trying to generalize. Unless we have something specific to bite our teeth into, as it were, to serve as a starting point, I don't see why we couldn't take one at least of these fourteen points, not as a beginning, for a specific going over of the whole curriculum, but just as something definite to start with so that we may see to what extent we could integrate the three fields of interest from a practical viewpoint of interest and necessity for understanding life and traditional curriculum material, and from that very distinctly keep from taking all the fields up, but from that begin to generalize and begin to work out perhaps the objectives of a college as we go along. It is very hard to deal with the question in a generalized form. My idea would be if we could take this up - for one thing we have entries enough now so we could approach some one field or some one topic and see what frightens us about change and to what extent such a change would be very radical if it were to more closely correspond to interests and to social needs.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: I think it would be well to have an expression of opinion from everyone here as to the method of procedure. There may be more differences of opinion, while they would be welcomed, than I had anticipated.

One of my remarks was open to misinterpretation. When I said "give each a turn," I did not mean discussing curriculum. I agree with Dr. Hart that would be unwise, but I agree we have discussed the thing in general terms quite as long as is desirable. While we want to continue the discussion of principles, we need to carry on the discussion from now on in somewhat more definite terms, as President Warren just said.

I suppose we would all agree that the function of the liberal college is the transmission of knowledge. Now the question is what knowledge is to be transmitted and what point of view, and it seems to me we would be back very much under these three heads, whether the knowledge to be transmitted be selected from the standpoint of interest, from the standpoint of social needs, or from the standpoint of the orthodox conventional classification of knowledge and the relation of these to each other.

Personally I didn't understand that the suggestion was that Dr. Watson present us with a curriculum, but more specific treatment of some of the subject matter from a particular point of view so we could get the issue more

concretely before us. I may have understood the matter wrongly.

DEAN McCONN: That was the intention of the Steering Committee.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: Dr. Ellis, what is your suggestion?

DR. ELLIS: I wasn't here at the first meeting so I probably haven't caught up yet. My own feeling is we have plunged into the details before we thought our way through to principles which could guide us, which involves going clear back and starting over again on a somewhat tacit assumption that education should be a working out of the students' interests. We spent a very profitable period discussing those interests, but it seems to me we should go back and see where would students' interests fit into the whole picture, if at all.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: Dr. Ellis, do you think we can more profitably discuss principles without closer connection with details from this point on, details that would illustrate what these things mean? It is very easy to agree on general principles as long as we don't translate them.

DR. ELLIS: I don't think it would be easy for this group to agree on them. (Laughter) We haven't any principles clearly before us as yet.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: Can we get them and know what



WEDNESDAY MORNING SESSION

January 21, 1931

The meeting convened at nine forty-five o'clock, Dr. Dewey presiding.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: I will ask Dean McConn to make a report from the Steering Committee.

DEAN McCONN: The Committee has given it thought since the last meeting and has several suggestions to offer for the Conference, these suggestions being uncorrelated but representing different possible attacks.

First, at the close of the meeting yesterday afternoon, the suggestion was made that there might be some elaboration of each one of the fourteen points to get the proposals with reference to material and the presentation of that material under each of those points more concretely before the Conference. Some objection was expressed or suggested to that on the grounds of the amount of time that would be involved.

It occurred to the Committee that it might be well to ask Dr. Watson at the beginning of this morning's session to pick out and present in the manner suggested, some one, an elaboration of some one of the fourteen points, with the idea that possibly such an elaboration of one of the points might serve the purpose as illustrating what was intended in a parallel way for the rest, or that when that was

they mean without illustrative detail?

DR. ELLIS: They would have to be illustrated, of course.

PRESIDENT HOLT: May I move that this Conference adopt these five principles as a function of a liberal college, and let's debate that, if necessary, and from this we can go on, if necessary. We can't get anything more general than those, it seems to me.

DR. WATSON: That would be with the understanding of what knowledge is to be transmitted and to whom.

PRESIDENT HOLT: If we accept that, under transmission of knowledges your points would come in.

DR. WATSON: I wanted to be sure I understood to what we would be committing ourselves. Probably there are some forms of knowledge to be transmitted to some people and some ability in some people should be developed, and some kind of character in some people. If we make all those reservations, I don't think we would have trouble in agreeing, but I don't think it would help us. (Laughter)

PRESIDENT HOLT: You might say the function of the college has nothing to do with public service, but I believe it should. But I should like to see this Conference, if they agree, adopt those five principles, that those are the main functions of a college of liberal arts. If we do that, we have our first principles agreed upon. We can go from

that and then develop each one as far as we are able to do so.

How are you going to develop character and ability and extend knowledge in a liberal college? How are you going to do public service, for instance, through the students and faculty at large?

DEAN McCONN: May I ask for a little extension of No. 4, the extension of knowledge? One thinking of research, is that what you mean?

PRESIDENT HOLT: It might be that. That is principally what I mean.

At all events, to be concrete, I move this be the sense of this Committee: that these be the principles of a college of liberal arts.

DR. ROBINSON: May I ask Dr. Holt what he means by 'character'? I am so bothered by these words! I am a simple sort of chap and if I committed myself to that, I would be saying something I didn't understand at all. I haven't any idea what that means. It seems as though I ought to. Everyone speaks as if he knew just what he meant. I don't mean to bother you, Mr. President, at all. I am just honestly wondering. That is a word we use. I suppose it means that we want in some way to encourage people to act the way we approve of and something of that kind, but I don't know. We all have character, and what we mean, I suppose, is having a character that would suit us or others better than the one we

have now.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: Might I suggest to President Holt that if we are going to go at it this way, there is one element which has been involved in the discussion up to this time which doesn't seem to be included. The proposition as we had it before was "knowledges, appreciations, and skills." The first two, the transmission of knowledge and development of ability coincide, but there is nothing here about what I take to be meant by appreciation.

DR. ELLIS: Also "the awakening of interests." You may have intended to include that.

PRESIDENT HOLT: I shall be glad to add "appreciations, abilities, and skill" in No. 2, if you like.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: In that case, if we took the first two and added appreciation, we would be just apparently where we are at up to this point. We could come back to the discussion now of these knowledges, appreciations, and skills if we could agree to postpone the other two, and I think the extension of knowledge could not be --

PRESIDENT HOLT: Perhaps my word "appreciation" would be the same as "knowledge" or "skill."

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: It could not be discussed from transmission. Public service is probably more or less connected with this point of view of the relation of the curriculum to a matter of the fourth point of what is important

and demanded by society from educated people at the present time; in other words, I am wondering what advance we would have made over the present stage of the discussion. In general I suppose we would all agree to these points.

DR. WATSON: May I ask a question about another thing? I think President Holt means to include this, and I am not sure how it should be stated in it. I think I have heard him say at certain times that college students should have a rich, happy experience in the present; that it is not so much preparation for life as a kind of life.

PRESIDENT HOLT: A phase of life, yes.

DR. WATSON: This is not in contrast to anything you have here, but would you need another point to make that emphasis clear?

PRESIDENT HOLT: What do you have in mind?

DR. WATSON: Oh, the provision of the most satisfactory kind of life in the here and now for young people of college age, something like that.

PRESIDENT HOLT: It comes under character development.

DR. HART: It happens without any collusion that in following up my own idea of this I also set down five items dealing with the meaning of a liberal arts education, which I should like to set in here just to extend this situation in one direction. Those five items are:

A liberal arts college should help a student to develop understanding of the world in which he lives; to achieve some perspective on life in terms of history and the future; to reach some ease in life --

PRESIDENT WARREN: What do you mean by that?

DR. HART: Mental ease, appreciation, sense of belonging. The fourth is, to develop some critical judgment of values; and to discover valid personal bases for the choosing of vocation.

PRESIDENT WARREN: I don't see any very great difference between your first and second points.

DR. HART: There isn't any great difference.

PRESIDENT WARREN: If you are going to help us develop an understanding of the world in which we live, you have got to develop perspective.

DR. HART: These were merely jotted down in extension of my feeling that we have got somehow or other to get a perspective ourselves in which this curricular discussion can go on.

DR. CREESE: Doesn't No. 1 absorb all the other

four?

DR. HART: Probably.

PRESIDENT MORGAN: No.

DR. HART: You can expand it at will.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: For further discussion the immediate matter before us is the resolution of President Holt.

PROFESSOR BAILEY: I will second it, Mr. Chairman, gladly.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: It has been moved and seconded that we adopt as principles to be observed in a liberal education that its functions are the transmission of knowledge, the development of ability, the maturing of character, the extension of knowledge, and preparation for public service.

PRESIDENT HOLT: No, public service itself.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: Not preparation but public service itself. Is there anything further to be said on this point?

PROFESSOR BAILEY: Mr. Chairman, I wish you would hear from our latest acquisition today, President Morgan, his opinion of those points before we vote. He has been living in a different atmosphere.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: President Morgan, we will all be happy to hear from you.



PRESIDENT MORGAN: I think silence for a while would be very appropriate, but I am not given to that. It seems to me that these items mentioned by President Holt are very interesting and necessary and desirable methods for achieving the ends of a college, but they are methods rather than purposes.

For instance, a Jesuit College could take this list and approve it completely. A Soviet college in Russia could take the list and approve it completely, a university like Harvard could take it and approve it completely, but the resulting product would be very different in those cases; that is, this discusses not the end of education, but the means of attaining those ends, and until I know something about why is a college and what aims are to be achieved by a college, I don't know what would eventuate from the use of these means.

PRESIDENT HOLT: We can put our own meaning in it, just as Harvard could. That is a good thing.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: Certainly you have no objection to these, but after what President Morgan has just said, to abuse the privileges of a Chairman, it seems to me from now on any discussion of general principles into some kind of more specific details would be perfectly innocuous, and after we have adopted them, we would still have the question of what they mean by translation over into actual procedures that would differentiate a modern type of liberal college from the

traditional one and the traditional college would say, why, yes, this is just our aim.

PRESIDENT HOLT: My only hope in introducing them was that if we accepted those principles, we could take each one up, just as President Morgan has, point by point, and see how we could put those ideas into principles on which to base a curriculum, and go as far as we can agree, all of us.

PRESIDENT WARREN: Would it be better to speak in terms of means rather than ends if we are going to take this up? I should like to hear some discussion of Dr. Hart's points. President Morgan, would you discuss that?

PRESIDENT MORGAN: I think Dr. Hart's points get a little closer to ends, but, not knowing anything about what has gone on here before, except what I heard, I would feel I was taking hold of things a little more natively if I first knew what it was I was going to try to achieve and the other things just fell in line as the more effective means of achieving them, but until I have some picture of why people set up colleges and support them, and what it is about, a discussion of student interest and a discussion of methods might relate to any purposes at all and which are secondary.

I think that Dr. Hart gets a little closer to ends than President Holt, but his points still deal quite largely with means.

DR. WATSON: Would it be appropriate to encourage other members of the Conference to make statements or formulations that they would like to have taken into account in this business of deciding why people do run colleges anyhow?

I think I should agree with the Chairman that it doesn't matter especially; after we get through agreeing on these, we will have as different ideas of what college ought to be as we had in the beginning, but I do know from many discussions many people feel more comfortable after certain principles, objectives, definitions of what the thing is all about have been understood and stated. Perhaps they do offer a kind of guidance when it comes to making the discriminations that have to be made later, and since there is concern of that sort, I should be glad if you would take time to get clear whatever any members of the Conference feel are important along the line of the things that President Holt, and Dr. Hart, and President Morgan and others have suggested.

DR. ELLIS: This is the sort of thing I have in mind: Suppose we do start out to get some of this sort of knowledge, I think we ought to try to get a clear set of questions that we would ask ourselves about each piece of knowledge or product of knowledge before we put it in there.

I was just jotting down four or five in my mind while you were speaking.

1. Ought we not ask ourselves whether it would leave him with a better understanding of himself?

2. Would it leave him with a sense of dignity and worthwhileness and possibly nobility of life, or a blasé attitude which so many have?

3. Would it help him to judge values critically in some field of life?

4. Would it help him to keep an open mind rather than a closed mind which nearly all of us have?

5. Would it help him to have a nationalistic or a human viewpoint, an aristocratic or a democratic viewpoint?

And so on, until we have a list of questions we can ask ourselves about each thing we propose to introduce, and try it out by them. It seems to me it is anybody's game as to what we put in. If we never can agree, it remains anybody's game. I had some faith we might agree on such principles, so-called.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: Might I ask whether we want to get at this stage a set of principles or questions, or whatever they are called, upon which we can most readily agree, or whether we want to get a set of issues, or questions which will bring out whatever real differences of opinion there are among us?

PRESIDENT WARREN: May I ask you to get up and speak to us a little bit on this point?

DR. ELLIS: I second the motion.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: I have one of the qualifications that Professor Rice spoke of yesterday in the discussion of college education and that is I have the blank mind of an infant one year old on the subject of what colleges should do. I have certain ideas about elementary education and about graduate schools, but I have as near none about colleges as anyone could have.

On the more specific issue, perhaps the very way I put my last question suggests my own prejudices or bias in the matter. I don't wish to take any time unnecessarily, but it seems to me we have reached a point where the statement of questions and issues that will bring out the differences of opinion among us is much more important than a general formulation which we could agree upon in general, but agree upon only because each one gave his own particular differentiation in presentation as to the meaning of those general statements.

Personally, I should like to discuss this 5a because it brings out points which should be brought out at this time. Perhaps it needs to be put in more detail, but here we have a question, What weight should be given to (1) the interests of the student, (2) the problems of civilization, and (3) the traditional classifications of knowledge? Is a creative synthesis from these sources possible?

This seems to define an issue on which probably there are marked differences of opinion when we come to detail

among the members of the group. Take this matter of transmission of knowledge. We have in the traditional curriculum a certain organization and classification and there is no doubt about what the knowledge is, to be transmitted, certain courses and certain material in history and literature and mathematics, sciences, and so forth. The pabulum is all there and distributed in fitting doses and you just come up and take it. That, with some certain modifications, is one point of view regarding the transmission of knowledge. The other is along the line of Dr. Watson's suggestion, which would say, as I take it, that this knowledge is to be organized and arranged so as to make the student conscious with regard to contemporary and future social demand and needs, presented from that point of view. It was eliminated and as it didn't seem to bear on the question, it was reorganized and rearranged so as to bear on it.

Then we have the interests of the students, which would give us another arrangement or selection and distribution of that material. Nobody here is going to say that some one of these, I take it, is going to be taken to the exclusion of the others. It is a problem of what weight is to be given to each or the integration that is to be made among them.

Maybe that question is still too general. It needs to be broken up in the meeting of a number of more specific demands, the need of appreciation, developing open-mindedness, discovery of personal aptitudes, and so forth, but,

personally, I simply say I would welcome any mode of discussion that enabled us to translate our general antecedent convictions in this matter into a form that would define more than we have done yet the issues and the divergence of issues among us.

I think that is all I have to say at the present time. I may wish to deliver myself later.



PROFESSOR BAILEY: To meet Dr. Morgan's desire for something fundamental as to the objectives of liberal education, I should like to suggest that we adopt this statement: The aim of a liberal education is to make better men and women than we are.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: We have a motion already. Is there further discussion on this motion?

DEAN McCONN: May I ask with strict relevance to the motion, whether or not in President Holt's thinking the last two of his five objectives are simply minor and subsidiary, perhaps, auxiliary, and the first three predominant?

PRESIDENT HOLT: The first three deal primarily with the students, and the last two more with the faculty, but I was thinking of, first, the function of a college, not of a curriculum. Then I wanted to see if we could relate the curriculum so that both faculty and students could do public service, but certainly it seems to me the first three are the most important for us to discuss and I hoped that we could agree on this or some other formula as the main functions of a college and then take up the transmission of knowledge, which is the key to everything else, it seems to me, and, if we once got the key, then the other things would fall into their places, if we have time to discuss them after that.

I am simply trying to go back of the fourteen points to get a start. We have to go from the general to the

particular or from the particular to the general. I think we will go first from the general to the particular rather than the other way 'round, but we can go either way.

PRESIDENT MORGAN: To follow Dr. Dewey's method, from the particular to the general, which might lead us quicker than we are getting at it now, the discussion of the first question: What weight should be given to the interests of the student? that has been floating around the Conference, might clear up one item, although it may be out of order.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: I quite agree with President Holt that we should go from the general to the particular. I didn't understand that the fourteen points were meant to be the material of the curriculum, but rather they were illustrations of the general question raised under No. 4, that is, the first three questions we had, interest, and the fourth question. We had the other pole of the matter there, the needs and demands of society. That general, very general point of view as over against that of interest was illustrated, as I understood Dr. Watson, in the fourteen points, but as a general point of view rather than the details of a curriculum.

DR. WATSON: Absolutely.

DR. HART: It seems to me one difficulty at this point is that we are trying to discuss a change in the curriculum in terms of two concrete educational psychologies, and our difficulty is that our psychologies do not meet. One of these types of psychologies is expressed in the word "transmission" of knowledge, and the other in the phrase "the extent of knowledge." In a sense those things seem to be correlative and friendly and all that and they can be, but in general they are not as represented in the actual pedagogy of our time; they are not friendly particularly at all, and to illustrate it further, I might suggest that the fourth point in President Holt's list, extension of knowledge, is intimately related to this whole question of students' interest. It is not merely related to the question of whether faculty members are going to extend knowledge, but whether students themselves are going to be permitted to extend knowledge and, therefore, you can't say that the function of the college so far as the students are concerned is confined to the first three.

The fourth point is fundamental to the students' participation in college life. They also should have a chance to extend knowledge, to approach knowledge as something they are going to realize in their own experience.

PRESIDENT HOLT: Would you want to leave out the fourth and put it in with the first, "and transmission and extension of knowledge"?

PROFESSOR BAILEY: Don't do that, because extension of knowledge includes understanding of environment, the first point Dr. Hart made. All science and all art has come out of a study of nature at first hand and there is no hope of advance in science or any of the arts except along the line of closer observation of our environment, of nature. That is absolutely fundamental and that goes along with student interest and extension of knowledge. They have nothing to do with the transmission of knowledge.

The difference between Dr. Hart's first and second points is clear. One may have a perspective on life and have a theory about the future, and walk around the world with both eyes shut tight and never know anything about what is happening around him and never see anything in the world. Those are tied up together and they are fundamental and come first in liberal education.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: Would it be your suggestion that we put "extension" first and "transmission" third? What is your suggestion?

PROFESSOR BAILEY: My suggestion is that we adopt President Holt's five points and proceed. (Applause)

DR. WATSON: Would there be any objection to adopting not only President Holt's points but also Dr. Hart's, Dr. Ellis's, and Professor Bailey's suggestions, making some sixteen statements of values that are important and worth consideration as we think of the organization of knowledge, suggesting perhaps that a sub-committee (if no one has any objection to any of them - I certainly haven't) formulate them in the form which will make a certain amount of duplication, but which will express the important and valuable ideas these men wish to have included in this statement? Would that defeat the purpose that President Holt or others had in mind in suggesting their own lists, if we included all of them? It doesn't seem to me there is any clash within them at all.

PRESIDENT HOLT: My only purpose is to get down to business. I don't care whether you adopt these or anything else, but let's start with something.

PROFESSOR BAILEY: Yes.

DEAN McCONN: Could we follow out a motion for amendment that would accomplish this, following out Dr. Watson's suggestion and referring these five formulations to a committee consisting of the five gentlemen who presented them for embodiment together and presentation at the next meeting?

DEAN DOERSCHUK: I so move.

DEAN McCONN: I second such a motion.

DR. ELLIS: My suggestion was that we work out a list. I don't know that I would stand by those I happened to mention.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: That would be the sub-committee's function.

PROFESSOR BAILEY: If you make a sub-committee, you will eliminate some very important brains. (Laughter)

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: Is the amendment seconded?

DEAN McCONN: I seconded it.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: Is there any discussion of the amendment?

DR. ELLIS: May I have it restated?

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: That the various suggestions which have been made by President Holt, Dr. Hart, President Morgan, Dr. Ellis, and Professor Bailey, be referred to them as a sub-committee to refer back, first putting it in words, and refer it back to the Committee. That is what I understand it is. Is that it?

DEAN DOERSCHUK: Yes.

PROFESSOR BAILEY: Inasmuch as my name is in that list, I don't favor passing the buck. It is trying to get rid of wide-awake thought on the part of other members of the Commission, whose business it is to do it.

DEAN DOERSCHUK: May I explain what is behind my motion? It seems to me we are discussing 5a. We have

given a good deal of consideration to point No. 1, the interests of the student. We have assumed and have a right to assume a good deal of common understanding on point 3, the general traditional classification of knowledge. We have proceeded in an exploratory and more or less inductive manner and I don't feel we are ready to jump into the opposite method of procedure without further exploration of point 2. I should, therefore, like to postpone such a complete change in method, first of all for further exploration along the lines we have been proceeding, namely, point 2 and all it involves, and, in the second place, in order to permit a more careful formulation before we do change our method of procedure so entirely; therefore, it seems to me some concentrated thought by these five people, with various suggestions, is important, because it would be a marked change in our whole procedure, and I should like to postpone that to give time for formulation, and also to hear Dr. Watson perhaps explore one of his points to give us some idea of the method, the results of such a method of procedure as we have applied to point 1, the interests of the student, in applying it to point 2, the problems of civilization.

DEAN McCONN: It seems to me probable that these five gentlemen, who have all been thinking of the purpose of a liberal college and have made different formulations, could harmonize and embody together those suggestions in terminology

and in a group of statements with which we would all agree very quickly and that could well be done in the sub-committee.

DR. HART: In the meantime, Mr. Chairman, with respect to what is Dr. Watson going to explore one of these points?

DEAN McCONN: Let's find out.

DEAN DOERSCHUK: Let Dr. Watson answer that.

DR. HART: If we have no objectives and aims, with respect to what will he do the exploring?

DR. ELLIS: In the light of what can we criticize or evaluate it?

DR. WATSON: Suppose we criticize or evaluate any presentation. I am sorry to get it centered about any particular ones. Suppose we criticize and explore any point that is presented in the light of all sixteen of these, and any other values we might have in mind. It doesn't seem to me the particular formulation is a task we want to spend time on in the total group. That is one reason I thought a small committee could do it if there is no essential disagreement with any of them. We already have them.

DR. HART: Dr. Watson is now saying in the background of the exploration there are implicit principles of criticism.

DR. WATSON: That is for objectives rather than principles of criticism.



DR. ELLIS: If you haven't any questions or principles about the thing you or I present, we have no way of judging it.

DR. WATSON: That involves a point that Dr. Dewey suggested and it is perhaps worth discussing a little bit in our own method. It is very interesting to discover that these two methods of work from particulars to generals, from generals to particulars, do interact, and I don't suppose any of us would favor either exclusively. We have long been accustomed to formulating our ends rather logically and saying how can we apply them and work them out in detail. I don't suspect that is the way in which ends usually operate with people. I imagine they know first some things they want and some things they don't want and eventually they work those up into principles.

If I were to make a specific situation, something I thought it would be interesting for a college to do, most of the people in the Conference would criticize it, I imagine, for purposes of discussion in front of the group in terms of principles. Actually I think they wouldn't like the student to do that thing but do something else specifically. We have a series of things we should like to see students doing and wouldn't like to see them doing. We have built those up into systems, superstructures of principles. I don't doubt they have some influence upon the particular preference as to what

students should do and should not do, and the extent of the influence in the reverse direction, formulation of principles out of things we should like students to do and not to do; however, I don't see that either method would hamper us particularly in procedure and if there is any strong feeling that we will work better, and I think there is a strong feeling that we will work better by getting our general principles first, I am quite agreeable to proceeding in that direction.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: Might I take the liberty of amplifying a little what Miss Doerschuk said? We spent three meetings in discussing the interests of students with reference to the problem. We had a somewhat scattering discussion yesterday afternoon of the bearing of social demands, the world in which the student is to live, upon the determination of the activities of the student, and she said we know already pretty well what is meant by the traditional classifications of knowledge. We have only to locate the ordinary program of studies, catalogs of any college, to see what that means. We haven't had any definite discussion of the meaning of these social demands and I take it the one object of this motion to refer it to a committee was to clear the way so we might have a somewhat more definite discussion of the second point.

Do I interpret aright your point of view?

DEAN DOERSCHUK: Yes, also to give a little more time to the formulation of these general things.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: Are you ready for the question on the amendment? The amendment was to refer these various suggestions regarding the aims and functions of the liberal college to this committee of five for consideration and formulation and reference back to the Conference.

DR. GEORGIA: Of whom is the committee composed?

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: President Holt, Dr. Hart, Dr. Ellis, President Morgan, and Professor Bailey.

... The amendment was put to a vote and was carried seven to five...

CHAIRMAN DEWEY; It seems to be carried by a vote of seven to five. The amendment is carried and that carries with it the submission of President Holt's original resolutions to this Committee.

DR. WATSON: May I suggest that a possible next step for the group as a whole would be the question you raised a few moments ago? If these are some of the points on which we pretty generally agree, are there issues, objects of a liberal arts curriculum in which we suspect there would be a good deal of difference? Those might well be aired for discussion now.

DR. GEORGIA: I should like the members of the newly created sub-committee to hand to the Secretary a

copy of their suggestions for incorporation in the minutes.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: You understand this request of the Secretary, that you hand to him for incorporation in the record the nature of your suggestions.

How shall we proceed further? Dr. Watson has suggested a method of bringing out whatever differences there may be.

PRESIDENT HOLT: Let's take up his fourteen points, to be as concrete as we can be, and go the other way. Let's take them up one at a time and see what we think about them.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: Shall we return to the suggestion of the Steering Committee that he illustrate his point of view by reference to one point? Is there objection to that?

DR. GEORGIA: May I ask if the fourteen points have been distributed?

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: It wasn't to discuss the fourteen points, but some one of them. Is that correct? Wasn't one to be used merely for an illustration?

DEAN McCONN: Our suggestion was one of them to be taken out and elaborated in an illustrative way, after which we would go over the rest or assume that that showed us what was involved in all.

DR. WATSON: I should much prefer to spend half as much time on two because of the contrast in the way in which different kinds of points might develop. I think that would give us a better series of specific suggestions to work on, perhaps.

May I say I do not find myself proposing these problems of civilization in a sense that I would exclude student interests or exclude the traditional classifications of knowledge. The question that I have in mind and which I think you may want to think through with me as we talk about these specifications is something like this: If we start with these social problems in the way that I suggest, will we cover sufficiently not only those, but also relate ourselves to student interests in an effective fashion and also incorporate whatever there is of knowledge in the systems that have been built up in the college curriculum?

I propose this as a means which integrates the three or four standpoints. I think they could be integrated from all points of view, but this is something of the way they would integrate from this point of view. The two areas would be, taking the first two on the list, economic adjustments, problems that arise in production, distribution, and consumption of goods, first; and love, marriage, sex, home relationships, second; two very different types of area with different types of projects developing in each.

What sort of thing might students do in the areas if they carried on projects in those fields? Specifically what would they mean? For example, we might discover an economic area, a few questions like this, in which a few students would be interested. I happen to know one or two who have been:

Is the individual farmer going to disappear in our society?

Will he be swallowed up in collective types of agriculture, corporation farming, and the like? Why?

If this would happen, what would be lost?

Suppose he went to work at that, where would it lead him, or suppose a group went to work at it, where might it lead them?

They might visit farm homes, or tenant farmers, and see what difference there is between attitudes, and what about the position of the owner and the tenants historically?

What is scientific agriculture doing? That would certainly come in.

What do machines mean for farm technique?

What type of machines are developing and what new ones are to come?

What is chemistry contributing to the changed agriculture? Possibly it is in this field particular interest would be shown.

What are the possibilities in new fertilizers?

What are the possibilities in substitutes for agricultural products?

What products once wasted are now being utilized by modern science?

How have natural enemies been attacked and eliminated?

It might lead him to discuss what the Government Department of Agriculture is doing, and questions as to whether governments should do that sort of thing. It might lead to the discovery of the development of new plants, and the significance of research in answering questions:

What sort of educational program the Government is carrying on?

It might lead him back to what electricity means to farm life, the coming of the radio and the development of the airplane.

Is there a health differentiation between farm and city life?

Care of milk, control of flies, selection of drinking water, effect of quiet and effect of noise. What elements in urban life are causing decentralization?

It has been said the farmer is an individualist. Is that true? Why?

What has been the history of change in other

groups? Would such a movement help to conserve the natural resources of the soil?

How far has the cooperative gone among stores, warehouses, banks, and shipping?

Why do farmers leave apples and oranges to rot on the ground while thousands are hungry?

What is happening to woman's life on the farm?

Is she presenting a possible career?

Why are our rural schools less adequate than the urban schools?

Would corporation farming be any better in that sense?

How could the seasonal labor be handled, or the seasonal labor problems?

How would the actual analysis of costs on corporation farming be handled?

What great literature has been built around the values of farm life in this civilization? In other civilizations?

Comparison of life of the Danish farmer and American farmer, and significance of those.

How are the Russian Collectives working?

Is a tariff necessary to protect farm prices from competition with cheaper standards of living abroad?

Should we limit production to what we can consume



in this country? What sort of board could plan this? How should such a board be chosen? What would they need to know?

What does our study of politics reveal about the efficiency of that sort of institution?

How much does the middle man get?

Would the proposed subsidy help or hinder the solution?

What farmers would get it? What would they do otherwise?

Would Government ownership or operation be better than private?

What has been the history of such processes?

What are the leisure time possibilities in which rural life surpasses urban life?

What trends in society have a bearing on this problem?

Decentralization made possible by general availability of power and materials. Concentration of capital and control. Mergers and combinations in other industries.

Discussion of this problem at a grange meeting, an institute of teachers, a rural high school. A production by rural high school students or teachers of pageants and plays in connection with rural groups to express the basic ideas developed in the study.

If urban life is more stimulating and rural life more contemplative, which is the better? What have philosophers suggested?

What has life in the Orient contributed to this point?

See the avenues that it might open up! Literally hundreds of traditional subject matters that would come in.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: May I interrupt at this point to ask a question which I don't think is wholly clear in our minds yet? What is the relation of what you are saying to the question of general principles as over against the details of planning a curriculum?

DR. WATSON: The general principle involved is this: Can we more effectively give the kind of education we want on social problems, also I should say on student interests, and in terms of classified knowledge, by a series of projects of this sort that would start from some existing social problem and branch out into some of the questions that I have just suggested? Can we do it better that way than we can by the attempt to approach curriculum from some other angle?

It is very crudely stated. Perhaps we had better pause a moment for discussion of it to make sure we understand it. I am trying to illustrate what is meant when we say let's build a curriculum in terms of meeting the needs

of our society. What would it mean? What would it leave out?

Somebody said that is pretty thin stuff. Somebody said why not combine all these into one course, the theory of education, and give it one semester. Why not see where each of these things lead? Why not see where these lead if you try to carry them out, and to suggest, as I see it, any adequate treatment of these, would carry us into literally thousands of these questions and enterprises of education that have important stuff in them and contribute to the social problem.

DR. ELLIS: After all, isn't that a discussion of the method of getting this thing across?

PRESIDENT WARREN: Getting what thing across?

DR. ELLIS: What he is trying to get across.

(Laughter) I didn't mean that flippantly at all.

PROF. RICHARD FEUERSTEIN: May I ask a question? Do you not, Dr. Watson, outline here a college for the subject of sociology, and, if such a plan would be considered, we would have then to inquire what preparation ought such a college for sociology have. It is a college for the study of sociology, as I see it.

DR. WATSON: This question has had a good deal of sociology in it but also arts, literature, science, and mathematics and in some of the other projects these aspects may stand out more clearly.

I should like to suggest that the vigor with which I have presented this foreword may belie my own uncertainty as to its ultimate value and significance as a basis for the college curriculum. If any of you are more uncertain than I am as to how a college curriculum should be composed, I should be surprised. I think there are certain possibilities to be looked at and I should like to look at them.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: If I may follow out my other question, there is perhaps a feeling that you are formulating a curriculum instead of attempting to determine the principles by which a curriculum should be formed.

DR. WATSON: I think that is true. I am illustrating what a curriculum would be like on an assumption that the interests of the student and the traditional knowledge and problems of civilization can be integrated in a series

of projects of this sort. If you want to discuss that assumption, I think that would be quite all right.

PRESIDENT WARREN: Could we have the other one as contrast?

DR. WATSON: This isn't typical of all the things we do in the Department of Education or in the field of economic problems or meeting the economic problems of our civilization. We have questions of whether I will be a writer or a physicist, and definite preparation for each which would involve the mathematics and the sciences and drafting for people who want to do that kind of thing.

DR. HART: May I ask one other question about this, first? Do you feel that somewhere towards the end of the general series of exploratory projects the student would be in position to formulate for himself, that is, in terms of his own intelligent understanding, something that would be essentially a general outlook on economic questions, or would he be left with the fragmentary results?

DR. WATSON: You answer that in asking it. We want as continuous a generalization as his mind is capable of making.

DR. HART: The question is, Does this sort of thing lead to a systematic outlook upon economics such as is supposed to come from the presentation of economics from the standpoint of an organized knowledge? Will he in some sense achieve actually what he is supposed to achieve now?

PRESIDENT MORGAN: If he would outline his next subject, it would make a better basis for the next question.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: Perhaps I should not have

interrupted. Discussion would come later.



DR. WATSON: I would suggest that this is one. I outlined one economic project of which there are thirty or forty listed here, as varied as the total field of man's life, in production and distribution. I will leave it at that.

In the field of home-making, instead of outlining a particular project there, I would suggest the kind of projects that would be developed:

Has monogamy been established in all societies as the best method of family life?

Why do some people never marry?

Why does the Pope in his recent encyclical oppose birth control?

What are the architectural characteristics of the best modern homes? (The study of material and art forms, and comfort in houses, climatic conditions, chemical factors, and so forth.)

What is the physical risk in child-bearing? Why is it more dangerous in the United States than in any other civilized country?

What sex education should children be given?

How do you account for successful and unsuccessful marriage as described in novels, plays, and poems?

Is Keiserling's "tragic tension" a good ideal for matrimony?

How does the Swedish system of companionate

marriage work out?

How have unusually youthful marriages turned out?

What is an adequate income for two persons in New York City today?

What have other states and countries tried in the matter of divorce laws? How do these work?

What is the physical development of a child from conception to birth? How does it compare with development in other forms of life? How much is born in a child? What can training do? How does this compare with unicellular plant and animal life?

In planning meals for a family, what does one need to know about nutrition? What chemistry does this involve?

How does an electric motor work?

Experiences in repairing plumbing, electrical connections, and woodwork.

Study of household materials, textiles, rugs, furniture, interior decoration.

Comparison of advantages to children of growing up in the same home, rotating homes, and being raised in nurseries.

Should a college girl pay her way on dates with college boys? How does this connect with general economic

status of women?

Interviewing women who are holding jobs and raising a family successfully. Finding out what books and organizations will be helpful when it is necessary to learn more about child care.

Learning some games a man and wife can play together throughout life, not one playing football and the other field hockey.

Carrying through the reeducation of the child being spoiled by unwise parental treatment. There is a problem which could be solved.

Developing a more artistic and attractive method of dress.

Are there basic differences in the psychology of the sexes? What are the experimental data?

Understanding crushes, their causes and outcomes, psychological case studies, literature, novels, and so forth.

Home practices in sanitation to prevent contagion.

Clearing up any sex questions which students want answered, by the best available scientific information.

Learning to sing and play the piano.

How should children be taught to play the piano?

What sort of chairs in the home give the best

postural support to the skeletal and muscular frame?

Home rituals, Christmas, Sundays, birthdays.

Making a will.

Who should be insured?

Is it better to own or rent a home?

Will maids in the home be replaced by well trained, well paid professions of house care, food preparation, and child care?

What is the effect of this on the opportunity for the colored race?

A series of questions of that sort seem to be ramifications from interests that exist at present in home life, marriage, sex, and so on, and indicate the way in which a program like this would pull out the things worth conserving and quietly drop the things not especially important or worth conserving.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: Now would you state the issue, as you see it, your proposal raises with reference to the work of the liberal college?

DR. WATSON: Suppose it is stated in this form as a proposition to answer: What weight should be given to (1) the interests of the student, (2) the problems of civilization, and (3) the traditional classifications of knowledge?

The answer would be something like this: That weight which comes as a consequence of providing curriculum units of this sort organized around the problems of our civilization, that would give, I should say, sufficient weight to student interests by giving points of attachment and sufficient weight to traditional subject matters by including them wherever they help serve these functional ends. That is the thesis, at any rate, to which I think there are a good many objections.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: The matter is now open for  
discussion.

PRESIDENT MORGAN: I think that Dr. Watson's question does raise an issue of method, not of purpose, but of method, that is a pertinent one, that is a method of organizing the curriculum around traditional subject matter or around situations. He took two fields. One was the field of economics, in which he talked about agriculture particularly; the other was personal and social relationships.

The difficulties of his method are indicated, I think, by his illustrations. For instance, in agriculture, he deals with the breeding of plants and the better crops and so forth, and the breeding of animals. He has a biological inference there. If his approach to biology has been through that concept, the student comes to it without that mastery of his subject matter which leads him to understand the laws of inheritance, for instance, and he will read hastily and get a superficial view of what somebody thought of that.

Then he gets into another classification of social affairs and the question arises as to what are the relations of heredity and environment in the making up of a life, and he comes to the same subject of biology, as to many others, and, not having a grounding in that field, he must take superficial appraisals of biological factors, and if he, with all the maze of interest, can spend only a few hours on that subject, he comes to a conclusion based not on an

understanding of biological principles, but of facts somebody has written about this particular subject.

Take another thing, how does the motor work in the sweeper, or whatever it is - he can have possibly half an hour or even an hour or two to study that fact along with the other interests. If he has a farm motor to run, he could possibly spend an hour or two and get the trick of the motor, but not the principle by which electrical operation occurs, and you will find a tendency to a smattering over a very wide field, whereas, if he had taken a substantial course in biology, he would have had a way of thinking and a habit of thinking that would have answered questions in a multitude of fields. That is the argument for the traditional organization of subject matter.

On the other side is the question of motivation. How are we going to get the student in biology interested in studying cells and reproduction and nuclei and chromosomes, and so forth, unless he sees some application to his own life, and you have got a genuine dilemma. Education is made up not of a choice of right and wrong, but the least of evils. If we get that idea in our heads, that every method of education is wrong from some point of view, it is simply a choice of dilemmas and a choice of evils, and you must have that motivation, and the problem is not whether this is a right method for that, or whether you ought to center around subject matter



entirely, but what is in fact a distribution of the interests, and my particular answer to that is that while economy of life absolutely demands the following of possibly tradition, or at least consecutive developments of subject matter as you do in biology or physics, the economy of life absolutely demands that in following that method you must motivate it by the project method, but that is a method of motivation and not a control.

I think we are getting down to a fundamental point in building the curriculum, that the building of a curriculum is to come about not by divine inspiration such as that by which the Apostles' Creed was handed to us, but is more a matter of invention, as you design an automobile, a radiating of parts so that the practical result is greatest, and that in the whole design of a curriculum it is the searching for economies of time and effort and a part of economy is motivation, and if you leave out either, the project method or the method of traditional development of subject matter, you will have left out a very fundamental element.

DR. WATSON: I think I should agree with President Morgan except for one explanation and distinction. The explanation is this: I would not suggest that every student be yanked by his collar breathlessly through all of these questions and enterprises that are suggested as possible. I think of those as a cafeteria offering and I see no reason for assuming that they have to be one-hour enterprises, that a student should do those that are most worthwhile as he judges it, or as the faculty judges it, very thoroughly, with the mastery of principles involved in it rather than in a smattering fashion. That is not at all out of the possibility, it seems to me, in this sort of program.

The other differential relates to whether this is a question of curriculum or a question of method. Probably it is both, but at the present time I think we want to discuss it as a curriculum question pretty largely. This is a way of discovering what students ought to be doing, namely, analyzing these areas as we have tried to do, seeing where these things lead, setting these things out for students and making discriminations among them; quite apart from the way in which they are to be organized and handled, but from the standpoint of method, this is a way of eliminating what I should think was waste material in the curriculum, and discovery of new things that should go into it, and perhaps it is from that angle we should go into it particularly.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: Dr. Hart, will you raise your question again now?

DR. HART: My question was closely related to President Morgan's, how, out of all this, the student will eventually get that organization of mind and outlook by which he will come to feel more or less at home, as you might say, deductively in the field of economics. He is supposed to get that now through the taking on of the organized matter. He doesn't, ordinarily. This offers an opportunity for him to become acquainted with an enormous range or at least so much as he has time to cover, a range of economic, or sociological, or psychological experiences, real experiences, but education is certainly more than having experiences of this particular sort. Eventually he has to feel himself at home in this world of organized knowledge. Where in this procedure will he come to be not merely an investigator of specific projects but a man of organized mind with respect to these resources of the world of mind? Is it possible at some point for him to stop and say, "Now I have achieved a sufficient understanding of the phenomena, of the nature of the phenomena, of particular phenomena in the field of economics that I shall want no longer to investigate particularly, but now organize within the total organized world of economic knowledge."

DR. WATSON: Some people would do that very thoroughly; some people would do it more casually. I think it is possible to overestimate the significance of having one's knowledge organized in just the form that the subject matter divisions are organized. Most of us don't live very much that way.

DR. HART: I mean in the form of an organized outlook on life.

DR. WATSON: In some form, I think, that is more or less inveterate in the human mind to make some classifications and I should be strongly in agreement with you that should be encouraged and people should take such time as they need to bring their materials together, but do it as Wells and Huxley did, by neglecting the traditional systems and asking a new question: How does life develop? What do we know about it? It seems a useful way of going about that. It doesn't seem to me the selection of experiences this way precludes necessarily an organization.

DR. HART: In spite of the fact that you think this should be a curricular matter, it does involve an overturn.

PROFESSOR BAILEY: From the point of my experience in teaching art, I should say this matter belongs to the first two years of training in the college before differentiation takes place, before you come to study any one field professionally.

DR. WATSON: Wouldn't it belong to the upper years also in the sense that a student takes one of these interests, say an interest in the tariff, or diplomacy of foreign nations, or chemical engineering, or something of that sort, and focuses attention upon that? Those are quite among the projects that would develop except that they are very long term and intensive.

PRESIDENT WARREN: Is it possible that we have so long been concerned with a systematic study of a field like economics that we haven't been sufficiently concerned with the fact that in life things aren't systematized quite that way, and are we apt to keep our minds rather in compartments, our mental information and our interests in compartments, to the sacrifice of ability to view life around us in its many facets, its many angles? Is that perhaps a serious difficulty with our education which perhaps we are not always conscious of, but which might be helped by approaching things from another angle provided we can make some adjustment between that and the getting out of sufficient principles?

PRESIDENT MORGAN: I think it is a false question we have as to whether this is better than that. I think both processes must travel side by side.

In our Antioch project we follow traditional organization of subject matter, but at the same time put students into situations so they have projects, and to

eliminate either one of these, I think, is fatal to education.

PRESIDENT WARREN: Would you give some illustrations of how you do that?

PRESIDENT MORGAN: I don't know that I ought to begin, but may I follow a little further in saying this: Ten years ago, when I began at Antioch, I felt that the traditional organization of subject matter had become fixed and set so that it was inhibiting any capacity for exploration in a well educated person, and by the time a man had become a graduate of our educational system, by the time he had come through it, he had become so indoctrinated that he couldn't do it any other way. I had a picture in which a third of the faculty would have been educated by the project method, self-educated out of the projects they had developed. They had indeed intellectual mastery and had become educated men outside of college and I began to explore the country for men who would come into our faculty who had reached intellectual mastery by the project method, by living their lives, and by just the method Dr. Watson has described, and I said perhaps a million or two million people have gone to college, and a hundred million haven't, and out of that hundred million I can find ten, or twenty, or thirty who have learned to organize their lives and accomplish disciplined thinking by the project method.

I have never found one. I have become a

convert to the educational process by trying to find people who had educated themselves outside of it. Here and there I have found people who were not available. One man I tried to get to be President of Antioch had two years of schooling in his lifetime. He is one of the best educated men I ever knew, but the quality of his mind enabled him to do it. He is one of the leading figures in the United States, but it takes an unusual capacity to organize one's mind without the help of organized knowledge, and the disciplines that have been transmitted to us.

I have come to feel that one of the greatest human possessions is the educational tradition and that to try to educate one outside of that is almost too difficult an undertaking, but at the same time I would not leave out the project method, but carry the two along and try to discover what is the relative value of each in an education.

DR. WATSON: Isn't your comparison a little unfair in the sense that the people you spoke of did not have the resources of the college's situation laid before them? They were not associated for four years with people endeavoring to stimulate them along these lines, surrounded by books and activities of that sort.

It was interesting to me on our first afternoon here when we talked informally about how we had been educated that no one mentioned formal courses as contributing. Perhaps we were wrong in our analyses. We all suggested a project set going here or an interest there, over a period of time, so it may be when you found persons who came out of the college situation, their education was more a by-product than a direct product of the systemization of knowledge that we have had.



PRESIDENT HOLT: Doesn't the question have something to do with the person's major or minor interest? In our major interest we must integrate the knowledge and go over the thing thoroughly in the whole field, but, and I suppose a student should be compelled, if you have any majoring at all, to do it in his major subject, he ought to be advised to do the same in addition to his major as he has time to do, but beyond that it seems to me the wisest system of getting in touch with things.

Dr. Ellis spoke of the man who gave two evenings of calculus. That was a project scheme in a way. In my own case I have no mechanical ability. I can run an automobile, but I don't know the first thing about it. Having no ability, should I go through the wrong process to learn the whole theory? It would help me in certain cases, but on the whole it seems wiser not to spend the time on that, but have someone else fix the automobile.

DR. HART: I must confess that this whole procedure, now that Dr. Watson has outlined it, is very congenial to my way of thinking about it.

I am assuming that this implies that in a class in some subject a teacher is sufficiently diverse in his interests and conscious of his methods to permit a group of students to select out of this great array of possible projects those which will help each student to come into personal contact with some specific aspects of reality and develop them; that then at some vital moment the teacher will be able to get all the students together in some way, upon some generalization of all the projects which will throw light on all of them and be a preliminary step to the organization of knowledge in that general field.

If, as President Morgan says, these two bases of education can run on together in such a way that particular experiences and reality will accrue to the individual in terms of his own activities, and then continually he will be generalizing his experiences tentatively, experimentally, and achieving bit by bit some understanding of the broader principles involved, so that out of a course of this kind, or a year's work of this kind, or out of any particular time elements, attention to this particular aspect of the subject can be given, he will emerge not merely with some particularistic experiences, but with something of an organized outlook

upon the range of these problems. If that can be worked out, not merely as curricular material, but as teaching method, then it seems to me we are on the track of something that will eventually help us to achieve, to conserve, the gradually emerging and changing interests of students, and the solid substantial results of the world's experience to date.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: Might I ask a question, Dr. Watson? How far do you contemplate this as the exclusive basis of a curriculum, or how far would it be consonant in your mind with the combination of two types of process, one, say, definitely in biology and physics?

DR. WATSON: I can see how what we now call a course in calculus, let us say, could be one of these projects alongside of many others, and some students would go in for how various degrees of systemization in biology might be appropriate at various times, but they would not be in any sense departures from this approach as I see it. Everything that would seem to me to be of worth could be offered as a possibility here and it would seem to me to be better to let the things we have usually called courses, the acquisition of materials and organization of materials, stand alongside these more particular investigations, development of skills, appreciations, recognizing that some of these questions can be answered in ten hours' work and others will take two hundred hours, but not trying to divide them on the basis of time element into some things which are short and we will do them for a couple of years, and some things are long, which we will do a couple of years later, after we get the short ones done.

DEAN DOERSCHUK: May I ask Dr. Watson whether he has had any experience with students with this procedure?

DR. WATSON: None with undergraduates; some

with elementary and secondary, and some with graduate students.  
The rest of you have much more of that.

PRESIDENT WARREN: Why do all educators neglect  
college for so long?

DR. WATSON: We are making amends now.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: We aren't here discussing the practical side of the question, as I understand it, but rather theory, but it is hard for me to resist asking that question that would bear upon the practical method of execution. I think your illustrations, while you didn't emphasize that point, made it clear that these projects would draw on the natural sciences, run out into history, and also the whole bringing in the elements for those who are interested in the fine arts and appreciation, if that is the assumption that all these fields of organized knowledge would be drawn on.

DR. WATSON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: It would require from a practical point of view unprecedented amounts of cooperation, wouldn't it?

DR. WATSON: Yes.

PRESIDENT MORGAN: Another difficulty is that just at the time you want to use a method, for instance you need to use the statistical method in appraising your factors, and you find in order to use it intelligently you have to have a year's work, or two years' work in mathematics to get you ready for ten minutes' use of it. I think it is his business to discover what you might call the universalities of need, to be used not in one case but a thousand cases, so you don't have to stop the development there and go back and pick up the universals, so we are reasonably equipped with universals.

DR. WATSON: We have taught a year of statistics to write a dissertation and a couple of years later they have gone back making investigations and we have taught statistics all over again in relation to the particular situation. I suspect not everyone would need to learn all that is involved in the subject. There would be a certain amount of delay and an individual would have to back up or stop his projects and shift to the acquisition of that tool, but, to learn as much as he needs in the form in which he needs to use it at the time seems to me a better principle of organizing the curriculum than to assume that everyone is going to need it and provide it in a set-up.



DR. ELLIS: Another serious difficulty, one which all of us have when we try to bring about any improvement in education, is the teacher. Where would we get the teachers with the divine wisdom necessary or the omniscience necessary to carry out this?

DR. WATSON: There are three or four answers to that, but hastily I will give this one: Most of the projects could be outlined in written units by a few geniuses who do see them. To supplement mightily the ordinary person, we can put something in print, and we know something of that in our civilization, fortunately. In the second place, I think the limitations of teachers who are narrow specialists, who are interested in only one field, as far as liberal arts is concerned, would be apparent but no more real than they are at the present time.

The third suggestion is I find whenever I talk to teachers along some such line as this, they say, "Where can we get a school which will let us do that? That is what I have been trying to do." I find administrators saying, "Where can we get the teachers?" Parents say, "Where can we find a school like that." It is time they got together.

DR. HART: With respect to that, there are certain other difficulties. Almost any teacher could at the present time take these units and transform them into bits of the present curriculum and teach them. On the other hand, as

the progressive schools in New York City have found, there are enormous numbers of people who want to teach in progressive schools, who carry into them merely the habits of old teaching.

I am perfectly congenial to this method of procedure, but I don't see that it is merely a curricular problem.

DR. WATSON: Excuse me, I wouldn't say 'merely.' I thought we wanted to discuss the curricular aspect of it here now. It could be discussed as a method and administration problem.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: That question is raised by implication of how far the method of presenting organized subject matter and its underlying principles is actually efficient. Dr. Watson has given a negative illustration in the case of statistics. I wonder if it is possible to bring to bear any actual experience on that program.

DR. ELLIS: I had exactly the same experience when I taught the psychology of education and took the students out of the College of Arts. What residuum of psychology was left in their minds I hardly ever was able to discover at all. Certainly it was needed in applying to the problems of education, but there was not more than a Volsteadian quantity, one-half of one per cent, something like that; however, they pick it up more quickly than if they had no training at all.

DR. WATSON: That is true of statistics, but

the total time teaching it to them first and picking it up afterwards is greater than the total amount of time consumed in learning it at one time.

DR. HART: Certainly what you learned at that time would be only that necessary to dealing with that problem at that time.

DR. WATSON: Not necessarily. I think it would be possible, quite possible, to find college students intelligent enough to see it had wider application than the present problem, and they would do the thing thoroughly.

PRESIDENT WARREN: You would tie it up immediately with their interests. They would see a definite reason for learning the things and that always helps in the time element, doesn't it?

PROFESSOR BAILEY: May I ask one question of Dr. Watson? Would that involve always a sub-division of activity on the part of a class? Isn't college life too brief for any one individual to work out such a problem as that? Wouldn't you have to sub-divide it?

DR. WATSON: Probably so. I should think some of the work could be done by individuals and some by groups. It is a question of whether this is the kind of work students ought to be doing. If we are agreed on that, I think it is almost fundamental.

DR. ELLIS: I think the main object of the college career is to start them off on enough of the problems to keep their minds busy for the rest of life.

PRESIDENT WARREN: Aren't we back to what the aims of a liberal college are?

DR. ELLIS: I would say we are.

DR. WATSON: Problems that are important for our civilization as far as we can see.

PRESIDENT WARREN: And translate their interest.

DR. ELLIS: Few settle any of the problems, because they are dead mentally then.

PRESIDENT MORGAN: I differ with Dr. Watson. He was on one side of the fence. On the other hand, I am just as much on the other. It is not a question of which we take, but the right relation of the two methods, and the right proportion, and in an institution or a group where the project method is ignored, I feel it is as much a riddle in the other direction.

DR. WATSON: I think any difference between President Morgan's point of view and mine would be cleared up in answering this question: Dr. Morgan, what is the conduct of a course, let us say in biology or chemistry or mathematics, made up of a number of interesting projects, plus a lot of additional material which has no special relevance, thinking of the students at the present time and things they are doing,

and the problems of society, things that belong in mathematics or biology or chemistry, or do you have simply a different organization of exactly the same kind of enterprises that are of worth as far as we can see when you organize them in your subject matter groups?

PRESIDENT MORGAN: The projects that you have in biology have a dominant biological influence, with the others brought in. The subjects in mathematics may have a dominant mathematical influence with others brought in. There is a tendency brought up in the field to have dominant factors in that field, but other fields are not absent by any means.

DR. WATSON: That is not quite the question I had in mind. Do you manage to get rid of the rather useless material which has cohered to the academic systems called by subject matter names, or does that get back in as soon as you let people organize their projects into those divisions?

PRESIDENT MORGAN: It gets back in as long as you take the faculty members from the traditional educational channels. That is why education is a dilemma and not something to be discovered. There is no panacea for it.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: As a variant of Dr. Watson's question, do you find that the combination method, the existence of the projects reacts to modify the subject matter courses?

PRESIDENT MORGAN: By all means. Take the case of a businessman's economics and as a rule it is acute in the particular application they have, but unless they are trained theoretically in economics, their major economics is rotten, very largely. On the other hand, you take your academic economist, who has been working only in the literature of the field, and put him into practical situations, and he is up in the air. It is only as those two methods react on each other that you get real education.

DR. HART: Do they react on each other anywhere at the present time?

PRESIDENT MORGAN: Yes.

DR. HART: Where?

PRESIDENT MORGAN: For instance, let me give you a case. I have been interested just casually as an observer for a number of years in the propagation of blueberries. Some friends of mine have taken the wild blueberries of the hills and have produced a new type of blueberry. This new type averages five or six times as large as the average wild ones and have flavor and color and everything else, including keeping qualities, superior to the wild ones. In that there was united practical skill and knowledge and information along with the most acute theoretical knowledge of biological principles, and there happened to be two people working together, one with practical abilities and the other with

theoretical abilities. Neither of them could have achieved that result without the other and neither could have achieved it without enough sympathy with the other to realize the importance of the other.

I could find a thousand examples, but that is a particular case and it is the most beautiful job of the acceleration of evolution that I know of in America, almost.

DR. HART: I should like to ask with respect to this question, has the working out of that project between those two men, in any sense of the word, had what you might call an excess liberation value on the practical man? Would he approach any other project more sympathetically than he would have if this had not happened?

PRESIDENT MORGAN: Yes. One happens to be a woman and she is approaching the problem of delinquency in her community with a biological outlook. She is very active in handling feebleminded and delinquents in her community. The biological background she has absorbed through association has been effective.

PRESIDENT WARREN: Would you not say that would apply in the practical application of chemistry to industry? The big industries have laboratories where pure chemists are busy working out that theory, and hasn't that rather affected the whole study of chemistry?

PRESIDENT MORGAN: By all means.

DR. HART: On the other hand, has it in any sense of the word affected the industrial manager's approach to other kinds of problems? I mean, has this application of a so-called science in industry any carry-over of any kind whatsoever into any other aspect, social relations of industry and things of that sort?

PRESIDENT MORGAN: That depends on the individual, where he has that capacity of excess relationship.



DR. WATSON: It would be a mistake to confuse an integration of courses and projects with an integration of practice and theory. It seems to me projects may well involve an integration of the practical and theoretical, and courses may likewise involve real integration of that sort. I should feel that President Morgan's principle there must be in action, integration between the theory and ramifications and meanings that lie back of it, and the practical activities that one attacks immediately form a perfectly valid theory, whatever our basis of selection of the curricula.

DR. ROBINSON: In spite of all the indecision and lack of conclusion, there are a series of things said here that are of very great importance. That has been the case from the start. It would seem as though we ought to have, instead of voting in the usual way, a point formulated that happened to get expressed. For instance, that what we call the traditional fields of science might be gravely modified by this newer attitude which has been expressed by Dr. Watson and ratified by President Morgan. It seems as though we would be getting, actually salting something down as we went along, if we could get that point formulated without any particular vote on the thing; but here is a definite thing, namely, that there is a strong suspicion that the old departments in which our knowledge has fallen, the old so-called fields, are not necessarily pedagogically sufficient as they stand, that is, old-fashioned psychology (about as poor a thing as you can imagine), and old-fashioned chemistry, certainly old-fashioned physics and old-fashioned history the same way.

If we could put down that point, namely, that President Morgan and Dr. Watson, having talked over this thing, and the rest of us looking on and participating somewhat, had reached the interesting conclusion that this so-called problematic approach or project method, as it is technically called (I some way resent these particular ways of calling things, but we have to call them something) has really

exercised a chastening influence on what might be called the formal presentation of subjects.

Why can't we have a committee or someone who, when we feel that a point has been made, could put it on record? Pretty soon we will find that if we could only go back and try to recall all the things that have been said since we have been conferring here, we would have a rather imposing list of, I won't say 'conclusions,' but of emergencies of one kind or another as a result of our discussion.

Does that seem a practical project? It would be the result of our cooperation and not the statement or view of any particular person. As we have gone along, this, that, and the other issue has emerged, and now we will have an illustration of it.

Dr. Watson has given us an idea of the wealth of problems that will emerge under any particular one of his captions, and President Morgan, with his wide experience in and extraordinary attitude toward the matter, has been able to make the whole matter clear, and he says definitely (and Dr. Dewey says the same thing) that no doubt this particular way of going at things, namely, project method, is going to influence and has already influenced our secondary school books very much, so they are quite different from what they were a few years ago.

Why can't we organize ourselves in such a way

that when the point is made, the point is recorded?

Now what does your enigmatic smile mean?

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: It meant two things. It meant that I was in very high sympathy with what you were saying and I was wondering how we could carry that out.

DR. ROBINSON: That might determine somewhat the fruitfulness of our further procedure.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: I agree with you.

DR. ELLIS: I think that is vastly better than voting on things. It has been said that it is better to sit down and think than stand up and vote on things; it involves intelligence.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: We have a raconteur officially, and I wonder --

DR. ELLIS: Suppose we ask Dr. Watson and President Morgan to formulate that.

DR. ROBINSON: That would be a good idea.

DR. WATSON: I was going to make a suggestion that we appoint from our own number a Findings Committee, not to write these things originally, but, ask each one of us, when we think there is a conclusion of that sort, to write it down, and at the end of each session turn over all our sheets to the Findings Committee to report the unanimous points or other points on which there is no reason for objection, and

raise the point as to whether we have reached a conclusion or not, and let all contribute to it, but let that Committee organize and report back from time to time.

MR. GAVIT: I think the time has come exactly now for the Chairman himself to do what has been suggested, and that is, tell us as he sees it just exactly where we are at.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: We haven't heard from everyone and I don't know what the degree of underlying agreement is. We do seem to be agreed as far as the persons who have spoken, that it is desirable that the study should grow out of definite situations which are so related to the experience of students as to have a potential interest for them.

We seem to be agreed that we can't get anywhere in dealing with these situations without drawing upon the organized, accumulated, classified knowledge of the expert.

We seem to be agreed that it would be more vital that in using this, in the third place, in a vital and effective way, there would probably be a considerable elimination of material included in traditional courses, and along with that a very considerable change of emphasis and arrangement of this subject matter.

The fourth point has not been dealt with much, and personally I should be inclined to presume, but I realize that it might be questioned by others, that this situation

method, drawing upon organized fields of knowledge, would serve to discover individual aptitudes, and the same way that it would lead, (or would it lead?) to more organized and consecutive habits of thinking and therefore in the end to an actually better intellectual organization than is obtained by the older method of starting with logical intellectual organization.

Dr. Robinson organized a question as to the best chrysalis for points in the discussion so they would not evaporate in the multiplicity of questions that come up.

Dr. Watson made the suggestion that each person -- what was it?

DR. WATSON: Each of us write down what we think might be a generalization of principles, of findings, as we go along, as it emerges, and turn it in at the end of each session to a Committee that will organize and formulate a statement for us and bring them back to us.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: We might submit it to the Steering Committee and not multiply committees.

DR. WATSON: We should like to have the Chairman meet with us.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: Each person may make such generalization or condensation of the discussion as he wishes, the deposit in his own mind. We can't force that on anyone, but it is an agreeable suggestion.

PROFESSOR BAILEY: I move it be adopted.

... The motion was seconded ...

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: That will be the understanding, that each person, as far as possible, turn in his statement of the deposit in his own mind.

DR. GEORGIA: The Secretary would be glad to have copies of that, too.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: The Secretary would be included in that, of course.

I am going to take the liberty of calling on Dr. Bancroft to state the relation of this to 5a and these three elements.

DR. BANCROFT: I have been waiting for 5a to come up, and with Dr. Dewey's permission, I will speak a little longer than the special committee would have liked.

If Professor Bailey had been asked after his lecture last night what he thought of Dr. Watson's fourteen points, I think he would have had to say it meant the destruction of education by the barbarians, because you remember he said that the slogan of the barbarians was damnation to everything that has gone before, and I have the impression that all these reports agree on the general principle of distribution and concentration. Most of them want distribution first and concentration afterwards.

Dean McConn takes a slightly different view. He would like to have them go ahead simultaneously. How you would do it, I don't know.

It seems to me this general proposition as put forward by Dr. Watson is the rankest form for specialization. If it comes in at all, it should come in the second two years and not in the first two years. I don't think that is an exaggeration because if you take the student committee's report, they say perfectly definitely here they think so, that arts and sciences as subjects should be given in the first two years, and their report is based very largely, with modifications, on things that Dr. Watson said before, and in the special meeting of the Committee Dr. Watson rather extended



that and said he thought it would go for four years.

I can see that if you are going to give the professional course in theology, or theory of education, whatever you wish to call it, or if you are to consider Rollins as a laboratory, we have been told Prohibition was a grand experiment, too. Some of us don't like it. The trouble with it is that you are dealing with human beings, and so I don't know just how it is going to turn out.

If this goes ahead, in a few years, so far as I can see, Dr. Watson will be in position to be ahead of the game; if not, if it doesn't work out, he can say, "I didn't foresee the results," which is all right from the point of view of the experimenter, but awfully hard on Rollins in case it goes that way, and my feeling has been, as a research man, it is pretty desirable to check experiments and not go too fast when you are dealing with human beings.

We have a particular case that would seem to be more or less, not necessarily a project, but it is certainly along student interests, in the case of the Moraine Park School, where the idea was that the boys, before reaching college, should work intensively at things that interested them. If they were intensively interested in airplanes, they built airplanes.

I was very much interested in it. It was a gorgeous thing at the time. I watched it with a certain

amount of care. I was very much interested in it. As a matter of fact, at least three of those boys came to Cornell, and they had a very bad time indeed. You may say it is the fault of Cornell. That is immaterial, but there was a mental maladjustment, and what the thing had done apparently had been to convert them, well, let us say, more or less into infant prodigies along certain lines and float them entirely out of gear with other boys. You may say they were better or worse. I don't care, but they got along to more or less of an isolation where they wanted to play with the people from Moraine Park and didn't want to do otherwise, and two of them, as I remember, didn't survive the struggle. I think the third one finally worked through, but so far as I can make out, the thing was ghastly.

Another interesting thing is that although I should say it was a very striking case of a development not along projects, necessarily, but along student interests, neither Dr. Watson nor President Warren were familiar with it, which it seems to me really they ought to be.

I haven't any objection, personally, to shaking dice with the best, but I don't like to do it with regard to somebody else. I think it is an unfortunate thing to start off on a thing which I admit is perfectly lovely on paper, but may very likely come out rather badly in everyday life, and in that case, whose fault is it?

I mentioned mental maladjustment. You remember that the student report here cited as one of the things they worried over a good deal, their mental health. That struck me as a little peculiar and I asked about it, and Mr. George Holt said they did worry over their mental health a good deal, and the girl who answered confirmed him in every detail, so I think there is no question about it. That seems awfully queer, because the undergraduates I have known either in the present or past, have never worried about mental health, didn't know they had it, and didn't care whether they had it at all.

So, I made some inquiries to find out what it was all about and I was told there was a very considerable percentage of mental maladjustment at Rollins. Well, in my ignorance, that meant incipient insanity, at the least, and I was a good deal worried and I asked what they meant by 'mental maladjustment.' It turns out it is very simple, that is, a great many students have an inferiority complex. I don't know that we do not all have an inferiority complex on certain points. That is mental maladjustment and undoubtedly it is good and those of us who haven't an inferiority complex probably feel high-hat along certain lines, in which case we have a mental maladjustment. If you cut out the people at the top with the superiority complex and the people with the inferiority complex, it is a question of where you put your dividing

line, how close you bring them together, whether you include everybody under it.

There is nothing new in it. That is the same old thing we have always had. "Everybody in the world is queer but thee and me, and sometimes I think thee's a bit odd." So, I personally don't feel any special reason for worrying at present over Rollins College students as being fearfully abnormal. I think it is possible they are in a hypersensitive state, but that isn't very important.

Supposing you take this thing, which, as I see it, is primarily a professional course in sociology, or take it on any basis, when they get through with it, giving it every possible advantage, where are they going to come off? They are not going to know what it is they are going to do unless they want to go into sociology; otherwise, I don't see how, after they have had two years or four years of the special kind of sociology Dr. Watson recommends, that they will know a bit more than they did when they started as to what they want to do. They will not be in a position to earn their living except again along narrower lines. That perhaps is immaterial, and they won't be in a position to enjoy life, and to enjoy their fellowmen, at least in the way that the rest of us understand it.

And, by the way, I don't know that I should cite Dr. Watson as a good advertisement for his method. He

told us he was dissatisfied with this and that, and, as far as I could make out, he is dissatisfied with everything. As a matter of fact, I don't think there is any doubt that he gets a certain amount of pleasure out of grouching. If he wants to look at it that way, that is all right. I am not so sure all the other people feel that way. They might say they would like to be more or less satisfied with something, and I am very much afraid if this thing were tried out as a beautiful laboratory experiment, that we would get a product which consisted very largely of freaks.

I know perfectly well, of course, that the undergraduate doesn't mind being called a freak, if he knows he is a martyr. He loves to be a martyr, but if it ever gets around to the point that it dawns on him he really is a freak, that is going to hurt. There is no question about that.

Then another place was indicated the other day where I apparently don't speak the same language as other people. I was talking to Dr. Robinson at breakfast and he said in his experience the people could be divided into two classes: (1) those who believe the world is 99 per cent good and who, therefore, advised not changing it; and (2) those who believe the world is 99 per cent bad, in which case whatever you did couldn't make things worse, and might make things better.

That seems to me sort of more a question of a man who is dealing with phrases than with fact. The people I know don't go quite on that. I know people who were fifty-fifty and sixty-forty, and so forth and so on, and, if you want a platitude, put in that limiting cases are not average cases, and I don't believe for a moment that the world divides up into people who are 99 per cent one way and 99 per cent the other. The only place where I know where that occurs is in stories for children. They want the heroes to be heroes, or heroines, and the villains to be villains, and there is no question about it. Things are black or white. In everyday life most lives find that most of the things are gray.

That, of course, is destructive criticism which in itself isn't of any use except that one has to try to clear the air, and as everybody has agreed the first two things are the important ones, and I do not agree, we have to go through it, but then people come along and say, 'Well, what would you do?' That is a fair question.

In the first place, I should like to put it to you. In the first place, since people are very different, I shouldn't advocate under any circumstances any rigid curriculum for everybody. I think you should have enough alternatives so you can satisfy pretty nearly anyone.

In the second place, I would rather not talk about courses or subjects, if you prefer, as they are. That

is one of the things I hoped we were going to do when we came down here, take subjects, chemistry, physics, biology, and all the rest of them, and see what ought to be left in them, instead of taking sociology and seeing how much chemistry, physiology, and so forth, should be put in it. Apparently that is a vain hope and apparently nobody else is interested in that, but I feel a certain amount of interest in what the other people have called the classic arrangement, using that in a derogatory sense.

I don't care for history myself and I don't read much history, but I do believe that history and fine arts, and English literature, and composition, and the whole list of the regulation things are an awfully good thing and that you can't ask everybody to take all of them, but they would be a great deal better and have a better view of life if they took a certain number of them. Consequently what I would do and what I suggested the first day (I saw at once I was an outsider for suggesting it) would be to take the different possible subjects (I don't think they would run over fourteen or fifteen at the outside), those which you could call cultural subjects, and cut them down, if you could; and, if not, put them into groups, and then say that in your first two years you ought to take at least one from each of these four groups and you shall not take more than, say, three.

That is a mere question of detail and then the

thing to do would be to discuss what ought to go into the courses. As I told you the other day, I have a very definite opinion that chemistry as it is ordinarily taught at the universities is an utterly unfit subject for a college of liberal arts. The same thing is true of physics. Those are the two I happen to know most about, and I think it is probably true of most of the other things, though it may not be true of history and the fine arts.

I have heard a good deal this week about trying to cut loose and that we ought not do anything that anyone has done before. I have heard it in the past. Lots of people feel that way, and, personally, I have always felt that was rather a confession of weakness, or, as Professor Bailey would say, a confession of barbarism. And so we come to exactly the same thing that we reached last night, that I think Dr. Watson and probably most of the conference would say that the weight that should be given to No. 1 and No. 2 probably is 90 to 95 per cent.

I would put in the kind of thing that Dr. Watson wants. I should put it in as most valuable, but, as he said he didn't approve at all that it should be put in as a course, I think it should be about 5 to 10 per cent of the total thing for the two years and then, for those people interested in that line, go on for the last two years and specialize.

We give a course which, as I see it, is similar



in principle to Dr. Watson's, at Cornell, but we call it a professional course in chemistry. If you call his a professional course in sociology, I haven't any objection, but the moment he does that, he throws it out of the discussion, as the chemistry is out.

So, I am absolutely on the other side of the fence, thank you, and I am perfectly ready to be thrown either down through the floor or out through the window.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: I don't think there will be any disposition to do either - on the contrary.

I don't understand, expressing my own views, that we are at all debarred from a discussion of the content of various subjects, biology, chemistry, physics, history, and so forth, provided we have time to get around to it, but that our first problem was rather to determine the points of view and principles, if I may use that word for the moment, which shall determine the selection of subject matter in the branches. It might be well for the Steering Committee to consider that, whether it might be profitable to take up - they can't cover the whole fourteen or fifteen subjects any more than all the fourteen points, but take up some of these subjects as a concrete field in which to discuss the determination of principle. That might be one very good way to get at it, but our time has come for closing this morning's session, I believe.

We shall meet again at eight o'clock this evening.

... The meeting adjourned at twelve-thirty o'clock ...

---

## WEDNESDAY EVENING SESSION

January 21, 1931

The meeting convened at eight twenty-five o'clock, Dr. Dewey presiding.

... Announcements by Dr. Georgia ...

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: The meeting is ready to begin operations and the first thing in order, I think, is the report of the Special Committee, and President Holt tells me he has turned the Chairmanship over to Dr. Ellis.

DR. ELLIS: Mr. Chairman, we have not completed our conference, but we have taken three steps on the way and I will read those steps, using President Holt's memorandum of the morning as a basis.

"The purpose of the College of Liberal Arts is:

"1. The organization, transmission, extension, and application of knowledge.

"2. The awakening, developing, enlarging, disciplining, and elevating of interests, appreciations, and attitudes.

"3. The rendering of public service."

The Committee I presume will meet again and report further progress.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: I take it this is a report of progress rather than anything requiring immediate action.

DR. ELLIS: We report. We hope it is progress.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: Is there a motion to approve as far as the Committee has gone, or shall we assume that without a formal vote? Is there any objection? If not, it is carried. (Laughter)

The Chairman was asked to make some kind of statement. He doesn't know exactly what sort of statement was wanted of him.

President Morgan said this morning (I will have occasion to refer to that later) that any education of

which we have spoken was in a dilemma. As I say, I want to refer to that point later, but first I want to say that the Chairman is in a dilemma, or a dilemma is in him, and, in fact, as he is a Chairman, he is a dilemma.

I suppose being Chairman something is expected of me in the way of assisting the progress of discussions, some kind of conclusion; that while our discussions are theoretical in nature, they are supposed to end up in something which is at least capable of practical application, and I fancy and I fear that if we do not reach some kind of conclusion of some fairly definitive sort, the responsibility and the blame will either be the Chairman's or he will be a convenient goat for the failure of the Commission to reach some definite conclusion.

That is one horn of the dilemma. On the other hand, this is, after all, the Conference's own meeting, and I am sure that no one of you, if you were in my Chairman's place, would desire in any way to try to lead the discussion in any direction or, for the sake of getting some definitive opinion, suppress discussion or turn it too much in any one direction. So much for my personal dilemma.

Now, as a point of text to my remarks, I want to take two statements that have been made here, both of them, I think, this morning. To one I have already referred. The other, I think was a question asked by Dr. Hart, Why is this Commission here? or, amplifying it a little, as he did, Why is

it that the curriculum has become a problem?

Of course, college faculties have been tinkering with curricula for a very long time. It is a continual process, but I don't know of many discussions, in fact I don't know of any just like this, where people were brought together at the invitation of a hospitable institution and a very broadminded president, to discuss the principles or criteria which should govern the determination of a curriculum with all barriers down and the ground thrown freely open. I think the question, then, that was asked this morning as to why that has taken place now, when such a thing would have been almost inconceivable a few years ago, is a very pertinent question and a question which has certain bearing upon the tenor of our deliberations.

It would take a very long time to answer that question, but I should like to suggest that one reason is that the conditions of American life have changed very rapidly in the last generation and have changed so rapidly that the changes in life in general have outstripped the educational principles, philosophy, and practices of the college. Our pioneer period is long passed, of course, and if one were to try to put a date upon the general change of conditions in this life from rural and agrarian to urban, semi-urban, and industrial, I suppose we would fix the date somewhere roughly in the nineties, or say a generation ago.

It seems to me this change, which was barely hinted at in that remark, is one reason for the feeling which has crystallized in this meeting that there is a need of a new independent consideration of this whole question and one which through this intellectual as well as other generosity of the President and Rollins College, has not any fixed limits to it, so that we are free to consider any possibility and explore any and every aspect of the field.

In conversation with Dr. Hart my attention was recalled to an article by Professor Mead, of Chicago University, which presents another aspect perhaps of the same general question, namely, the divorce and the somewhat increasing divorce between what we call culture, for lack of a better name, and the more indiginous and spontaneous movements of American life.

There seems to be a split somewhat similar to that which Mr. Santayana some years ago called the split between the drawingroom in the home and the kitchen and the dining room, the somewhat exotic nature of those higher interests that we call culture as compared with the actual, dominating interests and activities of the great mass of the American people, and I think if I might indulge in a perhaps too philosophical presentation of the situation, one reason we have to discuss such questions as we are discussing here is that there is felt, if not consciously formulated, the need of making a closer

connection between all those interests that go by the name of culture and the dominant interests and activities of the great body of the American people.

It would take too much time to go into detail about these points and to add others which I think will naturally occur to you, but if one were to attempt to translate these general remarks over into more definite and refined terms, it might seem to me to at least express some of the main problems and issues, and movement underlying the issues, questions which come before us. How shall we readapt or readjust the general movement of college life in the college of arts that will have it take into greater, more intimate account in some way or other, and how, is one of the problems we have to determine with the great change that is taking place in American life within the last generation; and the other is how shall we make the colleges count in developing a culture which is more truly indigenous. It is not imported or exotic; it grows out of American life and still more reacts into our American life to refine and elevate it in all of its different phases.

The other text I was going to take is this remark of President Morgan which is: at best, under any circumstances, education is a dilemma. We cannot (if I am not misinterpreting him) set up any absolute goal or ideal of perfection. We have to choose, if not between the better and



the worse, at least between the better and the good, and the good in contrast with the better would then be the worse. They have to make, in other words, adjustments or even, if you please, compromises between various competing interests, interests that compete in colleges because they compete not harmoniously in life itself.

That suggested to me one point which perhaps is a little nearer the practical issue than the general remark that I have already made. If we cannot conclude satisfactorily with any program, not of curricula, but of criteria, meaning ideas on which we unanimously agree, it would be at least a step forward if we could define the dilemma, if we could determine more definitely what the alternatives are that have to be met, for even that, I think, would give genuine guidance. It would tend to put some limits to flux and introduce more of definite aim and purpose or goal, or might be made to contribute to that end in American life.

So, I suggest that at least so far as there are differences of opinion among us, as there certainly must be in a group like this, we do not regard ourselves as defenders of any particular, irreducible dogma, but rather that we use our differences of opinion to help define and describe this dilemma of college in such a way that we might at least suggest some alternative school.

I was reading in the New York Times the report

from an educational discussion of a somewhat different sort, being held in New York City, in which one educator in that city is quoted as saying that it is desirable that all American colleges should have the same curricula. I rubbed my spectacles and my eyes. I thought I had read it wrong, but of course what he said was that it was not desirable that all American colleges should have the same curricula, but there it was, at all events, "It is desirable that all American colleges have the same curricula."

If we believe there is room and desirability for different curricula in different liberal arts colleges of the United States, then I think we would, as I have said before, at least help contribute to the guidance of different institutions in defining the dilemma so that various alternatives, various alternative types of curricula, different lines of experimentation, might be laid down.

I have just used the word 'experimentation' and that suggests my final point. All education is experimental, whether we call it that or not. We simply can't help that and we are experimenting with very precious and valuable material in the lives of these young people. We may think or try to convince ourselves that there is no experimental element in the situation, but practically everything we do, every course we lay out, and every class we meet, is in its effects an experiment for good or for bad, and if we can help so much more

to define alternative modes of experimentation and make the situation more clear in that way, perhaps we will be enabled to capitalize the difference of opinion that must exist among us, rather than have it bring us to an unfortunate deadlock in reaching a conclusion.

I thank the Conference for their kind attention. I don't know that I thank them for asking me to do this, but that concludes my remarks. (Applause)

DR. ROBINSON: In any report that we make I think the substance of what you have said ought to appear, that is, as Dr. Hart suggested, it needn't be very long, but we have to give a justification of President Holt's idea in summoning us, and I want to say a word on that because it fits into the mystery of this very great change that all of us older teachers realize so vividly.

It seems to me that we used to have a great deal more confidence in our teaching, and we are very much more indifferent to learning. Now, as I want to say, teaching is quite an easy thing, particularly the traditional process, but learning remains to me a very great mystery. I scrutinize myself. I often think of sitting down to a typewriter and seeing if I can't in some way come to terms with the process of learning. We have a vast literature of teaching, but I think learning remains a mystery. There are some efforts to analyze learning, but I am quite sure that one of the great advances of the future is going to be to understand learning well enough so that our teaching will become a great deal more efficient than it has ever been in the past.

Some way or other, it is much like writing books. I personally always worry a great deal about the reader, but when I read other people's books, it seems to me that the writers haven't worried about the reader much, and so it is with teaching.

I suppose I began like everybody else with the accepted ideas of teaching, but more and more I have become more and more nervous about this matter of learning. How am I going to teach in order that learning should take place? And, not knowing how learning takes place, I don't think I know how to teach.

Doesn't that fit in, really, with our problems? It is a new scrupulosity which may be ascribed partly to the fact that in the old days when I was at Harvard there was no one to blaspheme against education. You could neglect it or do anything you would about it, but nowadays there is much open blasphemy on the part of the young, and the trouble is in my case that I sympathize so very heartily with it, and the thing that has most charmed me in our meetings here is that everybody else seems to.

Whether that could be added to the prolegomenon that we ought to prepare in some way, I am merely offering this as a supplementary idea to those suggested by our Chairman, but if our work is to take the form of a report, as I suppose it inevitably will, it seems to me that someone should be charged, not overdoing it at all, but to formulate as well as possible those things which have led to this quite unprecedented enterprise of President Holt's.

DR. HART: Mr. Chairman, I should like to say for Dr. Robinson's information I can show a number of books on educational psychology in which the whole mystery of learning is finished off in two short paragraphs. (Laughter)

PRESIDENT MORGAN: While the meeting is on trivialities, may I say that a remark was made by Dr. Bancroft this morning here that I feel silence might lend consent to on my part (if I can get off the subject here entirely) when he discussed the Moraine Park School and said that it was a ghastly failure, I think that was the summing up.

There are two or three things I should like to say about that, as seems necessary. One is that a fairly careful record has been kept of the outcome of the graduates of that school and an unusually large proportion of them went to college. Of those who did go, somewhat more than 85 per cent were successful in their college work.

After the meeting here, one person who is here drew my attention to the fact that in a particular college where he was teaching there were two of these students. One was an honor student and one was considerably above the average. His transfer of scientific method is such that he does not generalize from those two students too much, but I think that the record of that institution as a whole ranks well with those of secondary schools in the success of its students in college.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: What is the desire of the Conference about further order of discussion? Shall we recur to the original program and continue discussion of 5a? What is your wish in the matter? You will notice that we have a new sheet here of some specific curricular problems.

PRESIDENT HOLT: I move we take up these specific curricular problems as suggested by the Committee.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: Is that the desire of the Conference?

DEAN McCONN: It was the thought of the Committee that at some point, not necessarily right away, but at some point, we should want to have a tentative formulation of some of these specific problems. It was, I think, a part of the thought of the so-called Steering Committee that possibly the next step after what we went through this morning might be a further discussion of 5a, unless the Conference wants to leave that and it is then possible this might come along pretty soon.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: The Chairman would like the guidance of the Conference. Those in favor of continuing the discussion as far as 5a applies, please raise their hands.

... Five hands were raised ...

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: Those in favor of the special curricula raise their hands. It is a question of what we shall do next. Those in favor of continuing the discussion of



5a please raise their hands.

... Ten hands were raised ...

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: Those in favor of special curricular problems. I think ten is a majority. Some of those who raised their hands are certainly ready to continue the discussion.

MR. GAVIT: I have wanted to hear some discussion of the weight that should be given to the interests of the student. We have had that interest presented and raised the question of how to find it, but it has been to me assumed almost too much that we knew how much weight should be given to it, and this afternoon I put my mind on the subject and tried to get it into some words that would be more brief than an offhand speech, and with your permission I will read what I wrote:

The conscious interests, tastes, preferences, choices of the student are of primary importance in projecting the task of the college.

It is the first business of the college to ascertain what they are and upon what they are founded. They inexorably condition the whole relationship between student and teacher; just as the physical peculiarities and limitations of the individual condition the work of the physical trainer; just as subjective symptoms are indispensable to the diagnosis of the physician. They indicate - indeed they largely constitute - the point of contact between the student and the teacher, without which the relationship is sterile.

But these "interests" (or "excitements," as Dr. Robinson prefers to call them) as recognized or fancied by himself, or even by the teacher, are by no means necessarily adequate as a decisive guide in projecting his college experience.

They may be the flowering of a sound and illuminating development; too often they are the expression of limitations, repressions, warpings, the correction of which is or should be the main purpose of the college. They are inadequate even as an index of either capacity or direction.

It is the second business of the college (the teacher) to examine, or, rather, to assist the student in examining and appraising these supposed "interests," and the background behind them. Probably in most cases - certainly in a very large proportion - that background, including the student's whole nexus of personal experience and influences, positive and negative, from his birth and the heritage behind it, will be found to be inadequate, lopsided, ill adapted to supply any sure footing upon which to choose either life-work or the means of making it personally satisfactory or socially effectual.

It is, therefore, inseparable from this task not only to help the student examine and revise his supposed "interests" (or confirm them as the case may be); but to supplement and amplify them; to find them if they seem non-existent; to discover and awaken new ones. In short, to check up and rectify motivation.

It is regrettable, but nevertheless an inexorable fact, that commonly the college must waste a great deal of time and energy in taking up slack; in doing what should have been

but was not done earlier; in overcoming, antidoting, correcting, supplanting, the results of negligence, ignorance, repressions, false perspectives and valuations, long accumulating during formative years, in school and home and social environment from the very beginning of life. It must take on, whether it likes it or not, a job which theoretically should not belong to the college period at all.

The third business of the college - as it is of the teacher anywhere along the line from the beginning - is to make available for the student, and awaken his interest in, the accumulated experience and knowledge of the world, of the race; so that he may himself revise and constantly criticize his judgments, choices, interests, and discover new ones; so that he may now and continuously hereafter until he dies confirm and reinforce a sure and well chosen footing upon which to live with satisfaction, satisfaction within himself as a separate individual, and to his comrades and neighbors near and far, in the business and adventure and relationships of the civilization in which he lives and to whose betterment he will aspire to contribute.

This business includes that of spreading before the student, in some convenient and systematic manner, with the largest possible purview and sense of the inter-relation of all "subjects," this accumulated experience and the reflections of wisdom thereupon. It includes the effort to

broaden the scope of interest and concern, of "excitement," about environment; leading that "excitement" to center itself congenially and as early as may be upon particular aspects and purposes for more intensive cultivation.

Curriculum (synthesis) selected among the more or less conveniently classified "subjects," must vary with the disclosed needs of the individual; but only rarely is the student equipped to make the selection which shall best enable him to serve even his own supposed "interests." Therefore the college (the teacher) out of desire to fructify even such interests, must prescribe a minimum of essentials, and assure itself that the student either brings them with him at entrance or acquires them. These are the tools with which he must work; the keys to the treasure-house in which the college, the teacher, is bound to make him feel at home.

In my own experience, I was allowed to evade this fundamental equipment and to follow my "interests" along lines of least resistance. This has interfered with my access to the stores within the treasure-house; and I know now that my "interests" ought to have had a wiser guidance.

(Applause)

PRESIDENT HOLT: I move that it be the sense of this Committee that that is as good a statement as we are likely to get of how much weight to put on the students' interests.

PRESIDENT WARREN: I should like some further discussion of that.

DR. ROBINSON: Why couldn't we put it in the form of a motion that the statement be incorporated in our report? I think with President Holt it is improbable we will get a better statement of it.

PROFESSOR BAILEY: I second the motion.

PRESIDENT HOLT: I think eventually we should have an editing committee.

PRESIDENT MORGAN: It seems to me there is one element that might be added to it or enlarged. I was just going to make the same motion that was made before. It seems to me that it is correct to say that all accomplishment is the outcome of interest, that no one does anything except because of interest. If I run away from a dog, I am interested in escape.

MR. GAVIT: You are interested in the dog.

(Laughter)

PRESIDENT MORGAN: And I may be getting my lessons because I am liable to be fired otherwise. There is no accomplishment except by interest, and I think that Mr. Gavit said very correctly that the interests students bring with them are sometimes wisely developed, but almost invariably they are to a large degree the result of the environment of that student and not of his innate qualities, and only if that environment happens to have been unusual are those interests on the plane to which the college is seeking to bring his life; and it seems to me that the primary business of the college, if I were to try to make the statement, is to enlarge, and to discipline, and to educate, and to reapportion the interests of the student, and that for a teacher in college to undertake to present subject matter in any course without introducing the student to the significance of that course is a mistake.

I think it is one of the great crimes of education that we undertake to present subject matter without having taken the students into our confidence and letting them see why we think that subject matter is significant and important, and the bringing of the students into our confidence and helping them to see as we go along why our presentations are necessary, why the subject matter is valuable, is one of the greatest changes that needs to take place in education, and when it does take place, we will of necessity largely have a disappearance of the conflict between the student interest and faculty work.

I think under the surface most students come for this reason: They want to discover about life and get its significance and be prepared for it, and they have been told or have somehow come to the conclusion that college is a place where they do that, and they present themselves to have those processes carried through that will result in their being ready to live; that is, their primary interest is a general one and, with intelligence, that can be guided and made loyal to the most comprehensive picture of education, if it is done carefully, and thoughtfully, and wisely. Students' interests are not necessarily provincial beyond cure, and the chief business of the college is that removal of provincialism, development of catholicity, of universality, and good proportion in students' interests.



CHAIRMAN DEWEY: The question is before you, namely, that this statement of nature and limitations of interest has been accepted and placed on the record.

DR. GEORGIA: I think the motion was that the statement of Mr. Gavit be taken with respect to the student interest.

DR. WATSON: There are certain aspects of the report I suspect we would all agree upon and some points where I think we would go further than the statement goes. I know, for instance that teachers are defended on outrageous courses. Good teachers can interest students in almost anything, Latin epigraphy, for instance, and I would say that was not the criterion to determine whether it is right to enter the situation. At the same time there is a difficulty we should recognize even if we can't clarify it, in determining which interests we will encourage and keep and which ones we will not. We can say catholicity and good proportion and better interests and more worth while ones, and I think we will agree, but when it comes to a particular John Jones, it is a bit difficult for any of us to say. None of us, I suppose, would want to say we should have a certain pattern of interests just like that of someone else.

There was a hint there that lopsidedness was bad. In a sense it is, but some kind of axial structure to one's personality is certainly a very desirable thing. There is a suggestion of general requirements which I suspect if we were to try to define, would lead us into a good deal of difficulty. I wonder if the report ought not include some recognition of the fact that the problem is not solved with the statement and the difficulty of determining which interests are good and which are bad or least worth while, let me say for

the moment, is one to which we ought to direct a good deal of attention and perhaps in terms of individual cases.

MR. GAVIT: Absolutely.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: There was a student who arose to his feet. I should like to know the desire of the Conference. Shall we hear from him?

SEVERAL CONFEREES: Yes, surely.

MR. WALLACE GOLDSMITH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

As a corollary to that, I should like to take Mr. Gavit's proposal. When he mentioned the line of least resistance, it immediately crystallized something I felt has been eminent in this Conference, that is, a sense of two objectives for the student, the developing of his interests and the developing of moral stamina or a certain doggedness about the way in which his character developed, more the development of character, I should say, and some will persist in the belief that that comes through taking undesirable subjects and things that are often totally anathema to the student and against his interest.

It occurs to me it is often said those students who work their way and receive scholarships often get more out of college than those who have their fathers pay their way, and it has also been said that those who never go to school at all, but develop themselves outside of the precincts of education develop more of this moral stamina and are better able to cope with the world.

It seems to me that if education is going to develop to definitely supercede these most difficult manners

of approach, then it must follow the line of least resistance. Please do not misunderstand me. I think that the whole motivation of education is in the making it easier for the student to gain what would take him years to gain outside of the schoolhouse.

It is just as in the matter of leisure, one may say leisure is a bad thing and it encourages idleness; on the other hand, if it is used in an enlightened way, leisure is the salvation of the race. It is going to be the salvation of America. Not until we do encourage leisure in our students, and that was something that President Warren proposed at the beginning of this Conference which appealed to me, shall we find the salvation of America. And yet, in its over-regulated sense I should say it was almost a warring upon itself.

Then there is the matter of least resistance in the student's interests. I should disagree with Dr. Watson when he says there are good and bad interests. Any interest in connection with education must be a good interest, and so one develops this line of least resistance until it becomes the hardest thing that the student does; that is, he finds that it grows into something more and more difficult, just as one tackling a short story plot for the first time in his life is led off in many digressions and has to elaborate and do a great deal of research which he wouldn't have done

otherwise. I think that education is like going into a short story course. One finds many points that intrigue his interest which never did intrigue his interests until they became so all-important.

That is all I have to say.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: As I understood the paper, Mr. Gavit, it consisted of two parts. One was the general statement of the nature and limitations of interest, and the other was a recommendation for a particular type of course.

MR. GAVIT: Not quite, Mr. Chairman. What I did, because I felt I had not done it before, was to stick to point 5a, dealing first with the student interests, and then with the question whether it was possible to make a synthesis. That went, of course, to this other curriculum, and the point I stressed last, or tried to, was that even there the college must out of its experience prescribe a certain irreducible minimum of tools with which the student is to achieve these interests after they have been checked up and rectified and, if you please, confirmed; and then I thought there was a recommendation for a course which should present the interests' relations. I made the suggestion during the week that there should be such a course. I didn't directly allude to that there, although I think there should be something of that nature in it. I thought I heard something of that nature and I thought if that were the case, perhaps it should be divided. Perhaps the motion should be divided, but I see I am wrong. I had no idea of its being adopted by the Committee. It was my own private notion.

... The motion to adopt Mr. Gavit's statement for incorporation in the record was put to a vote and was

carried ...

PRESIDENT HOLT: What was the next, problems of civilization?

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: Can anyone make an equally effective statement of the way to begin with the problems of civilization, President Holt suggests.

PROFESSOR BAILEY: Civilization, Point 2.



DR. WATSON: Is this the place to raise a question as to which of two paths we want to follow in carrying out the implication in Mr. Gavit's statement? I know some colleges, for example, which say the thing to do is start with the best interest the student has and follow it and let it lead into other things, guiding, as you go along, a kind of organic development in the individual from his present interests. Others say there are some things good for students that are necessary for civilization, or something of that sort. Let's lay those out, set them forth and find the best way possible of interesting students in them and getting them into those things.

Isn't there a real difference between those two methods of approaching the provision for the reeducation of interests?

PRESIDENT WARREN: Perhaps there is a difference in objective there in a way. Perhaps one is based on difference of emphasis. One is based rather more on trying to develop the personality of the student so that he may integrate with the community rather more than the other; and the other is rather more interested in giving him information about the world in which he lives. Might that be true, would you say?

DR. WATSON: I am greatly puzzled at that point.

PRESIDENT WARREN: I am, too.

DEAN McCONN: I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if in a college which might have, as I think a college should have, a very flexible curriculum, adaptable to different students, it might not be possible and very necessary to use both those methods of approach? There are certain students who come up to college with a pretty good background of cultural interests and with definite intellectual interests of a worthwhile kind quite thoroughly established, and who usually have some dominant interest. It may be a very definite interest, almost vocational in its ultimate direction in, we will say, creative writing, or in chemistry, or in teaching, or something like that. In such a case, one might start right in feeding that interest and showing the student how that draws in everything else.

You can branch out from any one of those things and take in the whole of human knowledge and all of human affairs just as Mr. Gavit, in one of the first sessions, showed how you could build a whole curriculum around a piece of chewing gum. With an interest in creative writing, it is easier.

On the other hand, many students come up without any well established interest that is very much worthwhile from the intellectual point of view, and there you may have to take the other approach. I should like to see both of those embodied in an ideal college curriculum as alternate weapons

in the hands of the student's adviser, one or the other to be used according to the individual case.

DR. ELLIS: While we are back on interests, there is one other aspect of it I wish we could get into this report and get to the attention of our teachers in colleges, and that is the effect of the implanting of interests upon the permanence of the knowledge that the students get in college. Those of us who have been teaching and who pick up our alumni eight or ten years afterwards, have some rather sad shocks, and I heard President Nelson say the other day that the shame of the colleges were their alumni. I heard of a college president who hoped that in the next world he could be made the head of a penitentiary because the damned alumni wouldn't be coming back and telling him how to run it.

I heard President Nelson say in speaking of the alumni of Smith (and I think we would all admit they are far above the average of this country) that from careful investigations they had been making, they had been working a great deal on them trying to keep their intellectual interests alive, on the average in ten years every particle of what they received in college was gone. I think that was an oratorical statement rather than an exact scientific one, but there is altogether too much truth in it. They don't want to be alumni. By their senior year their interest in the sophomore subjects has gone and also their interests in the other years.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: They have passed them.

(Laughter)

DR. ELLIS: I don't think there would be any dispute on the part of any psychologist that no matter how much knowledge you may give a youngster, if that isn't revived or reviewed from day to day, or month to month, or year to year, by the normal interests of their lives, the thing just fades out. It can't stay. No one can hold anything many weeks or many months even, and unless we do succeed while we are giving them this knowledge that we try to give them, and at the same time develop an interest in the subject, it is just a foregone conclusion that that knowledge is going to be gone within three or four years or less time, so that the whole of education is almost futile, all this attempt to teach subjects is almost futile unless it eventuates in developing such an interest in the thing that the student will revive it in his or her mind occasionally and perhaps add to it from time to time from there on.

So, I think anything this Committee could do to impress it on the run of teachers would be of invaluable service to humanity, especially to the college humanity. I wonder if something could be put in to emphasize that fact, if there is going to be any permanence at all to the knowledge we transmit, it must be so transmitted as not only not to kill interest, but to develop it.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: Dr. Ellis, I was struck by your making that somewhat similar remark this morning about developing lines of intellectual interests that would stay by the student after he was through, all his life, and I was in hopes you would include that point as one of the purposes, functions, of the liberal college.

DR. ELLIS: We did. "The awakening, developing, enlarging, disciplining, and elevating of interests, appreciations, and attitudes."

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: I meant the specific point. Wouldn't that be a fitting place for that particular point you just raised to go on record? That was the point in my mind.

I tried to define to myself once what I would use in the case of my own children as to whether their college education had been upon the whole a success or a failure, and so far as the intellectual side of it was concerned, I took that particular point. I would be willing to have them lose their interest in a good deal, but unless they came out with some rather compelling interest in something that would keep them mentally at work on that line, I thought their education ought to be put down as a failure. But there are a great many other failures. If they came out with that thing, it might go on the credit side of the ledger.

DR. ELLIS: I have had that thrust upon me.

In two of our clubs we have a great number of prominent graduates and I sit at the round table where we have a free-for-all talk at luncheon frequently, and it is a tragedy what those people talk about, an absolute tragedy. I haven't heard one thing that couldn't be talked about by a third grade student.

MR. GAVIT: They remember football, don't they?

DR. ELLIS: Sometimes, but not much of that, but the utter hazard between their postgraduate life and college life is simply tragic.

PRESIDENT MORGAN: Is that statement Dr. Ellis made of sufficient importance to go into our minutes, the first statement he made?

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: My suggestion was that it might go in as part of the further report on the purposes.

PRESIDENT MORGAN: It seemed to me it was quite significant.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: I don't wish to dictate to the committee, but he is Chairman of the committee and perhaps he can work it in there.

MR. GAVIT: I don't know that Dr. Ellis would want to have this last expression of his go back to the Cleveland club.

DR. ELLIS: I didn't say which Cleveland club.

MR. GAVIT: All of them.



DR. ELLIS: It would apply to almost any club in any city, unquestionably. Yes, I think that would be a little unwise.

MR. GAVIT: It is confidential.

PRESIDENT WARREN: May I say something, as it is a subject in which my college happens to be very much interested? We have heard something about the futility of most of the interests with which young people come to college and the necessity for convincing them and of arousing their interests in the things we think they should know something about and have experience in, in order to make them efficient. As it were, selling, I should say rather selling the work to them by skilful teaching along those lines. We have found another approach to be satisfactory in many cases and that is starting with the interest which the pupil has and helping her to evolve from that an inner conviction of the importance of as many valuable things as we can show her growing out of that, starting in with that, using that experience, that interest, even though it may be sufficiently transitory and trivial at first, as a gateway, as it were, and just following on from that and widening their experience, as far as we can, through those lines and managing to create in a good many cases a very strong inner conviction.

It seems to me when you can get that type of interest aroused, it perhaps is more lasting than the one in which the member of the faculty tries to persuade them that that is really an interest which they should have. Of course, sometimes it means that you sacrifice breadth of information and breadth of experience to this attempt to develop an

individual conviction, a conviction within an individual, but I should like to have a little discussion, if anyone thinks it worth while, as to this, for I think the point was well made that there are two quite different approaches to this whole subject.

DR. ROBINSON: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry to intervene again, but in this matter of learning it seems to me a very important test can be made in discussing things of student interest, and the test could be made as to whether the work is getting into their reverie or not.

I made futile efforts to read in some reforms in foreign colleges and I was scandalized, as you said you were, Mr. Chairman, to find the number of subjects that students took, and I thought such a group of people as are here might be interested in how you could get any learning to take place if you were dragged from one thing to another on five different themes. I said it was hard for me to keep more than two things going and preferably one was enough.

The point is that psychologically we engage in a reverie or a spontaneous series of reflections, and people of the type we are have a reverie that would be quite astonishing, I think, to the people Dr. Ellis speaks about; that is, I might find myself wondering about all the words that we use for that suspension of action which we call deliberation, or pondering, or weighing, or, as we call them astrologically, contemplation, or consideration, and I would find we had quite a curious set of words that we use to offset reflection; and that would be a type of reverie very congenial, naturally much more so than wondering why Mrs. So-and-So said that to Mr. So-and-So - though that might at times be interesting.

(Laughter)

But how are we going to arrange our education so that there will be any chance of contemplation or deliberation? We must in some way. That came up in another connection. I think perhaps it came up last night - I have forgotten just when. How are we going to make interests possible by having our educational process sufficiently deliberate to permit the reverie to occur? I don't know whether I make myself very clear, but you can keep a person jumping, as I have to jump around since I have come to this Conference, and it is very distasteful to me indeed, because if I am interested in a thing, I always have to have an opportunity to ruminate, to take another one of these strange words which I have mentioned, and put together, and it seems as though you could test a student's interests by asking whether the interest went on between times.

You know, now, if we have taken five courses, and are busy several hours a day with class room work perhaps, when does the time for meditation intervene?

I don't believe in the old ascetic type of meditation, entering into your closet and one thing or another, but it appears to me there is quite another kind of thing which happens that is not beyond a test when called to a student's attention. Most people do not analyze their thoughts but there is this strange, speculative current of thought which

can be carried on at the same time we carry on other types of thought. That is a very interesting thing which I have made an effort to analyze.

It seems to me as though that were extremely pertinent to President Warren's question, how we can start to evoke the interest or promote the interest either by a wily form of teaching or a more troublesome form of trying to get a reaction on the part of the student, but we could add thereunto this question, or ask ourselves the question whether we were giving the student any chance to be interested or not, and it appears to me as though many of our colleges have such crowded schemes of things that a student really hasn't any time to think about things.

I once gave a summer school course at Columbia and I made the stipulation that they take my work and one other subject, otherwise I wouldn't accept the invitation. I got extraordinary results in a short time by having the students think, take fully half the time to think about what I had said. I have never had a more startling educational experience than that. It had a startling effect.

In our report somewhere we must enter some warning against the tendency to frustrate our whole scheme by encouraging the student to take too many courses. Unhappily, I found that Barnard girls were dead set against my plan. They didn't want to have just two or three courses. They

wanted to have four or five or six, because, I think, it saved them from thinking; that is, instead of jumping at this opportunity for silent meditation and elaboration of their work, they seemed to want to be kept busy all the time and to confine their attention, of course, entirely to lecture hours and such reading as was immediately connected with it.

DR. ELLIS: There is also the problem of having the time so much taken up by elevating outside activities, even very serious matters.

DR. HART: There isn't a thing in the educational psychology of text books about thinking about what the professor said! (Laughter)

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: It was suggested this morning that when some definite point comes up that seems significant, we might sort of nail it down. Shall we nail down this one Dr. Robinson just spoke of?

DR. ROBINSON: I should like to have it nailed.

DR. GEORGIA: Might I suggest that the member making the point present it in writing and then we will have it exactly as he wants it?

DR. ROBINSON: You will discourage raising the voice.

I was told by Dr. Guthrie, of New York, a well known churchman who taught English in a university of the South at one time, that he made a large number of statements in a lecture to students and they proceeded to take them down and reproduce them, and he marked the papers zero because he said they ought to have known he was lying. (Laughter)

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: Shall we continue this phase of this interesting discussion?



DEAN McCONN: May I bring out one very practical conclusion that seems to me to follow both from the point of President Warren and what Dr. Robinson just said, and that is that it seems to me we need, as authors of curricula, to be self-denying in that we shall not try to prescribe too much or even to offer too much for each student, and what that implies is that we shall not lay out any scheme all of which every student must be inducted into.

MR. GAVIT: Oh, sure, sure!

DEAN McCONN: Most curricula do that and I have thought I sensed a tendency to lay out or to conceive of such a scheme even here.

PRESIDENT MORGAN: Ours is an institution which does that and it does it perhaps to an excessive extent. We are constantly trying to reduce the extent of required courses, but last spring, as part of our comprehensive examination program, each senior was asked to write a sort of spiritual biography including criticisms of our institution and I hope that those criticisms never come to light here or anywhere else, but the nearest unanimity which we found, I think, on any point in that program that was discussed was the agreement of the students on the value of the required courses in our curriculum, on the extent to which they had opened new and unsuspected fields which the student himself would never have entered.

I feel personally that in so far as courses could be consolidated and the road opened up with greater freedom, that we should do it, but that it is not unreasonable to say that there is an irreducible minimum of general introduction to life which you should expect so nearly every student to accept that the exceptions can be comparatively few. One of the principal reasons for not making exceptions in our case is that if exceptions are made, a large number of students discover that, for instance, no one in their family ever could handle mathematics, that there is a subjective surrender that is unnecessary before fields that would have tremendous significance to the student; and if that were not

the case, we would be much more inclined to leave the road open, and our principal difficulty, I think, in success in those courses is the difficulty of the faculty members who tell the students, "I am sorry you have to take these courses. I know you can't get anything out of this because I never did." The faculty builds up our chief difficulties in those courses, that and bad teaching in individual courses.

MR. GAVIT: Mr. Chairman, as I said this morning, I think that Antioch, requiring an irreducible minimum, ought to be put in evidence because I don't think it is widely known or well understood. I hoped President Morgan would do that. If he were not here, I should have insisted on putting it in evidence myself. If he doesn't remember it, I have it here. (Laughter)

PRESIDENT MORGAN: I have talked altogether too much now, but, for instance, we take the ground that the decent use of English is so nearly a universal necessity that whether the student appreciates the need of it or not, that element should enter into the education of practically everyone.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: Oral or written, or both?

PRESIDENT MORGAN: Both. We take the position that an introduction to the main fields of physical and biological science are desirable for every person. I talked about ten years ago to Dr. Bancroft and asked his help on a certain project there that was an elimination of physics and chemistry and an introduction of a course called "Matter and Energy" which would in one year give the introduction we might ask of every student into the field of physical sciences. We have been ten years trying to find someone capable and some guidance suitable for the combining of those two. I think we have arrived where next year we will have a course in matter and energy that will give an introduction to both physics and chemistry to the students and release one more year to freedom.

As it is now we have five years of college science required except for a student who can show a decent introduction to that field from his high school work. We have four or five years of work in the social sciences,

history, sociology, economics, and government. We have a year of philosophy which many a student would not take if it were not required of him. We have an introduction to the field of aesthetics on the part of every student and I could give you most erratic stories of students forced into that field who found some of their chief avocational interests there.

We have a year of mathematics which has been one of the points most fought over. I think it is winning its way. There are some orientation courses that I won't describe. There is a course in personal finance, helping the student to adjust himself economically. That much we have said is a minimum equipment.

We have practically said that general education ought not necessarily to be stopped at the high school level, that it is only a convention that it stops there and if we can raise the common level of intelligence to a higher plane, we are making the contributions necessary. We are to a certain extent trying to help the students catch up with the present state of human knowledge.

MR. GAVIT: You have left out languages.

PRESIDENT MORGAN: Yes.

MR. GAVIT: I think you ought to apologize for that.

PRESIDENT MORGAN: I do.

DR. HART: I should like to ask a question at this point. This statement which President Morgan has made more or less under duress is presented here as a curricular statement, but I should like to raise a question whether that isn't a false presentation of it. This is not a series of courses required of students turned over to indifferent teachers to be handled in any old way. This is also a matter of technique of teaching, the selection of teachers, and all that sort of thing, isn't it?

PRESIDENT MORGAN: By all means, and unless the student can be initiated into the significance of these courses, they are a failure.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: Dean McConn, do you want to add anything?

DEAN McCONN: Not at this point.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: I thought there was a little lack of agreement between your point and his.

DEAN McCONN: Yes, I think there is considerable lack of agreement, but I don't think I need to elaborate it now.

PROFESSOR BAILEY: In the art school may I say we have precisely that plan. We have a year and a half of training in what we consider the irreducible minimums necessary for general intelligence for the practice of any phase of art activity.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: I don't want to cut this phase of the discussion short, but we seem in spite of our vote to have gone over into the discussion of specific curricular problems. Just what is the principle under which this particular matter of amount of required study to irreducible minimum comes?

President Holt suggests as the day is cut a little short tomorrow, it might be well to ask the Conference whether they wish to continue the discussion a little beyond the ordinary closing time, or will that keep Dr. Robinson jumping too much?

PRESIDENT HOLT: Tomorrow we are going to the Bok Tower. There won't be any time to do any outside drafting and we have an evening session, unless we don't have any evening session and devote it to committee work.

PRESIDENT WARREN: Would you say our discussion is now centered around whether the curriculum should be fitted to the individual or the individual to the curriculum to a certain extent?

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: How about that from your point



of view, President Morgan?

PRESIDENT MORGAN: I think that there again we have got a sort of false issue. I think it is a matter of degree. For instance, we wouldn't have any student come to us who couldn't read and write. The question is, At what point is that separation to take place? At what point are we to cease to try to raise a common level of intelligence and education?

PRESIDENT WARREN: Suppose you had a Shelley come to you, would you have him take so many years of science?

PRESIDENT MORGAN: He had it. You read his poems and the science in some of them, the scientific interests in them, are profound.

PRESIDENT WARREN: I used the wrong selection, then.

DR. ELLIS: All courses were required in those days.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: His course was cut short.

I should like to raise the question as to whether percentage of required withdrawals is related to this subject.

PRESIDENT WARREN: I raised this because once in a while we get girls from colleges where the student is fitted into the curriculum with as much intelligence as the college can muster and with a good deal of choice, and they have carried that successfully, but they are very rebellious against it and wish to come to a place where they can get in and dig into the thing they want very quickly. Sometimes those girls, through digging in quickly to the thing they want, come to a realization of their lacks, particularly under wise guidance in those courses, and branch out and get a very much wider setting, but take a very musical girl, as I have in mind at the present, who had no interest in science and never could apparently acquire one, and was intensely interested in many, many branches of aesthetic experience. Would you expect a girl like that - do you think it is a wise thing, or do you think -- that particular girl's whole nervous system was quite broken down by trying to fit her into the type of college, to the type of thing she reacted against, and she has been enormously happy and has blossomed from the other kind of handling to a remarkable degree.

PRESIDENT MORGAN: There are two elements to that answer. I think one gets to the question as to where the four-year period should be stratified in division.

PRESIDENT WARREN: I realize mine is a two-year job.

PRESIDENT MORGAN: There has been a suggestion in the student report that the first two be of one kind and the second two of another kind. I think that is entirely an abnormal and undesirable separation. It is becoming almost traditional in American colleges. If the stratification could be vertical, if the student should have an opportunity as soon as he gets to college, to jump into his own interests and explore them and carry them along, the sacrifice you mention would not always have to be made.

The one thing we try to aim at always is to give the student a chance to start on the vocational program from the day he comes and while he does it, carry it along.

PRESIDENT WARREN: Suppose he is rebellious, have you aroused any interest which would be lasting? Is it wasted time or not?

PRESIDENT MORGAN: May I tell a story here for a minute? A young man came to my office to tell me he was leaving Antioch. He said that it was an unrighteous place, that we were making him take a course in physics, when he was

aesthetically inclined, had no interest in it and couldn't get it; his family never could get it. Incidentally, in the sciences we have the teaching for those going into science and also more or less cultural courses, descriptive courses, for those to whom it is a general element in the liberal education. He was taking the cultural course. I asked him what it was that terrorized him and he said "everything." I asked him to go back and see what the first concept was where there was difficulty, and take it to the teacher, and come to me when he came to an obstacle which was not a mental one.

A year later he came back on another errand, and after it was over, I talked about the courses and asked him what he was taking here and there, and among other things he was taking his second year of our technical physics, which is as difficult as anyone could want. I asked him how that came about and he said he got interested in the other to see where the difficulties were and finally got so much interested that he took the first year physics in the technical course and decided to become a mechanical engineer.

Those things happen. I could give you another example where a young woman didn't want mathematics and when she came into class, she would break down and cry. Her difficulty was not a disability in mathematics. It was a psychopathic trouble and she needed a psychiatrist. We never

did anything with her. We never succeeded with her, but there was a deepseated mental twist and that is what you are commonly dealing with when you deal with the emotional barriers, and often by removing the emotional barriers and getting a habit of mastery and a sense of freedom on the part of the student, you are making a greater contribution than by letting him for the rest of his life be afraid of it and constantly go by it.

PRESIDENT WARREN: Are you successful in overcoming that, as a rule?

PRESIDENT MORGAN: Frequently we are, and if we had better teaching and that spirit of sharing with the student the outlook of the course, if we could escape from the academic tradition and teach him, and in so far as we do that we are largely successful, but not always. At times there are pathological or psychopathic cases which come to us too deep to be overcome. When they do come, we try to recognize them; over and over again we say, "You had better go to an art institute," or "You had better take this course in child training." We try to divert these students into places where their own special interests can have an outlet. The reason we do not try to carry them ourselves is that for every one we excuse, we would have a dozen whose excuse would be a surrender, and not a necessary surrender but a moral surrender in the face of difficulty in many cases. It is an

arbitrary expedient for us that it is better for us to divert these people into other institutions than to surrender our own program.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: All of our colleges have a large and deplorable mortality. Of course, you can pick out cases of success in this, but what is your judgment, your experience, in application of this method to the percentage of eliminations and withdrawals?

PRESIDENT MORGAN: It is part of our job in Antioch to promote withdrawals and let the apple fall when it is ripe. I should like to eliminate graduation entirely and have the student stay with us until his normal development is completed so far as our program will take him, and then let him out.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: Is his withdrawal on that particular basis of not fitting into that particular method? Wouldn't that be a fair conclusion?

PRESIDENT MORGAN: Mr. Dawson, will you give your opinion as to how many students are eliminated because of maladjustment because of required courses?

DEAN DAWSON: I should say offhand that perhaps about 10 per cent are eliminated because of maladjustment to the whole program, including the industrial program as well as required courses, but, as someone asked me the question as to how many students were withdrawing, I said although we

graduate only about a third of our students, and although we have made a very careful attempt to analyze those withdrawals, it is impossible to go behind every case and discover just why they are withdrawing; so I say my guess would be about 10 per cent of those who do withdraw, withdraw because of maladjustment to the program.

PRESIDENT WARREN: As I talk to girls in other colleges, and boys, too, I find a great deal of very strong resentment against required work.



DR. HART: I should like to insist again that all that President Morgan is saying has no relationship to the curriculum in the ordinary sense of the word. He is discussing not a question of curriculum but a question of teaching method, and all I mean is I don't want to see anyone justify required courses in other colleges on the basis of the fact that at Antioch they make an effort to bring about these adjustments.

DR. WATSON: The approach of the psychologist seems to me in order when we come to these students who have barriers and blockings and frustrations, and a sense of inadequacy in certain subjects, as President Morgan suggests, and it is precisely because their difficulties are so largely emotional I am inclined to question whether the required course is the best method of dealing with them. It is the simplest administrative scheme, but I suspect that an individual who is given the kind of guidance that you gave this boy who was encouraged to recognize the nature of his aversion to exploring this kind of knowledge, his tendency to keep out of these activities most people find worth while, to get at the basis of it, to make an intelligent attack upon it, and to understand the methods by which he himself has overcome that complex, if you want to call it that, is on the whole better educated than the person who has been faced with the requirement you have got to do it and you might as well make the best of it, who is bit by bit lured into an interest in it and doesn't, when he is through, understand the process through which he has gone.

One might operate required courses and that psychological work could be done, but it is more likely to be done if the program is built on the basis of consultation with the students.

PRESIDENT MORGAN: I once had a discussion with Dr. Eliot, of Harvard, on this. If he had any deepseated aversion, it was to required courses. He said he didn't think a student ought ever study anything he wasn't interested in.

I said, "Here's a student from out in Nebraska. He has lived in a community economically very unfortunate. He had no money and the only interest he had in money was to become economically sufficient, and he didn't want to take anything but applied courses in his special field of business, and if he took anything else, it was of necessity. Would you let him go along his road with that deep imprint that he has, or would you require him to take some other interest?"

Dr. Eliot said, "That is a special case."

Then I took another case in a wholly different field. He said, "That is a special case." By the time we got through, he said, "I guess that is right. We are all special cases."

Now Dr. Eliot was not a special case. He was a special case in that his own environment was very fortunate, of course. If we could dry-clean slates in college, we could turn them free, but they are so highly conditioned, so extremely educated in special interests, that a good part of our job is the reconditioning of them, and if you could have each one spend an hour or two a week with a psychiatrist, that

would be better, but, if you can't do that, you are compelled to get to mass methods to some degree and it is a recognition that this is the least undesirable method we are using, not because we believe in it as a theory of it.

PRESIDENT WARREN: If you could do as you wished, would it seem ideal to you to start him in with his desire to study business and through that desire to study business, develop contacts which would lead him into wider interests, or not?

PRESIDENT MORGAN: By all means. The limitation of the project method is ideal in theory, but the limitation of time and energy and the investment you can make in individuals, the sheer necessity of situations, drives us to methods that are theoretically less desirable.

PRESIDENT WARREN: Then in stating an ideal curriculum, it would be the business of this Committee, do you think, to give its sanction to the less desirable, or would you state the ideal, leaving it to the individual college to take as many reefs in its sail as it had to to meet its situation?

PRESIDENT MORGAN: A limitation that was practically universal perhaps had better be recognized to whatever degree it is necessary.

DEAN DAWSON: Mr. Chairman, it seems to me in fairness to Antioch's program we might present a further point here and that is that during our freshman year we make a very definite attempt to point out to the students the main purposes of the curriculum; in other words, we don't feed in the courses one by one, but have a special orientation course which consists of a series of lectures on the curriculum, which is followed by discussion groups, and, as you might well imagine, a number of these lectures are given by President Morgan.

In addition to that, we also have a special advisory system, a counsellor system for freshmen. We attempt to meet these problems individually with the student, and get him to see in a larger sense the aims of the curriculum in an effort to enlarge his interests rather than expect those to come entirely through his acquaintance with the separate courses.

PRESIDENT MORGAN: And, as a result of that program (for ten years, I believe) we are finding this: It is becoming a part of the atmosphere of the college, part of the intellectual tradition, to assume of course a person wants a general, all-around training. There has been largely acceptance of a program which ten years ago was rather bitterly hated, and is somewhat disliked today, but there has been a constantly growing acceptance of it on the campus as one of the

expectations of going to college.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: Wouldn't that mean in your particular institution you have developed a certain atmosphere and selected through this gradual process of time a student body that is fairly well adapted to that particular atmosphere; and might not another institution get the same result by developing, if they were consistent and thorough about it as you are with yours, something somewhat different? It is one thing to lay down a principle and a limitation, and quite another to put it in a way which would seem to let the limitation develop into a principle.

PRESIDENT WARREN: I wonder if you think it is in order to ask for some expression of opinion on the part of the student body here as to how they feel about required courses.

DR. HART: They are not here.

PRESIDENT HOLT: We have a few.

PRESIDENT WARREN: Could you ask how they felt about those?

PRESIDENT HOLT: Let's ask some student to report on required English, for instance.

MR. GAVIT: Is the English professor here?

PRESIDENT HOLT: Yes.

DR. ELLIS: That is dangerous. (Laughter)

PRESIDENT WARREN: Let's put it, required courses as a whole.

PRESIDENT HOLT: I think I am correct, Dean Anderson, in saying you can't study sociology unless you have had eight hours of history.

DEAN ANDERSON: That is not necessarily true. It is true in certain courses in order to be sure the student has had the prerequisite background, but it is not required on the part of the student. We have the group requirement system. If the student majors in science, he must take twenty term hours and each of the other two groups, the language group and philosophy group; in other words, if he

majors in science, and always there is a requirement of a working knowledge of a foreign language before graduation.

MR. GAVIT: Including Latin and Greek?

DEAN ANDERSON: Any language. He has his choice. It is not necessarily a modern language.

PRESIDENT HOLT: Some of the students might give a report.

PRESIDENT WARREN: Not their own alone, but the general feeling around the campus.

MR. CHARLES MILLS: I have noticed only one or two students who resented it, but last year in mathematics a lot of them got along well enough and consequently didn't resent it, but a lot rather doubted whether they were getting a great deal out of it. French and mathematics were the most strenuously objected to of any of the required courses.

MR. RICHARD WILKERSON: I am glad to know that I do not have to have a working knowledge of a modern language. It looks as though I might drop it. I was told last year to the contrary, but it looks as if I might drop it.

DEAN ANDERSON: I will answer that by saying it is all right if you have a working knowledge of another language.

MR. WILKERSON: I have a great aversion to a working knowledge of a language. In the first place, it seems that the majority of students who supposedly secure this



working knowledge of a language, find that is very limited, as it naturally would be, and I am spending one-third of my next two years in taking a modern language so I may graduate with a degree; in other words, I am spending around two hundred dollars tuition in wasting my time.

I have taken work in psychology. I tried to analyze what was my trouble in learning a language, and I looked back over the years I struggled through Latin and I thought I saw the reason why. I looked back at what I started of French in high school, and dropped before I got kicked out, and I have thought maybe between the two I could manage this other language, which was reported to be simpler, and pass. I entered with a grim determination that if it was the last thing in the world I would do, I would pass this language, and up to the present time I have spent more time on this language than on any other two subjects put together, and I still find somehow that I am not learning it.

The teacher is an admirable one, I have great respect for her, and I have much respect for the use of the language. If I mastered it, I can see how I could use it, but I don't seem to be mastering it. I should be glad to find out where my trouble lies, and I admit I can't see much practical use to me. Many students feel that way about the language. By the time we get to the foreign country, we find we have forgotten it, along with the other alumni, and we

have to have an interpreter anyway, so I feel that that requirement particularly (and I know I am not alone) is using my time which I might spend along other lines which I feel would be more profitable, and while I do see the desirability of it if a person can get it, I don't see why it should be an ironfast rule. I suppose we all have some kind of case and I suppose I could work up into a case study, but I don't believe I am so terrifically queer, and from the fact that there are others in the same shoes, it seems there must be a little something wrong there somehow. (Applause)

REVEREND MAJOR: It seems to me the average college curriculum ought to make provision for a man or girl who has entered it to take those things congenial and of interest.

I noticed that the Dean assured me no students who had passed entrance examinations could take any specific courses they cared for; they must come under certain courses that lead to degrees, such as B.A. and B.S. Why isn't it possible for a student to go to almost any college and, after he has entered the college and passed the examinations, take courses that actually interest him? Why should he be forced to take a course, or courses that lead necessarily to the degree of B.A. or B.S.?

Speaking of this pathological tendency on the part of the students and students being queer and case subjects, it happened in one college in which I happened to be a student that the students were analyzed by a psychiatrist. I don't know what confidence you have in psychiatry, but I say with real humility I have none whatsoever, and very little in psychology, and none at all in psychoanalysis.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: I don't want to interrupt, but I don't know how relevant this is to our general theme.

REVEREND MAJOR: My feeling is that we should give the student the greatest freedom to follow his own interests, apart from all requirements, after he has passed his

entrance examinations.

DR. HART: I don't think we should put these students in the indefensible position of having to defend these remarks next week.

DR. ELLIS: Mr. Chairman, I hate to speak so often, but I can't let this go by without raising a question, or, put it this way, about the irreducible minimums, because I can remember when I entered the University of North Carolina they had an irreducible minimum of about fifty-two out of the sixty courses that we had to have and among the others were Latin and Greek, without which nobody would be respectable intellectually. I took them both and I enjoyed them very much. It was so in 1871 Harvard had no entrance requirement in English, which President Morgan lays stress on. It did require five books of Caesar and three of Xenophon, but no English at all, and as for mathematics, who knows what the irreducible minima ought to be?

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: It was a hundred per cent irreducible when I went to college. The maximum was the same as the minimum.

DR. ELLIS: I fought for twenty-five years in Texas to get mathematics off, but they wouldn't do it. They regarded it as absolutely irreducible, though it drove probably 20 per cent of the students out of the colleges. More than 50 per cent do not regard mathematics as important. I have been fighting to try to get some to even begin to think about the irreducible minimum of three years of modern language, and they won't even think about it as a possibility, yet they don't have it at Antioch, and so it goes.

If you look through the various catalogs for the requirements which alleged experts in this field have all compiled, you will find there is practically nothing that is not included by someone as part of the irreducible minimum and almost nothing included by everyone, so it seems to me we ought to be awfully shy in recommending irreducible minimums in this Committee.

PRESIDENT HOLT: I should like to ask President Morgan about the boy who thought he was so aesthetically inclined, but who became a scientist. If that were applied to every student who came with a bent and was made to go into the general field, do you think it could be used as a generalization?

Before you answer that, may I say this: If a student thinks that he doesn't want to take a thing, that it doesn't do him any good, and in spite of that we impose it on him, it is simply that we think he doesn't know what is good for him, and it really is good for him, and, if it is good for him, it is because he does something that is good for other people; therefore, the overcoming of the disagreeable thing is good for him. Overcoming the thing I dislike gives me all the moral fibre I possess. I do not think any man can do anything of first rate importance without going through a period almost of torture.

You cannot be the best golf player in the United States without going through great moral and physical and mental discipline. You can be a duffer at anything, but if you accomplish anything where society will pay you wages for doing anything, you get enough discipline in that. It is hard to understand why the world is so full of unhappiness and so many people are unhappy through doing the disagreeable thing, when there is enough unhappiness in the thing you like

to do. It is just adding trouble.

PRESIDENT MORGAN: I fully agree with that point of view. (Applause) You have plenty of discipline anyway.

DR. ROBINSON: But you must remember, President Holt, how the teacher has to get some compensation, you know, and if he wasn't engaged in pestering somebody, there wouldn't be much joy in life for him.



DR. ELLIS: There is another very serious aspect of it. As long as we can drive students into certain courses by regulations, we have very little leverage to work on these professors and deans to develop in them proper methods of advising and proper methods of teaching, and the minute you take the pressure off which the requirements give, which drives them in willy-nilly, regardless of the woodenness of the dean or the teacher, the minute you take that off, my observation has been there is a tremendous rattle among the dry bones in the dean's office and in the teaching office. So it is a great pity to lose that rattling. It is a very cheerful sound.

DEAN DAWSON: There is one point I should like to bring up that has bothered me since I have been at this Conference. I am not sure it is relevant, but I think it is. I think we ought to pause a minute to consider whether we are trying to build up a curriculum for all types of students or whether we are trying to build up a curriculum for a selected type of students. It is my own personal opinion that I would be disinterested, for instance, in the Antioch program as now organized unless we had a selective process of obtaining our students; in other words, we make a very careful effort before the student comes to find out in so far as we can whether he has a deepseated purpose, whether he has an intellectual interest, and I might say furthermore that in thinking over the students who have become adjusted or whom we found to be maladjusted to our program, nine times out of ten we find that we have made a mistake in our admission. I do not mean to imply we could have done a better job in admitting these students; regardless of the care we take, we will always make mistakes, but, after all, I do feel it is one thing to devise a curriculum for any student who may come along and another one to devise it for a selected group of students.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: That is the point I had in mind in the question that I raised. Some other institution might select on some other basis.

DR. ELLIS: A state university might not be

allowed to select at all.

DR. BANCROFT: I think Dean Dawson has brought out a question there which was really implied in President Warren's original question, if you hark back to it, her question about the girl with the tremendous musical ability. It implied that any student ought to be able to go to any university and get what he wanted. That doesn't seem to me at all necessary. I can imagine cases of students for whom going to Antioch would be very unwise, and the same thing applies to Harvard, or Yale, or any other college you choose to name.

My No. 2 daughter entered Cornell. She wanted to become an animal sculptor and found she couldn't get the amount of work in art in the College of Arts and Sciences that she wanted. Well, we didn't waste any time kicking against the fool rules, no matter what we thought about them. She transferred to the College of Architecture and then went to New York and studied there. That, it seems to me, is the answer for your girl with the great musical ability. She shouldn't go to Antioch. She should go to you or to some other school. Why should anyone insist that every particular person should find what he wants in every different university? I don't think it would be worth while at all.

PRESIDENT WARREN: Are we drawing up a curriculum that is to be of general use?

DR. BANCROFT: Yes, as it is applied in any

particular college. It won't cause everybody under the sun to flock there. I should be sorry if it did.

PRESIDENT WARREN: I think it is perfectly right that by no means all colleges suit all people.

DEAN McCONN: I want to refer just for a moment in this discussion back to our discussion on the first morning from the various persons sitting around the table who referred to their own educational experience. I thought at that time that the testimony was unanimous and very impressive to the effect that all of us here, such as we are, had in our own educational experiences as we reviewed them found we had profited greatly by whatever we had done that was directly and closely related to our own interests, and had profited not at all, so we scarcely remembered what it was, by all irreducible minima not attached to the interests, which we had gone through, but we seem to have forgotten that when we are making curricula for other people. (Applause)

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: I suppose it is almost half-past ten. I should like to ask one question. In your original remark were you speaking wholly of the number of required courses or did you refer also to the amount of work that would be required in any particular course? I was not quite sure on that point.

DEAN McCONN: I had in mind the number of required courses.

DEAN DOERSCHUK: I had in mind one student interest that we haven't taken any recognition of and that is the student's interest in graduating, and that seems to be the motivation which keeps students going in the required courses, and is this a very legitimate student interest to be the motivation of a course, on the part of some of the students who spoke of the necessity of doing certain things in order to graduate?

PRESIDENT HOLT: We can abolish graduation, if that is all that is troubling them.

DR. ELLIS: Abolish the requirement; that is simpler.

DEAN DAWSON: It is much simpler to abolish the student. That might help some.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: I think perhaps we had better adjourn.

... The meeting adjourned at ten-thirty o'clock ...

---



## THURSDAY MORNING SESSION

January 22, 1931

The meeting convened at two forty-five o'clock, Dr. Dewey presiding.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: Is there anything to report from the Steering Committee?

DEAN McCONN: Nothing more, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: I take it we have reached a point where the Findings Committee should be appointed so that they may gather material from their thoughts together and get it under way. I had hoped that the Steering Committee, with some addition, might serve as this committee, but Dean McConn, on behalf of the Committee, has rather protested against that suggestion.

DEAN McCONN: It wasn't on behalf of the whole Committee, but on behalf of the members who have discussed it.

DR. ELLIS: I move that the Chairman of this Committee be the Chairman of the Committee that writes it up.

DEAN McCONN: Have we a second to that?

PROFESSOR BAILEY: I second it.

... Dean McConn put the motion to a vote and it was carried ...

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: I was going to make a suggestion that President Holt should be the Chairman of that Committee. I think that is obviously the thing to do.

PRESIDENT HOLT: Rollins is only the host and we have done enough with our own Committees. I should rather, a great deal rather, have this done by anyone than those here, and myself least of all.

MR. GAVIT: I think President Holt should be a member of the Committee, but as I understand it, this Committee should not be in the posture of presenting an utterance from Rollins College. It ought to be not quite of that emphasis. President Holt would make an admirable Chairman and I am for him, but I think it might possibly be misconstrued.

PRESIDENT HOLT: I should rather not be on the Committee just for that reason.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: What size should the Committee be?

DR. CREESE: Three.

PRESIDENT HOLT: I move the Chairman appoint a Committee of three in addition to himself.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: I think that is a very embarrassing thing. I think everyone here should be on that Committee.

DR. ELLIS: If someone would take care of Cleveland College, it would give me great pleasure to stay here the rest of the winter on that Committee.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: President Morgan, and Mr.

Gavit, and Dr. Hart. President Holt told me he would prefer even not to be on that Committee, but I am going to ask him, and I am sure the others of the Committee would heartily second me, to sit in with the Committee, if he doesn't want to appear officially as a member of the Committee for fear it might be misunderstood in the relation of Rollins College. I am sure we should all like to have him as an unofficial observer.

PRESIDENT HOLT: I don't believe in unofficial observers.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: Naturally we should like to have our Secretary, Dr. Georgia. I assume that also. We should like to have him sit in with us at the meeting.

Is there any further business of this general nature?

MR. GAVIT: Mr. Chairman, I rise (still sitting in my chair) to something in the nature of a question of personal privilege. I lay awake a little while last night thinking about my sins, and not impure thoughts. They don't disturb me. I have a great many of them but, like the old Irishwoman who at the age of ninety-six confessed a sin committed forty-five years before, on the theory that it was that long ago, but she liked to talk about it - but this was a different thing.

I heard a sales talk once in which a good salesman, in fact, a perfect salesman, was described as a man who could sell a second-hand threshing machine to a confectioner. In my judgment that fellow is a rotten salesman, because the genius of salesmanship is a satisfied customer.

I sold this Committee last night a gold brick and it has troubled me since; an utterance intended to represent my personal views was most flatteringly adopted, and then it appeared in the subsequent discussion that nobody agreed with it. (Laughter)

If you take out of that statement that I made the idea of requirements, I don't know what is left of it because my whole thesis was that the student's interests, so-called spontaneous interests, are not necessarily an adequate guide, and I hope that before that is put in without looking at

it again by anyone except myself (I frequently read my own stuff and it is the best stuff that I ever see), it will be thought about quite seriously.

I happened to find this in a current issue of "Science" this morning. ( I have that and Detective Stories follow me around.) This is an address given at the American Association for the Advancement of Science in Cleveland on December 30, by H. F. Moore, Research Professor of Engineering Materials at the University of Illinois, on "Engineering Culture," in the course of which he says:

"The speaker wishes to make it very plain that he does not himself despise nor does he wish any engineer to despise the viewpoint of the philosopher, the artist, the writer, the musician, the student of literature, or the theologian. He does maintain, however, that no one of these, no, nor all of them put together, has the basis for a complete disciplining of the moral nature if they leave out of consideration the work and the methods of thought of the applied scientist. The author admires Plato, he reads his works (in translation) with interest, he is glad that Plato lived and that his work survived, but he does not believe that Plato is a complete guide for living and working.

"It may be objected that the speaker has proposed so broad a field for culture that no man can thoroughly master it all. This is true. No man can master

the whole field of art, of literature, of pure science, or of applied science. He may, however, hope to master some part of one field and to be an interested and respectful observer of other fields. The jack of all trades and master of none is not an admirable figure. The speaker believes that the jack of all trades and the master of one is an admirable figure, and is more deserving of the title of cultured man than is the super-master of one trade who despises all others. The speaker believes that the narrow specialist, be his specialty music or hog breeding, poetry or heat engines, is frequently, especially at times of crisis, a most useful citizen, but that he does not embody a high degree of culture."

If I rightly understand the notions of this Committee, the only person who really agreed with what I said last night was President Morgan.

DR. HART: He didn't. (Laughter)

MR. GAVIT: All right, that makes it unanimous. (Laughter) I only want to put this in this morning because I think it is perhaps the crucial point here of what shall a college do to make up for the twists that young people get from the time of their birth on, chiefly from their parents, what shall the college do to rectify that by, in the aspect of a physician, a proper dosage?

Of course, this begs the whole question. You

can't do it at all if you haven't teachers. The teaching is clogged up with people who represent that idea that somebody gave in this formula: "Those who can, do; those who can't, teach."

PRESIDENT HOLT: This brings up the question again of how we can cultivate the student's interest. We have said we should follow his interests, but we all admit that the interests should be cultivated in college, and I would hope that this body would go on record as saying that the most important thing in the cultivation of interests is teachers, that is, those with a gift of teaching, and in the college of liberal arts the teaching teacher should be given paramount place.

I am sure we are more influenced by men, as the Student Committee has said, than we are by ideas or anything else, and in any liberal college there ought to be the chief interest, in the selection of the man with the genuinely rare gift for teaching.

In the second place, it seems to me, as President Morgan said, that everything is interest, even if you are running away from a mad dog. We have the interest of getting away from it, but in life, in business, we find, for instance, a group of employees in a concern, the best ones at the top and the poorest ones at the bottom. For the men at the bottom the motive is fear, fear of being discharged. The men at the top have no fear of being discharged. Their motive is how to get increased wages or increased positions. For one the hope is of something better; for the other, the fear of something worse.



In college the fear of being discharged or dismissed is the same as in life, but there is no such corresponding financial or other motive to make a man do well except a mere "A," a mark or something of that kind, and we ought to go on record, it seems to me, as advocating the things primarily to give a man ambition rather than to appeal to his fear. We should minimize the examinations and marks and maximize something to encourage him to do his best.

I think this is a place, if the rest of you agree, where Dr. Creese, representative Vice President of Stevens Institute, has more to say than anyone else here on how they have worked out a plan to stimulate the student's scholarship and ability by decreasing the tuition. If the others would like to hear that, I should like to hear Dr. Creese explain that.

DR. CREESE: I was quoting to Dean McConn last night an anecdote I was reminded of by something that happened in this meeting. It seems that Artemus Ward at one time wrote a series of magazine interviews and one was with Brigham Young. After he had talked with him about a number of other subjects, he said, "I understand, Mr. Young, that you are a married man."

Mr. Young then having thirty-two wives, admitted it; and he said, "I should like to ask, sir, how you like it as far as you have got."

I felt a little that way about the Conference. A great many young and charming ideas have been admitted to the residence of my mind, but I find with President Holt's assistance that I am still a monogamist and have really just one idea and that idea is that the incentives and judgments of the world to which the student goes are the incentives and judgments which perhaps should be applied to him while he is in college, but they are perhaps more significant than the incentives and judgments of the graduate school which lately has been tending to creep down into the undergraduate school.

It is a little difficult to find out how to apply those incentives. The point at which the college touches the outside world, and so does the student, is the point of finances, and we happen to have devised a scheme which touches one of the oldest institutions of American colleges, an

institution that has been very little considered in definition, and that is tuition. Tuition has been established by the gods in the past as something that all students must pay uniformly. On the other hand, we receive our funds from a great many sources and the donors of those funds perhaps do not anticipate that the benefits of their donations shall be given equally to all men.

It costs us in our college something near a thousand dollars to educate each man and three years ago we were saying to each man that we would give him the benefit of our endowment to a limit of six hundred dollars if he would just manage to stay in college, or, if he were at the top of the pile. In other words, the benefits of endowment were distributed as a Christmas bonus at a club, equally, without much consideration of the merits of the men.

So, we changed the scheme and it has now been in operation with us for two years with sufficient success that we are now applying it to all men who come to us so that the benefits of endowment are distributed in proportion to the merits of the men so far as we can judge them; in other words, we are paying our men to come to college in a sense that an employer pays his men to work for him, and the man who shows the greatest ability, the greatest interest, and the most worthwhile interest in the things of college, will receive the greatest benefit from the endowment of the college. We

therefore raised our tuition fee to \$600, which I think is at present the highest in the country, and we say to every man, "If you come to us and stay in college, we will give you \$400 worth of our income from endowment. If you are better than that, you can stand a chance to earn more than that."

In the freshman class, for instance, we grant what we call Certificates of Participation in Endowment, rather an ornate phrase, and a diploma that is perhaps more impressive than it should be. We grant to thirty-six men Certificates of Participation in Endowment ranging in value from fifty to three hundred dollars. No man in his freshman year earns complete remission of tuition.

In the sophomore, junior, and senior years it is possible to earn as much as the total tuition fee, which means that we say to the best three men in the senior class, "You are so worth while in the place that we will give you the full benefit of the income of our endowment, that is, we will give you the \$400 any man may have, and we will also give you the \$600 that you have earned."

The plan sounds a little complicated, but it is worked out with considerably simplicity. In the first place, we have weighted the various courses, the grades, and we have determined as wisely as we can how much an "A" is worth, and how much a "B" and a "C" and a "D" are worth. We have also attempted to appraise the worthwhileness of a man as

a citizen of the community and in his other activities.

I think that the extra-curricular activities are generally admitted by the student to be of some importance in judging the worthwhileness of their associates and we also consider they are of enough importance to be appraised in determining a man's abatement of tuition.

It is in a sense paying men to go to college, but it is paying most to the best man and expecting the man who is not in that class to determine for himself whether a college education, our particular college education, is worth \$600 to him.

MR. GAVIT: Do you grade it on marks?

DR. CREESE: Partly on marks and partly on extra-curricular activities.

PRESIDENT HOLT: Will you explain that?

DR. CREESE: A man wins his honor points and the number determines the amount of the awards by good standing in his classes or by good standing outside of his classes, and if he is the editor of the college newspaper, we consider he has shown some elements of leadership and worthwhileness; therefore we give him honor points for that. Of course, the weighting is distinctly on the side of the work for which he came to college and is less on the incidental activities.

It means in our system that a man with a straight

"A" and without any great interest in community activities, can be equalled in financial returns by the man who is perhaps a "B" with a very good record of extra-curricular activities.

MR. GAVIT: Does it include athletics?

DR. CREESE: We pay our athletes.

DR. BANCROFT: If you give him a cash bonus for playing on the football team, don't you run the risk of getting into difficulties on the matter of professionals?

DR. CREESE: President Holt said he thought our college made two great contributions to education. I would not restrict it in the same way. One was the system of abatements of tuition and the other the fact that we play football only in shorts and have no intercollegiate schedule of football. Nobody has challenged us so far. We pay them, and we don't care much if they do challenge us.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: If the Chairman might refer to the remarks of Mr. Gavit about the adoption of his suggestion last night, I think there was complete unanimity in the fact that the interests of students should not be taken as they stand as the final criteria. The college has a responsibility for modifying those interests, developing new ones, and getting a better proportion among those that already exist.

The point of difference, if there was one, I take it was rather as to the method in which this development and modification of interests should occur, whether it should take place by the medium of definite requirements, the irreducible minima and so on, or whether it should take place by using the existing interests as a leverage and then proceeding to an expansion, refinement, a better proportion; at least that was what I took to be the general tenor of the difference that was revealed. It seemed to me there was no difference regarding the general point that it would not be accepted in any way as a general criteria.

DR. WATSON: I tried in a brief paragraph to state what I believe to be our conclusion on those methods and I should be glad to submit it to the Conference to see whether I have arranged the statements in a way that would be acceptable to everyone. It seemed to me that could be done in a very few sentences, as follows:

We recognize the need to enlarge existing student interests and to awaken new and more rewarding interests. (That is the basis.)

Among the several ways in which this may be done the best, where feasible, appears to be the natural growth of existing interests into broad new channels in a continuous and self-directed process. This probably occurs rarely and is dependent on an unusual previous education. The second best method, where feasible, is the guidance of the individual into new and appropriate interests through the counsel of an excellent teacher. (That was President Holt's approach to it, as I understand it.) The third method, necessary with the few cases which will not grow by the first two approaches, is the readjustment of bias by wise psychological counsel. A fourth method, made desirable by administrative economy in many institutions, is the development of required courses, made so attractive and worth while that students having had them look back upon them as highly rewarding and as having established interests which still continue.



MR. GAVIT: I move that that be put in with mine.

DR. WATSON: That is high praise, sir.

PROFESSOR BAILEY: I second that motion.

DEAN McCONN: I lay awake a little while last night, being somewhat helped by the process, and formulated a paragraph or two on the matter of interests which I should be glad to present at this time, in accordance with a suggestion made earlier that various ones of us might do that sort of thing from time to time.

I am far from having really any hope that this will meet with approval, but I should like to present it, anyway. I wrote it this way:

At some appropriate point in our procedure I should be glad to propose to the Conference, for adoption or rejection, the idea of the absolute primacy of the doctrine of interest as the fundamental principle which should be everywhere decisive in the process of building a curriculum in the liberal arts and sciences.

This idea derives, of course, from what I understand to be the consensus of opinion among psychologists and educationists that no effective learning does, in fact, take place at any level on any other basis; from which it seems to follow that to put students through any series of required courses or minimum essentials in which they are not interested is merely futile, no matter how desirable the knowledges, appreciations, or skills which such courses cover may be. The most convincing testimony to the correctness of this idea which I myself have ever heard, came in the initial educational

"confessions" of the members of this Conference, which were almost startlingly unanimous to the effect that what we had done out of self-felt interest had been vital in our education and everything else negligible or worse.

This idea may be made more explicit by exploring one or two of the corollaries.

The first corollary seems to me to be that no student who does not have some modicum of definitely intellectual interest already established should be admitted to college. The possession of such interest should be the principal entrance requirement.

Assuming that the entering student has some intellectual interest in something, that much having been required, I think we may assume also that his interest has both a focus and a periphery.

His focal or primary interest will be in some particular subject or field (not necessarily coterminous with any one college department). It will frequently, though not always, be vocational in its ultimate objectives. The doctrine of interest would seem to say that the student should be permitted to begin at once on the development and exploitation of this focal or primary interest; that he should by no means be compelled to hold that in abeyance for two years or any other period, because if that be done, we force him to switch off the main current of his learning power.

But along with his focal or primary interest in some particular field, every student has, I believe, a peripheral or secondary interest in his general physical and human environment, almost every part of which, he sees well enough, may be grist to his private mill. I believe that practically every student has enough of this secondary interest to make him willing and in most cases mildly eager to embark, also at the very beginning, on a general cursory exploration, a deliberately and avowedly superficial survey of the whole province of knowledge such as might be given in a series of survey courses as is proposed in the Rollins Student Committee Report.

If we should open a curriculum in this way, strictly under the guidance of the doctrine of interest, exploiting from the beginning both the focal individual interest and the peripheral general interest, the individual student and his advisor might then, I should think, build up for him an individual curriculum of courses or projects, becoming constantly more systematic and rigorous as the need for system and rigor became more and more apparent and self-felt, and eventuating in a thorough mastery of a special field including the subjects actually needed, and also in some degree of breadth which would at least be real as far as it went.

MR. GAVIT: In moving that that be taken with that, I should like only to demur that an appreciable number of students come to college without an immediately discoverable special interest, that it is the college's business to dig deeper for that and that a period of time should elapse (I don't know how long it might vary with the individual) in which every effort may have been made to awaken such a student. If he can't be awakened, of course he should not stay.

I make the motion that that be included in the material for this statement.

DR. ROBINSON: Mr. Chairman, I only want to add a word there. I remember asking the class once to report at the end of the week, without saying what they decided, whether they had decided or not. They said they didn't know what I wanted. The question was entirely puzzling to them.

I spoke to a psychologist about the matter and he said that he thought probably boys and girls of that age were not accustomed to put that question to themselves, and in this whole matter of interest I think they have to take into consideration the inability of many young people and even many old people to vocalize or express their interest. They might have interests, but they don't know how to talk about them. It seems as though that were very pertinent to this question that has just been raised by Mr. Gavit that a period ought to elapse in which perhaps the interest would emerge.

I think we find that all through life. Some little casual thing that we remember, or something comes up in conversation that suddenly gives us an awareness of a desire that we have not previously been able to express. It emerges, as John Watson says; we get words for it, and that brings us back to the question Dr. Bancroft has emphasized about our internal discontent and trouble which he maintained had nothing novel about it, but had been at any rate less conspicuous in previous generations. The great difference is that we have words for a great many moods and troubles that we

didn't have twenty or thirty years ago. We have a vocabulary of internal distress which did not exist in earlier times, and consequently we are able to talk about it and in a way to deal with it.

Our lack of interest might be called a form of internal distress. We say we ought to be interested. We seem to be inferior for not having interest and if in some way in this that element could be added to these two suggestions, namely, the inability at certain stages to analyze one's distress at not being interested, it seems to me the statement would be more adequate.

DEAN McCONN: May I say, Mr. Chairman, that is a crucial point here, of course. I believe it to be true that there are comparatively few young people coming up to college who have any business in college at all, who don't have some established interests and whose interests cannot be rather speedily uncovered under anything like skilful advisement. Even the focal interest uncovered may not be a permanent one, but that point seems to me to be irrelevant. If it is for the time being a focal interest, it serves as a source of learning power for the time being, and if the focal interest changes, all right, plug in in the new place.

I am doing that work all the time as a dean and it comparatively seldom happens that I do not find that the most blasé fellow, who gives me a cynical smile when I begin to talk about interest, has an interest that you can begin to capitalize and plug in where before he was nothing on earth but a good fraternity man.



CHAIRMAN DEWEY: Perhaps it would help liberate the thing if instead of adopting these with approval, we accepted them with thanks and with interest as a part of the record to be considered by the Findings Committee, and we might add to that that we should be glad of further submissions in writing, unless Dr. Robinson has placed what he has said in written form.

DR. HART: I think that the time has come in this discussion when some of the boundaries of it should be established a bit so that the original subject upon which we are called together can be dealt with somewhat more specifically, and I should like to suggest this statement as a statement of boundaries, perhaps:

There can be no general curricular problem in vacuo. In the large, any change in curriculum implies either that there has been a social change with which the curriculum is trying to catch up, or that the intelligence of the schools hopes to produce changes in the life of the community.

Within any educational institution itself at any age level any curricular change implies adjustments to curricula of antecedent schools and to later curricula experience; and it cannot go on without correlative changes in teaching methods and in administrative processes - implying changes - the preparation of teachers and administrators.

MR. GAVIT: I move the same procedure.

DR. GEORGIA: We have a motion by Mr. Gavit, seconded by Professor Bailey, to place a statement of Dr. Watson on record.

MR. GAVIT: I meant more than that, not on record, but such as you suggested.

DR. ELLIS: I move all be received for consideration.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: Would you accept that as a substitute?

MR. GAVIT: I certainly would. I should like to have the same thing take place with what I submitted last night. We went pretty far toward adopting that as an expression of the Conference. I think that my statement and the action of last night should be modified in this way.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: Without being very parliamentary here, unless there is objection, that modification mentioned by Mr. Gavit will be accepted.

DR. GEORGIA: Or, if it is satisfactory to the Conference, the Secretary will include in the minutes the various written statements presented to him, without action by the Conference.

DR. ELLIS: It seems to me still there is a little analysis of this which probably each one has made in his mind. I should like to get it expressed. I think we all agree on the need to rectify the warped and stupid and sentient, ineffective interests which not only youngsters but also middle-aged people acquire as they go along, and certainly when we get to college, if we can do anything to substitute for them and stimulate permanent and constructive and elevating interests, we ought to do it. That, to my mind, is much more important than giving them information. But, before we can substitute and get rid of the old ones and substitute better interests, it seems to me we ought to ask why they have these futile instructive interests because we don't know how they acquired them. We are not in good shape to get rid of them or have them apply some more.

If we assume they are just inborn, instinctive, and unavoidable, then we are hopeless. I think with all the folly of the behaviorists, they have done a real service in pointing out how little is inborn and how little is fatalistic, fatally necessary; they are not; they are acquired. They are acquired from parents and school teachers.

MR. GAVIT: And from grandfathers.

DR. ELLIS: And classmates, old wives' tales, and books, and other things they have read. They have acquired these things. What we have to do is help them acquire some

new ones. The only way in the world of putting out the old ephemeral and futile ones is to have them acquire some new permanent and worthwhile ones. We can't push one idea or state of mind out by anything else than another state of mind. It is up to us to do that as teachers and as administrators of college. How shall we do it?

One suggestion is just require it. That is a simple and easy way of hitting on the head with a policeman's billy, but we don't acquire many ideas that way. We acquire headaches. What we have to do is keep at it, beat the environment at its own game. If we can't build up within college a more attractive environment, an environment which makes it more attractive than the lower ideals are, we have failed on our job.

What do we have to do to do that? First of all, change the attitude of the faculty and of the student body from one in which each one is playing the game perhaps according to the rules, but they are playing on opposite sides, to one of friendly cooperation, of comradeship in a really interesting quest. That is the first thing and that is not an easy thing to do. It is very much easier to pass a rule that everyone has to take so much math and so much something else, but actually we have to do it another way if we ever really accomplish anything.

Second, you have to have some deans who are

trained for their work. If football coaches were selected with as little preparation for coaching football as deans are for advising students, we would be ruined. We don't think of selecting a man to train football players who has not made a very serious study of it, and yet we will take any good-humored professor (sometimes not so very good-humored), the professor of mathematics or English or psychology, and lo and behold, next morning he finds himself a dean! (Laughter) He hasn't had any preparation whatever for being a dean other than to live as a student and perhaps not a very unusual type of student; at any rate, he has been only one kind of student; but as to any particular study of the psychology of adolescence or the practices of deans in other countries and other schools, or any of the things that we would require of a football coach, we don't require it. I know because I have been made a dean, or was made a dean.

Another thing, they should give at least as impressive training as the football coach; if not, the students will follow the football coach instead of the dean.

The third thing we have to have is a faculty that knows what they are doing, that are not under the notion that everybody who comes into the class is going to be a professor of classics, or chemistry, or whatever the individuals happen to be teaching. We have too many now who are primarily interested in their subject and really have never

found out what they are in college for. They think they are there to take forty or fifty students and kill off all but two and make classicists or psychologists of them. They don't admit that but they behave that way.

Fourth, we have to have a more vital curriculum, not that the professor can teach just anything and get away with it, but have a curriculum which has some obvious relation to the life of the students, both their present life and the life they think they are going to have afterwards.

Those four aren't easy; they are very difficult. The minute we put these requirements on students, we relieve ourselves of the necessity of working at this to a considerable extent. Don't you see, we prevent the very thing that will remedy it? The only reason why President Morgan has gotten away with the prescriptions at Antioch is that in spite of those prescriptions he is doing all four of those things.

PRESIDENT MORGAN: I think the exact contrary is true. Our required courses simply present to us the need of directing interests. If we have a required course that is being badly taught, we make it elective because the teacher is failing in it. Our requirements put up to us our problem in the development of interest.



CHAIRMAN DEWEY: I take it that Dr. Ellis' remarks are very definitely in line with the suggestions of President Holt about the impossibility of separating the question of the modification of the curriculum from selection of teachers and the general method of administration of the college. Your statement was in that same direction, was it not?

DR. ELLIS: I should like to say just one more word about President Morgan's idea that if the course is a bore and you require it, you have such a kick-back from the students that you have to change it. There is a very much quicker way than that at Cleveland College. Everything is elective. If the course is a bore, there are no students and it is wiped out within three months. I have had one start with seventy-two students and wind up with twelve at Christmas, and next spring not have anyone. You can't get any such reaction on required courses. You wouldn't get it unless the students knew the dean and you were sympathetic.

The ordinary college president is not that way and the students won't go to him and complain. They will go to the last-year students and find out how to get by it with the least work, and the skill they develop in that is quite admirable. (Laughter)

DR. WATSON: Would Dr. Ellis indicate what might be done?

DR. ELLIS: First a change of attitude of the faculty and student body to one of friendly comradeship and a common interest; and the deans should be trained for their work and be selected with more impressive personalities than some of them now have. Those are the first two points. Third, that the faculty itself must be trained to know something besides their subject matter. They must know something about teaching. Fourth, the curriculum itself must be made more vital, more obviously touching the life of the students.

I will write that all out.

PRESIDENT HOLT: May I say in regard to the first point, if I may speak for Rollins, we think we have made a step in that direction by abolishing the lecture and recitations as a system. Of course, we have them, but that prevents the professor's being active and the student's being passive, and it has had a remarkable effect on the faculty and the students. I think we all admit that.

DR. ELLIS: That is perfectly obvious with these students attending the faculty meeting, discussion of problems instead of discussion of delinquents, the question of adding one more regulation to the category.

DR. HART: With respect to the third point, may I say that for some curious reason at Vanderbilt University the Chancellor and faculty have decided that they will never again recommend for a teaching position a Ph.D. graduate of that University unless he has taken in addition to his work in subject matter a course which has now been provided, a graduate course in the problems of college teaching, a year's course. They have decided that subject-matter preparation is not adequate preparation for teaching in American colleges and universities at the present time.

PRESIDENT HOLT: Would that guarantee that a man who had taken it was competent to teach?

DR. HART: No.

DR. ELLIS: You and I, Mr. Chairman, helped to organize the Association of College Teachers of Education, about 1900, and appointed Committees to investigate the teaching of kindergarten and elementary schools, arithmetic, social sciences, and everything under the sun. Until 1928, for twenty-eight years we didn't notice there was any teaching in college at all. There was not a thing said about it, and suddenly, I don't know how it got on (I wasn't present at the meeting), they decided to have one year book on college teaching, after twenty-eight years of telling everybody else how they should teach. They got a small year book and brought it to Cambridge, and it was astonishing how interesting we found the subject of college teaching, so interesting we spent two days discussing it and found so many problems left and so much information at large, we had no idea it existed, that they decided to have a man make a bibliography of the subject and a committee to get up a new year book.

Next year we came in with a year book including fifty-five different ways that progressive teachers had tried to modify our college methods of teaching, and there is now a bibliography of over six hundred articles and books on college teaching, whereas ten years ago I don't think there were six.

It is interesting that the last thing which college teachers thought about was our own teaching, even teachers of pedagogy.

PRESIDENT MORGAN: Before Dr. Hart's boundaries get fixed, I should like to break over them. A couple of months ago I was in California and attended the Notre Dame vs. Southern California football game and I went in my own automobile, and after the game was over I went away, and on the way I noticed a man who was trying to go against the crowd. There were about forty thousand automobiles going in one direction and he was trying to go in the other and he wasn't making very successful progress.

That is typical of the way interest, and I am speaking of human interest, runs. Unless you are going with the crowd, you simply don't travel. You are almost blocked.

Some seventy-five years ago or thereabouts, when Mendel made his great discovery of the Mendelian laws, there was a tremendously keen interest in Europe in biological subjects, but it had its own channel and direction of interest. He wrote to the leading German biologists of the time and tried somewhere to break into the current of interest and present his idea, which was greater than any of them had, and they sent him back his notes and told him to go about his prayers. He was going contrary to the interest of the day.

It seems to me here that in all this discussion we have been traveling with the interests of the day in education and that we might have another approach to this whole problem that would be so different and new that it would be

revolutionary in a way that our discussion has not been revolutionary at all. I don't expect to get anywhere, because it would be like going against the crowd trying to get away from the football game and it would be better to go along with it, but in spite of that, I will suggest another approach to the problem as a whole to indicate that you could get to a very different emphasis. It is a matter of emphasis largely.

If we knew what the human race is headed for, what the significant outcome of our endeavoring might be, what the possibilities and opportunities of human life would be, and where its values lie, then we would know what the object of education would be. The object of education would be to secure those aims, to achieve those aims; so personally I don't know what the end of human possibilities is, what the aspects of human aims should be, but I do believe that there are certain what we might call penultimate aims, not ultimate, but inevitable, on the way to the ultimate, that we can very clearly define for ourselves, and I think if we should define those for ourselves, we could to a large degree define the right purposes of education and incidentally or correlatively define what should be the object of a college.

I cannot see the ultimate aims of human endeavor, but I believe I could state two or three penultimate aims which are inevitable. One of those, I should say, is the continuity



of the human adventure; that is, the accomplishment of human purpose is not a project of this generation; it is a continuing project in which the work of any one generation is a minor part of the whole, and unless there is a continuity of the biological adventure of humanity, all of our aims are lost, and I would say that almost first among those aims that we can define is the aim of the continuity of the human adventure.

That seems a simple statement to make and yet that is revolutionary to a degree that if it were appraised, it would entirely change the temper of college education and to a considerable degree change the temper of the discussion we have had here. It means in the first place patience. It means that climax, satisfaction, and achievement are not matters for me to have in my individual personality.

I think that of itself would be a fundamental revolution in college outlook and in human outlook. The average student thinks of life as being completed and fulfilled in his life; only fifth or sixth in the list of our aims is that of social service or something of the sort, whereas it seems to me primary among the aims we can achieve and keep in mind is that of the continuity of this adventure; that our attention must be withdrawn or diverted from the idea of personal climax in our own lives and must be centered upon a continuing effort in which our own satisfactions are a rather

trivial incident. It means patience. It means other-mindedness, the direction of our attention away from our individual satisfaction to the ultimate goal. I should say possibly I would put that first.

Second, I would say that the control of the physical environment, so there could be a suitable environment for this adventure, becomes primary. That means the mastery of economic factors. The idea that you can have a liberal education independently of financial factors I think is ungrounded, that one of the absolute essentials is that we shall learn to control the physical world and know how to compel it to our use or adapt our circumstances where we cannot compel it.

Then we go to the problem of understanding our world, to know what kind of satisfactions and fulfillments are possible within the structure of things as they are, and to understanding of ourselves; and naturally we would be forced to the outline of a curriculum by the thesis that we are going to fulfil those conditions which must be precedent to ultimates in human aims. If we started from that road, I think we would discover that the great needs of college education are not satisfied when we have discussed knowledge, when we have discussed satisfying our impulses of interest; that we must have a very great revolution of interest from making ourselves the center of it to making this progress the center of

it, and I think the final outcome would be a revolutionary one which has not been much touched on here.

DR. HART: I should be glad to have President Morgan define how that statement conflicts with the statement I made.

PRESIDENT MORGAN: It conflicts in interest and attention, in emphasis, I should say.

DR. HART: My statement simply tried to make plain that the isolation of a curricular problem from everything else in the world was an artificial thing.

PRESIDENT MORGAN: The difference is this: the difference between the epicurean emphasis and what you might call the Christian emphasis. The epicurean realizes we must have restraints and controls, but the end is self-satisfaction, and the whole emphasis of college education is that I, John Jones, must have satisfaction in my life, and the ultimate end of that will be the same end as the epicurean reached, the center of attention was such that it led inevitably to what we moderns expressly call epicureanism; whereas the other emphasis is that of seeing the goal with our personal satisfactions as incidental, and that will have a different result. That difference of emphasis is fundamental.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: The Chair would like to take the liberty of saying a word at this point. I wonder if those of us who do lay stress on the principle of interest do mean by that in any sense that personal interest is the goal, whether we simply mean egoistic interest is the goal, or whether we mean that the facts of human interest and structure of interest is a leverage in moving individuals, human nature, to any goal that may be set up.

Certainly, if I had conceived of interest in the sense of personal satisfaction as the end, not rather as a working mechanism, I should entirely agree, and I imagine that none of us have conceived of interest and have been upholding that side of it as anything but the mechanism of human nature, and that, as you said yesterday, whatever we do in the way of achievement, no matter what the interest or goal is, there is an element of interest that is a moving spring in human nature, and if it is desirable to have it on record that we do not mean personal satisfaction as the goal and end, I think by all means, to avoid misapprehension, that should be included.

Now you say personal satisfactions are trivial or subordinate, but I should like to know if you wouldn't all admit that one of the great aims of the college is to bring young people to the point where they will find personal satisfaction in contributing to the adventure of human continuity.

DR. ELLIS: Exactly! That is an interest itself.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: How will we do it unless they do find some personal satisfaction?

PRESIDENT MORGAN: I would say there is absolutely no conflict between what you say and what I mean.

DR. HART: At that point you would have broken over my statement.

PRESIDENT MORGAN: The fact, however, is that there is a short-focused hedonism into which our remarks are interpreted by the college population of the country as a whole, and if you will discover the actual motivating drive of what is called the doctrine of interest, you will find it seldom (not very often) falls short of the interpretation you have and becomes an immediate, short-sighted end.

PRESIDENT WARREN: On the other hand, when we came to talk over the question of interest, most of us who had worked closely with the students were agreed one of the things most vital, one of the first and foremost interest in their lives is: Where are we going from here? What is the object of all this? What are we headed for? Why are we living?

PRESIDENT MORGAN: That is what I say. We cannot get the ultimate, but we can get the penultimates, and if those become the structure of the curriculum, the search

for those, if that is the center of attention, we will capture student interests for the greater ends, whereas if we are talking about the details more, what shall we put in this course or in that course, then we lose that greater interest of the student.

PROFESSOR BAILEY: The vision.

PRESIDENT MORGAN: Yes, we lose the vision.

DR. WATSON: I think it is particularly significant that in President Morgan's remarks he has felt there was a contrast between them and the things we have been saying, or a popularized interpretation of the analysis of the problems of education and civilization and the contributions education should make to them. We were talking, it seems to me, definitely about trying to center these about phases that human adventure has aroused and they must take it at some point where they can contact with it, but quite definitely the make-up of the curriculum, at least from my point of view, would have to be set pretty largely by the social demands and needs. Point two would be like 5a that we come to and from a great many times.

PRESIDENT MORGAN: The attention of the student cannot be dominantly in two places at once, and if his attention is constantly on the minute details, he will lose the whole picture, and he comes to live his whole life, as colleges come to live their whole life, with the ultimates forgotten and with the attention on the details of the methods.

Just within two weeks one of our students said to me, "They keep telling me I can't generalize until I have the facts, but by the time I get all their facts my capacity for generalization will be gone, and I must use my immaturity of generalizations, I must be working on the meaning of the universe all the time instead of developing the data for judgment."

I think the whole college needs to have its Sabbaths, as you might say, its weekly orientations, to see this thing fits in with the generalization. The average college student goes for four years to college getting the detailed things without having the periods when he is aligning these things up with the ultimates, and I think the fault, if any, is the fault of emphasis. We have assumed the ultimates and are now working out the details, but in doing that we are setting the type after the ultimates become non-existent by lack of attention to them.



PRESIDENT HOLT: Isn't there also the danger of going to the penultimate? I was walking along the street with a Socialist one time and we saw a woman who had fallen in a fit and he went on. He said he was working for the cooperative commonwealth and had no time to help her out.

PRESIDENT MORGAN: We are constantly directing our students at Antioch into projects so that the last occurrences that come along are criticized in our ultimates. If they were not, our ultimates would soon be lost, but if you let either one of those become dominant and don't keep them working against each other, you are losing.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: I was interested in your statement that we have assumed the ultimate here. I am very much interested in that statement because I have the feeling here somehow that is what our difficulty, our fog, was and the source of our lack of more definitive progress, that we were so uncertain about these ultimates.

Might I ask you what you think is the ultimate which has been implied that we have assumed here, the ultimate, if not explicitly, by implication?

PRESIDENT MORGAN: I would say not assumed it but sidestepped it. That is a better term, or ignored it, and what is assumed is this, that the course of society has determined the ultimates and that we can forget and it is our business to take care of the means; that the ends are all clear, that we don't need to worry about them, but our only worry is about the means.

DR. ELLIS: To keep from being run over by the procession.

DR. HART: That is exactly, President Morgan, what I thought I was saying when I said we couldn't deal with the curricular problems in vacuo. I thought that was what I was saying. I don't quite understand why you say you are breaking beyond it. It is of no consequence, perhaps, but I should like to find out about it. I mean it is of no consequence to this discussion.

PRESIDENT MORGAN: A discussion of this would almost necessarily start with what we are driving at.

DR. HART: I think, as I understand it, that is what the Chairman thought he was doing last night when he made his speech.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: No. Well, I did think it was what the Conference had been doing and that we didn't seem to have made very rapid progress, and that was because we all felt that that question of the ultimates was the central and important question; that was the question of discussion and if that was such a fundamental matter, we couldn't get on quite as rapidly as might seem desirable, but if we had been taking our ultimates for granted and simply confined ourselves to the consideration of means, we could quite easily have drawn up a pretty definite scheme. That is simply my impression of the mood of the Conference.

MR. GAVIT: Mr. Chairman, as an old reporter looking at what has been going on (I never can get out of that point of view) the thing that has impressed me and still impresses me is, by the time we get through this, we shall about be ready to begin. I think almost everyone came here with the idea that he himself was some kind of revolution, and my general impression is that after we have got away from the particular meanings of words, we all think very much the same thing.

I think there is a great deal more interest in this Conference than any of us realized and that what we finally produce will be deemed of a great deal of importance if we don't bury it away in the various kinds of words we have used.

I have been very much impressed by the big body of students who have been watching us perform and I know in many ways they are very much disappointed with us because of the fact that we have not been handing them something.

DR. HART: They have not been equally impressed.

MR. GAVIT: But I think we are at the point where we can begin with a discussion that hasn't anything to do with our own personal views. (Applause)

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: I have to remind the audience of the decision that for the protection of the members of the Conference, the audience should refrain from applause. (Laughter)

PROFESSOR BAILEY: That remark reminds me of something that occurred after a teachers' institute in Massachusetts, where a very important university man had made a speech to the teachers. One of the superintendents of schools, commenting on his speech, said: "The only trouble with Professor So-and-so is that he wraps his ideas up in a blanket of words so that they are stillborn."

DR. WATSON: I wonder if the Chairman will define our question. (Laughter)

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: Obviously there have been incidentally a good many questions raised and discussed. Personally, this is my own interpretation, merely my own, not official: I should say that we had been discussing two questions, one, the more obvious and definite one, is the fact that the modification or the formation of a curriculum cannot be separated from the question of selection and education of teachers and the general spirit and policy of college administration.

I think there have been certainly a number of very definite remarks on that point that any change of a curriculum that was made formally without very careful consideration of teaching qualifications and without modifications to the administration methods of the relations of teachers and students is bound to fail.

The vaguer, underlying question I think has still turned about the weight to be given to interests in the determination of the curriculum. So far we are still in 5a, and while we have considered somewhat incidentally the weight to be given to the problems of civilization and the traditional classifications of knowledge, the weight given to interest has been on the whole a dominant consideration.

PRESIDENT WARREN: Would you say it was the consensus of opinion of this Conference that the curriculum should be planned around the interest of the student with the wisest guidance possible, or that the student should be on the whole fitted into a curriculum, or both?

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: It is not for me to formulate the attitude of the Conference.

PRESIDENT HOLT: Do you mean should the student fit the curriculum or the curriculum fit the student?

PRESIDENT WARREN: Would you say we have come to any decision on that subject?

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: I think that the remarks of President Morgan have at least made it clear that we should define against any possibility of misapprehension the meaning that we attach to giving weight to the interest of the student.

DEAN DOERSCHUK: We have given so much time to point 1 under 5a, I think with our time growing so short, we ought to turn to point 2, the problems of civilization.

DR. HART: If the intention of the Conference is to turn in that direction, I should like to ask Dr. Watson to present to this Conference what sort of curricular setup his program would present to the incoming freshman.



DR. WATSON: Let us suppose that a wise group of people have presented the problems of our civilization and its possibilities something along the line President Morgan was saying. Let's suppose that units have been prepared with two free criteria in mind, let us say. They shall be, as Dr. Ellis said this morning, obviously related to progress in some of those areas of life and civilization. They shall be interesting, make contact with the students' existing drives at some points so we can use that leverage.

It is a matter of method, as Dr. Dewey has said. They shall be of a sort that will conserve the best in our tradition of knowledge. As I conceive it, there are several hundred possible projects, enterprises, units, meeting those demands. The way in which the freshman is introduced to that, the best, would seem to me to be with several hours of conference with a teacher who knows the resources and makes best use of the time by getting acquainted with the student. It is possible they could be introduced by lectures, general presentations, bulletins describing them, but generally I should assume it is better done in conference, and then I would proceed with some of them and work with all these.

MR. GAVIT: Personally or with a group?

DR. WATSON: Personal conference, about half done in groups and half with individuals, which is more group work than in any college that I know anything about it. These

projects would occupy from two to a hundred hours, so he could do something more than twenty of them in a year.

DR. HART: There would be presented something in the neighborhood of two hundred probably diverse, distinct projects.

DR. WATSON: Those he would know were there as possibilities. I suspect the adviser would not take up with him all of those. I suspect experience and previous activities of the student would lead to some definition as to what that student might best attempt.

DR. HART: That is, they should be grouped.

DR. WATSON: Yes, grouped, and starred, and asterisked, or daggered to indicate those essential for students in one way or another, at some time or other, in connection with most activities not desired, of course.

DR. HART: There would be no danger in the situation of so dispersing the freshman's interest that he would be in a fog for weeks as to whether he did the right thing by electing the one rather than another?

DR. WATSON: If that danger arose, I suppose that it would have to be met by that adviser and student in some assurance that it doesn't matter so much where you begin, that you have several years of study and work here, and to get going on something is exceedingly important, more important than a long period of indecision.

PROFESSOR BAILEY: I understood you to say some of these might be marked with a dagger as being more important or possibly essential. Doesn't that bring you back to your minimum requirement for freshmen?

DR. WATSON: I should be inclined to stand by the statement I made earlier. There are four ways of getting those things done, and the required course is the poorest of the four. It may be necessary in some administrative setups, but I wouldn't use it until I tried the other three and found that I suspected they would not work.

DR. HART: Of course, the adviser of the student would have to be an individual who had some disinterested perspective on these problems.

DR. WATSON: Now I am back to your point. I think we need teachers of that sort in college.

PRESIDENT MORGAN: A student two or three years later will be interested in physics, and as a preliminary to that he will have to have certain tools, mathematics, and so forth. There is a certain sequence there that he may not be aware of. Would you make this project program take the entire time of the freshman year, or have it going parallel with certain other elements of the curriculum which were preparatory to later understanding?

DR. WATSON: It doesn't seem to me necessary to go outside the project setup to meet that situation very

satisfactorily. Suppose a man knows he wants to be a research chemist, one of the first projects would be to find out what a research chemist has to know. He would talk with men competent in that field, study what they write, examine curricula that could be presented to him and lay out for himself a program of preparation, perhaps working with a group of others interested in a similar way, certainly at some points with groups, that would involve the mastery of the mathematical problems, and the laboratory techniques and other things he needs, not as something in addition to his self-directed program that is important for civilization, because he recognized these necessities, that that, too is one of the needs of civilization and something that is quite integral with anything that plans to meet social needs.

PRESIDENT MORGAN: In this matter of interest, I think this group is sidestepping the question somewhat by indicating the only one way in which they will acknowledge student interest is that in subject matter. There are other classifications of student interest. One student doesn't care to do anything well. He likes to do many things, a day here and a day there. If you require him to do anything well, you are infringing on his interests.

DR. WATSON: I have no objection to infringing on his interests. I don't think anyone who has raised two small children or more is likely to think it is never permissible to infringe on their interests.

PRESIDENT MORGAN: There is one way in which we will allow students a choice of subject matter or allow a change. We say, "After you have studied a day or two and are sick of it and would like something new, you can change and drift about and vascillate any way you want to." At any time you deny that, you are denying the fundamental thesis here that it is by following student interest you get somewhere.

DR. WATSON: I would say by creating an interest in doing the thing well and thoroughly.

PRESIDENT MORGAN: Would you require him to do it well?

DR. WATSON: I would see to it that he did.

PRESIDENT MORGAN: I think it is a matter of playing on words whether your compulsion is a compulsion of the way he works or what he works in.

DR. WATSON: In either case we are in agreement, and all of us aren't, as to the kind of work we want to see done. If you are suggesting that you can get him to do that and get him to be a competent worker, very efficiently, by saying this and setting up the kind of requirements that ordinarily exist in college, I think it is a matter of psychology and method, and probably your method isn't very good, and the best method for getting a person who is sloppy, careless, half-interested in things, to awaken to a self-directed kind of responsibility is through this individual advice that appeals to something within him to rise to that point.

PROFESSOR BAILEY: We say to our art instructors in Cleveland, "If you could go back through art school, what would you think the art school should give you?" In that way we get our minimum requirements for a year and a half for the freshmen.

If a freshman says, "I don't want to take this feature of this freshman course," I say, "Why?" Well, he doesn't like it. He is not interested in that. I say, "Do you want to be a successful worker in the field of arts later on?"

"Certainly."

"Well, I didn't make that course. I didn't require that. That course is made by the consensus of opinion of twenty-five successful workers in the arts, and they say that is essential, and what do you amount to, and what does your opinion amount to starting in as a freshman, as to what you ought to have or not have? We will respect your interest, but there are certain minor things, a minimum of essentials, that you will have to have to go through the art school, because after graduation we want you to be a credit to us and therefore you must have it."

In a group of men in a faculty in a college a lot of dissatisfied people like us, with our college education, as revealed in the Conference, might agree on certain things we all think the students should have in a college

course. Then, respecting his interest, nursing that along, helping him in every way we can, we will say, "You must take these things if you are going to be a success."

Over and over again I have used this figure with them: "If you want to go out on the shore of Lake Erie just for the afternoon or for a week-end, you can get along with a tent or with the cheapest kind of shack; if you are going to spend a month out there, or two months out there, you have got to have a better shack. You have got to have better foundations in that case. But, if you are going to live the year around there, you have got to put in a cellar and a heater. If you are going to bring up your family there and live there twenty-five years, you have got to lay firmer, deeper, stronger, richer foundations for that life.

"What do you propose to do? Do you want to be a cartoonist and think you may possibly get by, or do you want to lay a foundation which will enable you to build a life that will be permanently useful to the community and give permanent satisfaction to you? If you do, you can't go out in a tent."

MR. GAVIT: When I was a boy, I was very much interested in lettering and did a lot of fancy lettering, and my father interfered and said, "This is rotten! You can't distort lettering until you know what it is you are distorting."

PROFESSOR BAILEY: He was a wise man.



CHAIRMAN DEWEY: I might say in connection with Professor Bailey's very interesting and significant remarks, that we would still have the question of how far a policy which was wise for a professional school of specialized character would apply to the general liberal arts college..

I was very much impressed with the statement made by Dr. Ellis last evening, which seemed to be based on actual investigation, that if he took the catalogs of the colleges of the country, he would find that every subject was regarded as an irreducible minimum by some of them, while there wasn't a single subject that was an irreducible minimum for all of them.

There doesn't seem to be at present, even if it is desirable at present, any such consensus about the necessary elements such as would exist in a school like yours.

PROFESSOR BAILEY: That is questionable.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: I should like to remark whether there is any difference between compelling students as to what they take and compelling a certain degree of thoroughness and continuity in a subject; that is, that if a subject is selected by a student who says he has an interest in it, which is a presupposition, he obviously assumes upon himself certain responsibilities. He has taken that responsibility and it is only fair that he should live up to it. That seems to me quite a different case from the faculty or teacher's taking the

responsibility and then asking the student to live up to it.

DR. ELLIS: There is another aspect, too, that President Morgan brought out very thoughtfully, the fact that we all operate from interest even when we are trying to escape a whipping as a small child, if we have to do that, and so here when he compels these students to take a certain course or to make a certain grade, they are working from interest. They are interested in getting by. They are interested in getting a degree. They are interested in not being sent home, and that is the reason they are studying. Those are rather ephemeral interests and do not operate outside the college environment as well as they do in a college environment, and it seems to me anything we do in college to get them dependent upon such interests as those for their activities is bad, because in four years they will be out of college. If we can get them to operate from interests that will be accurate and effective when they leave college, we are doing them a very much greater service.

That is another reason it seems to me for not depriving or excusing the faculty and officers from the task of trying to find a way of developing another type of interest which would lead a student to take this course besides the mere interest of getting by and finishing the degree of requirements.

PRESIDENT MORGAN: There are one or two elements in our program which haven't been brought out. The first is that the Antioch curriculum is not static. Each year we have a session like this, but this is mild compared with ours, and students and faculty both take part, and the faculty as a whole take their work and the whole thing is gone over once a year and it is fluid.

Another item is this: that of something over eight thousand, I think, inquiries about coming to Antioch last year, only two hundred and twenty-five finally arrived, and every last one of those is made very much aware of what it is that we are driving at. If he accepts that, it is just as though he accepts a course in physics. He doesn't take page ten and page twenty-three as he likes it. He takes it as it is, as a unit. If he comes to us, it is because he desires this kind of program and he has made an option.

PROFESSOR BAILEY: They are as highly specialized as a group, as the art students are.

DR. ELLIS: That is why I think it is so dangerous to reason from that to the general course of an arts college because you not only have the very selected group of students, but also a highly selected faculty and set of officers doing all these other four things and talking it as hard as they can, and add this requirement, and my guess is that the requirement doesn't amount to half as much as what you

do in getting the requirement.

DR. BANCROFT: Dr. Watson spoke of the young man who knew in advance that he wanted to be a research chemist. I can't help thinking that is a singularly bad example to have taken. I know I didn't develop that way, and if I went back with my present knowledge and did it all over again, I know I wouldn't develop along that line; in fact it strikes me with perfect horror. He may be perfectly right on all his other cases, but he is absolutely hopelessly wrong on this. He might turn out a very interesting person but not a research chemist.

DR. WATSON: He would have done what you told him to do.

DR. BANCROFT: But you would turn out a person who went into words and not facts, I think.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: The time has come for adjournment.

I should like to ask for the guidance of the Findings Committee whether we are agreed that the teacher and the faculty, taking Dr. Ellis' suggestion, do have a responsibility for the direction and development of the interests of the pupil. Then we can nail that down and then possibly we can determine this evening in what direction, more definitely than we have so far, the teacher and faculty should interact to determine this.

... The meeting adjourned at eleven-thirty o'clock ...

---

## THURSDAY EVENING SESSION

January 22, 1931

The meeting convened at eight o'clock,  
Dr. Dewey presiding.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: Before the business of the evening begins, I want to take a moment to mention one rather important point that escaped me last evening. Having had to jump about as Dr. Robinson said, I haven't had time to put my thoughts together. One reason we have to discuss the curriculum problem in this broad way is because the agencies for giving all of us young, handhold things ready-made, have increased so rapidly at the same time that educational theory has been emphasizing the importance of activity rather than passivity, society has been providing pretty much everything to individuals in a finished form.

The direct active contacts with processes, operations, creative, productive, and so forth, are growing more limited. I mentioned last night that we have one problem of college today at least off-setting this tendency to have everything given to us in a finished form without any participation on our part, the responsibility of the college to provide more activity and demand for some kind of active participation on the part of the students.

The other remark is not so important but was suggested to me by conversation this afternoon. It is that



we should take appreciation in a broader sense than merely appreciation of the aesthetic element; that is, we should give it a positive meaning and make our whole education more positive in that way, and less negative.

I remember reading years ago an article by Professor Palmer who said there were some of the elements of comic opera about ordinary college education. It was as if in a store the storekeeper was putting out everything and offering to give it away and the persons on the other side of the counter were engaged in throwing it back as much as possible. That is one illustration of the negative phase of our education, and I take it that President Morgan might object to using the term "gratification," and would certainly not believe there ought to be more positive enjoyment of worthwhile things if that enjoyment were of a positive character and not dispersive and disintegrative.

PRESIDENT MORGAN: By all means.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: I felt sure you would feel the same way and certainly one of the problems is how we are to provide more of that positive enjoyment and appreciation of the whole range of interesting, worthwhile things as well as more active participation.

Thank you for indulging me. What shall be the order of business?

DR. HART: I move that the Conference discuss until nine o'clock some further aspect of this general problem, and that at nine o'clock the Conference go into executive session to organize for a finding.

DR. ROBINSON: I second the motion.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: You have heard the motion, two motions, perhaps, since there are two elements in it, that we go on with the general discussion of the general principles and at nine o'clock go into executive session. Is there anything to be said about this? If not, are you ready for the question?

... The motion was put to a vote and was carried ...

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: Have you anything to say on the general problems?

DR. HART: I should like to suggest that the Conference spend this three-quarters of an hour until nine o'clock in discussing some problems that grow out of these specific curricular problems presented by the Steering Committee, such problems as orientation of freshmen and the stratification of the four years and specialization or organization towards the end of the course, a few things of that sort, and see what our general point of view may be with respect to those.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: That is on the planning of

some specific curricular problems.

DR. HART: Yes.

PRESIDENT HOLT: If that is agreeable, may I suggest for discussion as the sense of the Conference: The college of liberal arts should be put on an accomplishment rather than a time basis.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: Is that motion seconded?

PROFESSOR BAILEY: I second it.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: Won't you speak to it?

PRESIDENT HOLT: I think it is self-explanatory.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: Are there any comments on this?

PRESIDENT MORGAN: I have this comment, I believe that while an institution like that should be put on a time basis, yet the medium ought to be determined, say it is three years, four years, five years, whatever it is, because that would determine the type of curriculum.

PRESIDENT HOLT: Oh, yes. Four years seems to be the convenient period that young men and women expect to be in college and I should assume if you went on an accomplishment basis, you would arrange it so the average student would take about four years to do the work, a brighter student less, or a student who had to earn his living, more.

When you are really trying to master something, for instance, as stenography, you don't take a course for so many periods of time, you wait until you do so many words a

minute, and it ought to be the same in any study.

DR. HART: I heard recently of a young man who asked a publisher how long a novel was and the publisher said about seventy thousand words, and the young man said, "Well, then, mine is finished." (Laughter)

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: That story of Lincoln's about a man's legs being long enough to reach the ground, seems to be in point here.

DR. WATSON: One of the bases that I see that has many advantages is in the objectives that Dr. Ellis' Committee brought to us the other evening. As I understood it, they include not only the absorption of a certain amount of knowledge but the creation of a certain amount of development of appreciation; they include certain contributions to the individual's development and to society which it is very difficult for us to measure, as I understand it at the present time.

DR. ELLIS: Contributions of the college, not the student.

DR. WATSON: Students were not to make any contributions to society if it could be helped. Isn't there a danger in the adoption of accomplishment basis that we will at the present stage tend to crystallize these in terms of simply mastery? You can tell whether he has it or whether he hasn't it. That might lead to some neglect of the other equally or perhaps more important objectives of the college.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: Are there further comments on this?

DR. HART: If some of these rather fine, high considerations that enter into our discussion, just have the nature of the teaching that is to come I realize, then the student will be safeguarded in those respects on an accomplishment basis quite as much as on a time basis.

MR. GAVIT: How are you going to find out whether he has, or I will say "she," meaning to include therein "he," the other thing which is quite as important as knowledge? What sort of measurement are you going to have to tell whether the student has what we want him to learn? What are we going to call accomplishment?

DR. HART: Even now you have to sort of slip up on the blind side and ask him when he is not suspecting it.

MR. GAVIT: That is the point which puzzles me; otherwise I would be for it.

PRESIDENT HOLT: Our Curriculum Committee has made definite suggestions as to what to get into the first division of college and what to get into the senior division. I should think the Curriculum Committee could work it out if we agreed on the principle.

MR. GAVIT: But what about the spiritual qualifications which are supposed to be underlying all this?

PRESIDENT HOLT: Dr. Creese has a system for measuring those.

DR. CREESE: I wouldn't measure them in that field.

MR. GAVIT: He is an engineer.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: Perhaps one thing would be that it could lead to making the accomplishment more definite than at present.

MR. GAVIT: As long as it depends on marks, you are all right, as long as he has made A's, B's, C's, and D's.

DR. ELLIS: What makes you think they are all right?

MR. GAVIT: I don't mean they are all right, because I don't think they are. I mean if you rely on marks, you know you have something to come.

DR. ELLIS: But you don't have any idea what it is after you have it, because the same person marking the same three people, for instance, three months apart, marks them differently.

MR. GAVIT: It depends on what the professor had to eat.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: That is what I had in mind. That is one advantage of putting it on an accomplishment basis. It would lead to more fundamental considerations than marks and examinations.

DR. HART: This has the old danger in the Boy Scout code that you can get virtue by doing one good deed a day. The Boy Scouts have decided to abandon that, I understand.

MR. GAVIT: There are so many queer things about us, like the honor system. I won't say where this happened, but at one of the colleges two fellows signed the honor statement at the end, but they caught them with the goods. They had been communicating during the examination and they swore that during it they had neither given nor received assistance. They were charged with this form of perjury, whereupon one of the fellows said, "Sure I asked him the answer to the question, but he didn't know it, so he didn't give me any information and I didn't receive any."



CHAIRMAN DEWEY: Are you ready for the question? Will the Secretary repeat the proposition?

DR. GEORGIA: Should the college be put on an accomplishment or a time basis?

DR. ELLIS: Do we know enough about that to vote on it? I don't. I was hoping for light.

DR. GEORGIA: I didn't realize it was before the Conference as a motion.

PRESIDENT MORGAN: We are doing it at Antioch and we graduate people in four, five, six, or seven years. I remember one who did it in four years and others in seven. It seems like a good principle, but when you apply it, you have the regular course with exceptions one way or another.

DR. ELLIS: I was going to ask President Holt just what he means by "an accomplishment basis."

PRESIDENT HOLT: I mean that you are given a task to do and when that is done, whether it takes long or short according to the ability of the boy, your record is accomplished. Then you go on to the next thing, and when there are a sufficient number of accomplishments, you graduate. There has to be somewhere to stop. It takes the average student about four years.

DR. ELLIS: Isn't that what they do in college now?

PRESIDENT HOLT: Yes, but the bright student

doesn't have to work hard and the poor student is kicked and cuffed. Why shouldn't the bright student be allowed to go ahead?

PRESIDENT MORGAN: That is true in some colleges definitely now.

PRESIDENT HOLT: One girl last year didn't attend the last term. She finished all her work and came back and got her degree in June. Why shouldn't she?

DR. ELLIS: That expression is sometimes used with a different meaning. You don't get by anything and get to the next thing until you have actually accomplished it, not 70 per cent accomplished it but actually done it, you have done it 100 per cent. I thought you had that in mind.

PRESIDENT HOLT: Some things you can measure and know about. If you paint a barn, you know when it is done.

DR. ELLIS: What we do with a rough system of testing that we have is let them by Western Reserve if they have 70 per cent of it, but we don't make them accomplish it. They accomplish only 70 per cent of it. One of the schools in the University of Chicago would not let the student go on to the second topic until he had completely mastered the subject.

PRESIDENT WARREN: They had an irreducible minimum; you had to master it completely.

DR. ELLIS: What we give on examination is that

minimum and they don't get 70 per cent. Some colleges have only 60 per cent of it. That couldn't by any possibility be called mastery.

DEAN DAWSON: We are attempting a couple of experiments at Antioch along the line which might share some interest in the problem. One is in the course in freshman mathematics. It seems to me, as Dr. Ellis has been indicating here, one of the chief difficulties in college teaching here is the emphasis on getting over so much material, and if you make it 70 per cent or 60 per cent, all well and good, but you must get over so much material in the course. I think one of the things they have tried to do probably all along the line is cut out some of the less important details of the course and try to see if we can set up a certain irreducible minimum of fundamental facts, but insist that all students shall master those 100 per cent, as though you were trying to decide on your friend's honesty. You don't want a friend who is honest only 70 per cent; you want a person 100 per cent honest.

The same ideals, I think, should carry over into academic work, so we have broken it up in freshman mathematics into a certain number of units and a student may make one credit hour during the semester, or four or five, depending on the rate at which we can travel.

We do one other thing, we give no grades below C. If the student cannot make a grade of C, he flunks the course. I realize it is easier to do that in mathematics than in most other fields simply because you have a definite

scale of measurement along the way. In the field of English the English Department is now proposing a similar scheme. There the idea is that no student in the college should not be able to speak and write good English. I think any college wants a student to be able to do that, and I think their idea is that no grades below C should be given. If a person cannot make more than D in English, he should stay with the course a greater time. They are proposing, therefore, that the student's grade in English will be a tentative C or B, and if at any time during the college course it shows up that he cannot write or speak good English, that grade will be withdrawn.

PRESIDENT MORGAN: There is another element, extra credit for the quality of work. You might outline that a bit.

DEAN DAWSON: We have a scheme which works somewhat as follows: Four hours of B count for an hour of A, and he is given so much extra credit, so a student maintaining an average of B is able to cut off one semester thereby. We recognize quality work definitely.

PRESIDENT HOLT: May I ask some of the members of our Curriculum Committee, Dr. Georgia or anyone he will designate, to speak about what has occurred in the Committee to date?

DR. GEORGIA: The Committee very definitely tried to put the work in the college on an accomplishment basis, but set up a rather different method of measuring the accomplishments. The Committee proposes to do away entirely with the accumulation of credits in the usual form, by hours, points, or grades, and to take the place of that usual system of evaluations, we have proposed to substitute two major evaluations of the student during the college course. The first occurs when the student applies to the upper division. At that point, having in mind the desirability of making the student take the initiative, we said that he must present in writing a statement showing how he had met our fixed requirements; secondly, what in addition he had accomplished, what he had accomplished in addition to these fixed requirements, and that included not only additional academic work but also it included all of his activities, such things as we now class as extracurricular, and so forth. We want to know also whether he has hobbies and if so, how far he has carried them.

A further consideration had behind it an attempt to determine something of his maturity of attitude as expressed in the reasons underlying his choice of a major field. So

there were those three items which we felt would be a fair evaluation of the student's work to that point, that evaluation to be reached by a committee examining the evidence presented to it and the committee was at liberty to satisfy itself in any manner it saw fit as to whether or not the student had done the thing he said he had done and accomplished the things he said he had accomplished.

Another evaluation was set up at the end of his work in the senior division when he came up for his degree, and here again the student was called upon to present his case, to show what he had accomplished, and again a committee was charged with examining the evidence and determining whether or not the student had met the things that he said he had and whether things that he had accomplished were sufficient to warrant it in recommending him for the degree.

This is, I feel, strictly an accomplishment basis, but evaluated in rather different terms than we think of these things at the present time.

MR. GAVIT: I am not at all familiar with the thing they do in the German universities, but in reading Flexner's book (and I have heard of it otherwise) I got the impression that there, of course, the whole business is viewed very differently, and it is up to the student to demand assessment and appraisal at any time he thinks he can stand it. He is the fellow who has to initiate the business.

DR. GEORGIA: So would it be here.

MR. GAVIT: He can come at the end of three months and say, "I have finished this and I am ready to prove it." I haven't had any teaching experience.

PRESIDENT MORGAN: That is also the case at Antioch.

MR. GAVIT: Can a man go in and demand a chance to show what he can do?

PRESIDENT MORGAN: If he had no basis for it, we might not take the trouble, but if we think he has evidence of accomplishment, we will try it, no matter whether he has ever taken that course or we feel he has accomplished it. We will try him out and give him credit for it.

DR. BANCROFT: We have the same thing in our professional required course in chemistry. We have said you have to have a reading knowledge of a language, pass this, that, and the other, and we don't care a particle how he gets that. If he wants to go out tutoring and get it, or go to



another university or read it up on his own hook, we do not care. All we ask him is that he knows enough officially for the requirements, because our object is simply and solely to try to turn out what we call chemists and not have them just do a certain amount of work in the university.

MR. GAVIT: But, to put it in an extreme way, would it be possible for a total stranger to come in from the outside and matriculate and get the four-year examinations and a degree without any matriculation in the university?

DR. BANCROFT: On paper I don't see any difficulty, but actually if he had had all that work, he would have received his degree elsewhere; but so far as our regulations go, I think we would agree.

DR. ELLIS: I think you would find your catalog states a year's residence is necessary. Practically all of them do.

DR. BANCROFT: For the arts course, yes, but the chemistry is simply and solely on an accomplishment basis. We don't consult the arts faculty. We recommend to them. They have to go through the form of recommending to the trustees but they have no option and we do it whenever we are satisfied that the man has done the work. If he does it in three years, well and good. If he does it in five, that is not so good, but he doesn't get it until he has met the requirements.

DR. GEORGIA: We say in the report that all

students must go over the hurdles and if he transfers from elsewhere, he goes into the lower division and he has to go over that hurdle.

DEAN DAWSON: Do you have certain definite requirements in the lower division?

MR. GAVIT: That is in the scheme.

DR. GEORGIA: That is the proposal of the Faculty Committee.

DEAN DAWSON: Had you thought how you might rate the extracurricular activities in the scheme of admission?

DR. GEORGIA: I think the feeling of the Committee was it would be unfortunate now to attempt to lay down any definite set of regulations to guide that board, that the board ought to have a considerable amount of discretion.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: Would this be in line with your suggestions? I think it was the rule at the University of Cincinnati where a freshman got no credit for the freshman mathematics, but postponed credit if he needed to use that mathematics in his senior or junior year. If he was not able to use it, he got no credit for his work in the subject. That method could be adopted where there is a continuity of courses in a single line. It would be difficult where there was not continuity of courses.

DEAN McCONN: May I ask Dr. Georgia if I under-

stand correctly that his scheme at each of these two hurdles does not involve anything in the way of comprehensive examination or other extended examination in the ordinary sense of the word?

DR. GEORGIA: It does not specifically provide for such a thing. It definitely says it is up to the board of admissions to determine as they see fit. They might at times, I presume, set an examination. It might be written or oral or they might prefer to have the testimony of the student's instructors, or they might use all sorts of methods of that type.

DEAN McCONN: And different methods in different cases.

DR. GEORGIA: Yes.

DEAN McCONN: I think where the accomplishment scheme or principle has been adopted heretofore, so far as I know, it has always been on the basis of the comprehensive examination, as in the German and French universities, the Swarthmore school and the new scheme proposed at Chicago.

PRESIDENT HOLT: Doesn't the comprehensive examination mean loafing the first part and cramming the second part?

DR. ELLIS: That was certainly true in Germany. There was a class of men there who made their living coaching men for that purpose. They made a specialty of all

the peculiarities and the things different professors would call for (laughter) and had them well listed and you could get by on three years' work, even some of the most skilful of them.

PRESIDENT HOLT: They were, in fact the real teachers of the course and the professors were not.

MR. GAVIT: It was the professors who were doing the loafing.

DR. ELLIS: I don't think that was always true. Many students were serious, of course.

PRESIDENT HOLT: When my roommate went to the College of Physicians and Surgeons, he found that nobody could trust to his memory or his notes. No memory is a substitute for knowledge, and they were not able to trust to their notes because they were not expert stenographers. They hired tutors to do the entire teaching of the course. Those tutors should have been made teachers. They are not obliged to keep any rules. Let the students hire a lecture room.

DR. GEORGIA: In the lower divisions certain minor principles have been set up, as under our general proposal No. 8:

"To provide for periodic consideration of the student's work in the Lower Division as a basis for his continuation as a student in the College."

We didn't feel it was desirable to let a

student drift too long and we have said in the lower division we will have them present at the beginning of each term a statement as to what they expect to accomplish during the term, and at the end of the term we will check up in some form if they seem to be doing the thing they say they are doing, and in that case we will let them stay. If they seem to be slumping, that is another matter.

It would probably be unfair to the student to let him drift two or three years without any check, especially in the lower division.

DR. ELLIS: Dr. Watson pointed out an extremely important thing and a great weakness. We all realize, perhaps, the greater desirability of having our students come out with some refinement of taste and broadening and elevation of interests and higher appreciations than they had before, and yet absolutely we have not made an attempt to devise any scheme for measuring that in America, so far as I know, in college. I may be in error about that. Am I, Dr. Watson? So far as I know, no college authorities have made any attempt to measure that, which indicates they are paying no attention to it in college or they would realize it. There ought to be some measure and we have very little measure of the kind of skill they ought to acquire.

I think we can learn a good deal from the English in that, especially in extension work. Any man can be given a problem and discuss it with the professor a little bit and go off and analyze that problem and go and hunt up literature and select wisely from the literature and present it in an intelligent and effective way and in good English and on that basis be taken into Oxford or Cambridge and entrance requirements are waived. He could go on to a degree, and that kind of procedure in college will get him a good way.

I wonder if that isn't a better test than a long comprehensive objective type of examination. Don't you really know more about what a person ought to have when he or she has

gone through college, if he can prove that he can do those things?

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: I have heard the suggestion within the last few weeks that there is a method of treating a student, at least in certain subjects, namely, that he be put in a library, given all the facilities of the library, for a day or two days, assigned a certain subject, find out the books that bear on it, and write a poem on that particular subject. It expresses their ability to use literature and find the ability to write English, to study and organize their results, and so forth. I don't know how seriously that was suggested.



MR. GAVIT: Get your information through the traffic cop or anywhere else.

DR. ELLIS: Anywhere. Go out and dig up something.

MR. GAVIT: You can't cheat in that kind of examination.

DR. ELLIS: Not so easily as with the others. I wonder if it is wholly absurd to say we would have some means of finding out when a person came up for a degree if we asked what movies he had been to see in the past year. That is one measure, and then what list of books he had read voluntarily.

MR. GAVIT: And find out whether he actually read them.

DR. ELLIS: And what magazines he reads, does he read the Red Book or alleged True Story Magazine, or the Atlantic Monthly.

DR. BANCROFT: Were you proposing to plan that same test for the faculty? Not one in ten of us would pass it.

DR. ELLIS: That is a sad commentary on us, if it is true.

Then what theatres did he attend and what class of musical performances. Again, we ought to have a measure of getting a list of the chief topics of conversation for a

week of a student who wants to graduate and his more frequent and favorite associates, if he or she enjoys going around with mosquito-brained people.

DR. HART: That might be for experimental purposes.

DR. ELLIS: And going to cheap movies and reading nothing. Unless he can pass a satisfactory test in those things, it seems to me there is no earthly sense in giving him a degree no matter how many credits he may have.

DR. GEORGIA: I feel that a good deal of information could be obtained as to a student's mental capacity by watching him play a game of bridge. (Laughter)

PRESIDENT MORGAN: I want to interpose this objection. Who was it? - one of our great philosophers, was playing a game of billiards with a young man - Herbert Spencer. He said such skill as that was evidence of a misspent youth. (Laughter)

DR. ELLIS: I think there is a great deal in your answer. I didn't want to be so cruel.

PROFESSOR BAILEY: You may be interested to know that many of these questions Dr. Ellis has mentioned we have on our application blank. On the basis of the answers to those questions made by those applying to enter the art school, we decide whether to take them or not.

PRESIDENT HOLT: Antioch does, too.

PRESIDENT MORGAN: It goes over that ground and it is a substantial source of information.

PRESIDENT WARREN: So do we.

DR. ELLIS: Do you do the same thing when you graduate them to see if you have killed them?

PRESIDENT MORGAN: We have a sort of spiritual biography and if any of you want a critical appraisal of Antioch, get those.

DR. ELLIS: I am serious in saying I think this Committee could find some way of calling attention to the need for checking up on the faculty as well as the student body.

PRESIDENT HOLT: The Student Report suggests that we mark the faculty the same way.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: What is the sum of the objection so far as it is based upon the vagueness of ideal accomplishment due to lack of adequate methods of determining it? Would it be taken care of if in the final statement this were accompanied by a recommendation that institutions study whatever methods of determining accomplishment are already in existence in different institutions?

DR. ELLIS: Certainly we have developed methods of testing equally difficult things and with a considerable degree of success and it is only a matter of applying some energy and attention to the thing. I am certain we could develop a system of tests not less accurate than the system

we have for testing the alleged knowledge.

DR. HART: There would be some difficulty with respect to class bias. That probably also would be taken up.

PRESIDENT HOLT: Under any system.

DR. ELLIS: You would get that in testing their knowledge. No two professors of chemistry insist on the same thing and on history they are as far apart as the poles.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: It is not a question of whether it is perfect, but whether it is better than the time method.

DR. ELLIS: It can't be any worse than what we have, I think.

MR. GAVIT: Are we ready to present a definite opinion?

PRESIDENT HOLT: My resolution as I remember it was that it be the sense of this Committee that the curriculum of a college of liberal arts should be on accomplishments rather than on a time basis.

DR. GEORGIA: I noted here "Should the college be put on an accomplishment or a time basis?"

PRESIDENT HOLT: I didn't say that.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: The resolution is that it is the sense of the meeting that it should be on an accomplishment rather than a time basis. Are there any contrary-minded?

DR. ELLIS: Would it be right to say it is also the sense of this meeting that college authorities should make more serious efforts to develop methods of testing the interests, appreciations, and attitudes that are developed in college as well as the knowledge that has been transmitted?

MR. GAVIT: Every mother's son of them would tell you they do that now. They told me that. I have found no college is very much interested in what is done at any other college. They don't bother their heads about it.

DEAN DOERSCHUK: I shall not be satisfied if we are thinking of accomplishment only in terms of acquisition of knowledge. If we are not getting away from that, I don't see that we are gaining anything by going on an accomplishment basis, because already a student who is able to take eighteen hours instead of fifteen can gain a semester. What difference will we gain unless we have a new conception of accomplishment rather than one that can be mathematically measured?

DR. ELLIS: If he makes a B, he gets 1 credit; if he makes an A, he gets two.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: This should be accompanied by some statement. It is not an examination of subject matter now, for credit, that was meant by accomplishment tests.

PRESIDENT HOLT: I think that is perfectly clear in the two or three aims we have formulated as the aim of the college of liberal arts. One has to do with knowledge, and the

other with skills and appreciations.

DR. ELLIS: We are suggesting that we ought to go to work to develop better methods of measuring these other accomplishments.

DEAN DOERSCHUK: What about accomplishment in terms of growth?

DR. BANCROFT: How would you measure that?

PRESIDENT MORGAN: Before and after.

DEAN DOERSCHUK: The reason we cannot now measure seems to make it a futile question to go from one basis to another, which has so little difference, until we can measure something we now consider immeasurable.

DR. BANCROFT: I should like to point out one objection to the time basis we have at Cornell. A student in the arts course must finish so many hours, let's say 120, to graduate, and must take not less than twelve hours per term, university hours. Suppose he gets around to his last half year and he needs only four hours to graduate. They say, "Oh, well, it would have a very bad effect on the other students if you should stay here and loaf and do four hours. You must take at least twelve hours and pass them or we won't give you your degree." That holds although as a matter of fact as soon as he has passed four, he has more than met all the requirements. We have to compromise and give the degree six months later without his doing anything more, but it seems a perfectly foolish sort of thing.

DEAN DOERSCHUK: I think we are begging the question if we change to an accomplishment basis rather than a time basis.

DEAN McCONN: There is a plan suggested here in the Rollins Report. I have the Faculty Report before me which proposes qualifications for entrance and again for the degree. I consider it the first serious attempt in that direction I ever saw, so much so that I reacted against it as one does against any new idea.

MR. GAVIT: It comes as a matter of fact then.

DEAN McCONN: "Fact" is a pretty definite word, but it is a matter of appraisal and estimate by the student, nearly always in good faith, and the faculty always in good faith, of growth, of attitude, of appreciation, of all these rather intangible things which at present can only be appriased, but here is a definite proposal, as I take it, to appraise those things, as the ability to answer two hundred questions on a new type of examination, something of which I think should perhaps also be included in some form or other. This is one of the newest things in the report and one of the most striking to my mind.



DR. ROBINSON: I will take but a moment, but it appears to me that this matter of testing achievements is one of the very most important things that we have come across and that it should either be an attempt to cast some light on it or admit it is a serious problem that deserves very special study because their temperaments are so different.

I have had that same nervousness that has been expressed by some of my friends that we could probably never be very successful in passing examinations, and I used to generalize that students in the junior class had the maximum examinability.

DR. ELLIS: They have gotten over their freshman fears and have not begun to worry about graduating.

DR. ROBINSON: The more you think about examinations, the less examinable you become. Everything strikes you in so many different ways!

I think we have struck an extremely important thing. I should have preferred to have this matter put differently. I think there is a certain amount of time that an instructor would have in mind suitable for accomplishing the task with the group which he has been engaged with, and I should prefer to have had the motion read that while the time basis seems on the whole most available in many cases, the achievement or lack of achievement could be constantly considered in a student's progress or a student's recognized

progress, something of that kind.

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: I see we have passed the nine o'clock hour when we were to go into executive session. It was not clear in my mind whether this meant we would go into executive session for the rest of the evening or the rest of the Conference.

DR. HART: I should like to move before the audience goes that the period tomorrow morning from nine-thirty to twelve-thirty be taken by the members of the Conference in the form of committee work or any other sort of work that may arise. I make that at this time so the audience may know what the decision of the Conference is to be.

DR. ROBINSON: Aren't we to meet tomorrow afternoon? Wouldn't it be better to have that period for our own particular deliberations?

DR. HART: It strikes me as I look this thing over that there are at least two strata of committee work that have to be attended to; one, statements of specific findings in a variety of directions; and then a general finding which these specific findings are organized into as a presentable whole.

MR. GAVIT: We would need as much time for that. Why not give it?

DR. ROBINSON: Why not give up all public sessions? Probably the audience has got all the amusement and education out of this business they are likely to, and it might

save us some humiliation to let them quietly depart.

(Laughter)

DR. HART: My reason for making the suggestion that we have executive session tomorrow morning is that at the end of that time we could determine whether it was advisable to have another open session and word could go out by way of the radio station or something of the sort.

MR. GAVIT: It strikes me this way: This audience has been listening pretty intelligently and eagerly and critically and will be interested to know what we think has been the result of our deliberations - if any, and it just occurs to me as an idea that we might reserve all of tomorrow for our own cogitations and then have an open session on Saturday morning, if necessary and suitable. We might not finish tomorrow morning.

DR. HART: I will accept that amendment.

DR. GEORGIA: There has been no second. Do you want to restate it?

DR. HART: I move that the Commission devote Friday, both morning and afternoon to executive sessions.

MR. GAVIT: I will second that motion.

... The motion was put to a vote and was carried ...

CHAIRMAN DEWEY: This concludes the public part of this evening's session then, and the audience is

excused.

... The audience retired at nine-fifteen  
o'clock and the Conference went into executive session ...

---