

# Creating Educational Futures: A Historical Perspective

by **Don Glines, Director**  
**Educational Futures Projects**  
**Sacramento, California**

"Join with Figment—a precious purple dragon, and Dreamfinder, a guide toward the future who together can conjure visions of an exciting JOURNEY INTO IMAGINATION." Disney World, Epcot Center

## Prologue

**CREATING EDUCATIONAL FUTURES** reflects an array of isolated but related happenings, historical in nature, yet envisioning coming decades—and a society without schools. Intended for all communities, it photographs quantity, in deference to in-depth analysis. The apparent disconnected roaming among topics is by design to portray the vastness of the experiences and research findings protesting the requirement of traditionally accepted schooling methods for everyone, and the multitude of known factors demanding attention. The limited references do not do justice to the overwhelming availability of program/people/evaluation documentations. The focus on larger comprehensive public schools rather than smaller programs of choice, represents only a beginning—for it is the majority, not the minority—which must be awakened.

The message is clear for those now labeled alternative educators. They, too, are "regular;" they no longer need to be defensive. The dismal record of schooling, illustrating the failure to truly excite and provide for 85 percent of the youth, clarions the call for new learning systems. Even the mass of the current successful "alternatives," though generally philosophically superior, have been timid in addressing the necessary revolution—too often focusing on immediate survival, maintaining the achieved status quo, improving parts of the program, and offering a haven for their existing students. Now the time is at hand to pioneer again, avoiding the unfortunate national "re" trap—restructuring, reforming, rethinking—and instead, turning the century through imagining, inventing, implementing—thereby creating their educational futures.

The numerous national and state proposals for "restructuring" and "reforming" education are historically obsolescent. The positive interpretation of this condition encourages guarded optimism for conceiving a significantly better future; the task ahead is to move beyond reinventing the past. The literature from the previous decades clearly reflects that the innovations currently being considered have been available throughout the 20th century; even the best ones—those that should be rapidly adopted—are merely old wine in new wineskins.

Most educational futurists believe that the heralded traditional changes being promoted—rigorous core curriculum, more homework, site-based management, outcome-based education, authentic assessment, national tests, certificates of mastery—will not make a major difference. Evidence supporting this view mounts, as the national Scholastic Aptitude Test results declined to their lowest level in ten years, despite the strong back-to-basics commitment beginning with the administration of President Reagan. Even appropriate use of advancing technology has been delayed by the caution button.

The majority of serious scholars who are studying the possible societal futures believe that the politicians and educators who have been promoting the recent flurry of blue ribbon committee reports and new legislation need to further reflect upon their hurriedly formed and generally copycat perceptions regarding the direction of education for the remaining 90s and beyond. Such an effort, it is felt, would lead to significant revisions of the existing politically popular recommendations, requirements, and codes. The available research already provides ample evidence for eliminating many of the conventions of schooling.

One approach for accomplishing this mission would instigate a review of the data, experiences, and opinions in nine major categories; (1) disturbing national images created by the calls for reshaping schools; (2) staring, forgotten, but successful past practices; (3) philosophical choices created from experiments with alternatives; (4) exciting successful design developed during prior efforts to restructure; (5) reality leadership lessons learned from those who previously tried to reform education; (6) delightful research which has long been overlooked and underutilized; (7) thoughtful change processes which have been catalogued the past several decades; (8) potentials for creating preferable educational futures beyond the limited scope of schooling toward a broad vision of learning; and (9) rewarding resources to document past innovations and to encourage "imagineering." Key components from these groupings offer continuity, if viewed as nine distinct rivers converging into one, thus providing the catalyst for discussion and debate among those who are emerging into positions of leadership for the 21st Century.

## DISTURBING IMAGES

THE AMERICA 2000 PROPOSAL for reshaping education, announced by President Bush in 1991, is but one example of the continuing dichotomies facing communities. Though the need for change is undeniable, the rhetoric merely revises traditions. The call for better, and more accountable schools, with the emphasis on higher standards in math, science, English, history, and geography, measured by new national achievement tests; has little chance enhancing education. The plan to establish academies to train teachers in five core courses, the advocacy for improving literacy, workforce readiness, and adult education; and the effort toward coordinating local, state, federal, and private child and family services are noble in intent, but, as structured, will not create significant change. Expanding choice, done correctly should have been accomplished within the public school districts long before the concept became a political football involving the private sector. The two rays of optimism—the three seven research programs, and the 535 models—are both dimmed by the focus on creating new generation of schools! If the concepts involved inventing the future toward a day when the

concept of schooling no longer existed, the current national attention on education could overcome the continuous criticism, and the multitude of reports, articles, books, and project promoting restructuring and revitalizing an airplane that should not be flying<sup>1</sup>.

The many previous change efforts in education have seemingly evolved in 30- year cycles. In the 1840s, urban schools were open 250 days. In the 1870s, the vacation schools were organized. In the 1900s, the proposals by John Dewey and Carleton Washburne and the work at the University of Chicago lab school and at Winnetka led to individualization.<sup>2</sup> In the 1930s, change struck the education scene again, with the Ohio State University Laboratory School reflecting many of the national experimental modes of that era.<sup>3</sup> In the 1960s, the Wilson Campus School at Mankato, Minnesota, State University, proved beyond doubt that the traditional curriculum and organizational patterns were no longer appropriate for all persons.<sup>4</sup> The creative designs of this latter era led to the existing alternative education models, further reflecting dissatisfaction with the established practices.<sup>5</sup>

In prior centuries, innovative learning reforms were advocated by such writers and philosophers as Froebel, Rousseau, Pestalozzi, Emerson, and Thoreau; in the recent past such as Freire, Holt, Pearce, Kohl, Kozol, Neill, Dennison, Trump, and Glines; and currently through organized efforts as portrayed by the Holistic Education Movement, the Global Alliance for Transforming Education, the school climate (CADRE) organization, and the Brain-Based Learning Network.<sup>6</sup> Related to the 30-year repetition in the change cycle, societal and educational futurists have long been projecting the mid-to-late 90s as a tremendous period of ferment, and an opportunity to not only begin to revamp the education system, but all of society.<sup>7</sup> They perceive this era as the transition period away from the industrial age lifestyles and schooling patterns toward the ultimate transformation to a significantly better world-and learning beyond schooling.<sup>8</sup> They have called for the establishment of NASA concept space centers for education—a commitment to true research and development.<sup>9</sup>

In considering the past evidence, while envisioning possible educational futures, deschooling advocates surface many questions regarding the "new" reform packages. Among them, they ask: (1) How can educators continue modifying the existing K-12 conventions, which have only tradition and minimal research to support the practices? (2) How can it be argued that restructuring current schools will make a difference, when a century of experience indicates the contrary? (3) How can Congress spend another \$535 million on "new model schools," when educators should not be modeling schooling? (4) Why should business contribute \$300 million to "beat the Japanese," when economic competition should not be the goal of learning? (5) Why should there be a need for the proposed private, for-profit national school system? and, (6) Why are there now 1.5 million youth in home schooling?

Their own responses would include the belief that there is not time to study and reject again ideas that have been proven, and that the successful innovations of the past, if quickly implemented, would then allow educational inventors to focus on developing entirely new lifelong living/learning systems. With the teenage suicide rate the highest in the world, and with the knowledge that in many communities 70 percent of all new marriages do not last five years, there is already a great social crisis that educators continue to ignore. This is further verified by the 1991 report from the National Commission on Children. It stated: "Too many children and adolescents reach adulthood unhealthy, illiterate, unemployable, and lacking moral direction and a vision of a secure future."

The disturbing images the nation now has of education are being magnified by the inability to think beyond the schoolhouse. Most forget that when compulsory education was introduced in Massachusetts, parents objected so much that the militia had to be used in 1880 to force the children of Barnstable to march to school. John Gatto, 1990 Teacher of the Year in New York City, summarized from the classroom view, the need to try startling new approaches. He stated: ". . . schools and schooling are increasingly intolerant. . . ; the institution of schooling is psychopathic—it has no conscience; . . . it is not the fault of bad teachers or too little money—but, instead the inherent design that makes it impossible to ever equate schooling with education."

## STARTLING PRACTICES

There are many startling past practices which validate the obsolescence of current restructuring proposals, while providing optimism for an eventual transformation. One of the prominent illustrations is that research favoring the graded classroom concept is scarce. The evidence available on school organization has supported non-graded/multi-aged teams and centers for decades. The Goodlad and Anderson classic, The Non-graded Elementary School, summarized the data in 1959; it was later verified in a study by Barbara Pavan.<sup>10</sup> The Mankato Wilson Campus School, in 1968, proved the latter practice by mixing pre-K through college students in the same rooms, with the same instructors and philosophy; however, with almost religious belief, school districts continued the graded pattern. Now, in another cycle, non-grading is becoming popular again. It is time to realize that multi-age groupings conform with child growth and development at all levels, and rapidly adopt the practice. Then creative people can create the step beyond non-grading for the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

A second illustration illuminates that the promotion of the junior high (Grades 7-8-9) was a mistake, especially since the underlying reason in the 1930s was to appease a housing problem. In the 60s, a group of inventors designed the middle school—a new climate for youth chronologically approximately 10-14 (traditional Grades 5-8)—knowing that achievement levels were spread from Grades 2-12.<sup>11</sup> It was to feature non-graded interdependent curriculum teams, pod-oriented facilities, individualized evaluation, daily flexible schedules, an affective domain focus, much choice and freedom, and teachers whose passions were with that age group. Some of the original middle schools (Mt. Kisco, N.Y.; Barrington, IL; Indian Hills, Beechwood, and Lima, Ohio), were headed in that direction. Unfortunately, nationally the concept became a space salvation. With declining enrollments, the 9th grade was moved back to the high school; educators debated whether to include Grades 5 and 6 or just 6 (the latter usually won); and whether to self-contain or departmentalize the 6th grade (self contained usually won). They failed to implement the planned curriculum reform.<sup>12</sup> They did, however, proceed to change the name over the door from junior high to middle, and ruined the greatest chance in fifty years to invent an entirely new happening in education. The original plans still hold promise for improving the life of long suffering 7th graders; if the 60s concepts were rapidly adopted, educators would then be free to design the replacement for the middle school beyond 2000.

A third intriguing piece of history confirms that report cards-A B C D F, and 0, G, S, N-modifications—have no place in learning. They destroy self-image, create super-egos, segregate students, and are of no value to the teaming process. In the 60s, Mankato Wilson School eliminated all grades, Carnegie units, class ranks, and other "badges of courage," students learned, behaved,

graduated, went to college, found jobs, married.<sup>13</sup> The evidence was conclusive; similar experiments from the 30s were thus reinforced. There is no need to structure report cards; instead the practice should drop in favor of Wilson-style individually tailored evaluation methods for use during the 90s, while creative people invent the future.

The list of startling practices from the past continues, for authentic assessment and the majority of the efforts in the 60s to create forms of flexibility were known as trifle flexible schedules, for in most there were five set patterns—a different, but permanent, arrangement for each day of the week. They were developed by Indiana University (Flex), M.L.T. (GASP), and Stanford, and were adopted by Marshall High in Portland, Rollwood in Chicago, Virgin Valley in Utah, University City in Missouri, Troy in Michigan, Hut South Dakota, and numerous other high schools. Educators knew then that the 50-minute mode, September to June, five days a week, scheduling process was wrong, yet most ordinary schools still subscribe to this limited teaming environment. All classes do not meet in the same size group, for the same amount of time each day, for 36 weeks. A foreign language cannot be teamed under this arrangement. Utilizing time more wisely can teaming goal toward the 21st century. In these 60s experiments to modify the rigidity of traditional scheduling, it was teamed that to be highly successful, the curriculum had to be personalized and individualized. In the best examples, students developed their own teaming patterns. The need to do so was known for decades. As early as 1914, it was stated that "individualization of instruction improves efficiency through increasing the number of children who profit, and decreasing number who fail or are adversely affected . . . the net result of individualization increased achievement of the group as a whole." One approach, "The Dalton Laboratory Plan, was summarized by Helen Parkhurst in 1921.<sup>15</sup>

**Learning from the research and these prior experiences, the Mankato** Wilson School, K12, had no required courses, offered no group-paced classes, and had no traditional graduation requirements. Football and drama were as important as science. The program was student centered. Youth selected the adults with whom to learn, selected their own advisors, designed their interest and need studies, scheduled their own time on a daily basis, participated in interdependent curriculum activities, and spent much time volunteering in the community. From 1968-1977, those who desired went to Puebla, Mexico, for two months each year to study Spanish—living with families and attending the public school, Centro Escolar. They did not miss anything, for when they returned they continued their other individualized learning experiences. The Mexican exchange youth came to Mankato for a month. Sister school international programs have been part of good education for decades; the concept is not "reform."

One key to the Wilson success was student involvement in the process; faculty members were considered friends and helpers, usually on a first name basis. Youths and adults liked their environment; they tried to come to the program even when sick. They learned to live the adopted motto: "With freedom goes responsibility"—and with those, courtesy and commitment. Most current restructuring projects involve national organizations, communities, administrators, and teachers, doing it for, rather than with, the students. How many students helped to design the Bush America 2000 plan? Implementing humane Wilson-style learning climates creates a need for year-round education. It has been unprofessional to close schools June, July, and August. Would the medical profession recommend closing the hospitals in the summer? Since 1968, year-round programs have flourished, proving how unnecessary and illogical the September to June calendar, yet most schools still perpetuate such a timeframe. Lifestyles and societal conditions demand continuous learning opportunities. Conferences are not needed on the sense of being open year-round, as the philosophy is not restructuring, but only a confirmation of an educationally sound practice that should have been adopted long ago.

## PHILOSOPHICAL RATIONALE

The many reviewed startling practices force an examination of philosophy. The great debates on choice and learning styles further validate the obsolescence of uniform school systems. One illustration confirms that the original 60s concept of alternative was "alternatives," in the plural. Each district was to offer a wide range of options open to all students within the public school sector from liberal to conservative. Had this been done on a national scale, there would be little controversy surrounding choice, private schools, business, segregation, religious issues, and vouchers. \*Alternatives" were never intended as the now commonly used notion of an "alternative school"—usually for drop-outs or "marginal" students—nor were they intended to be part of the desegregation efforts to overcome white flight from the inner cities, or magnet traditional schools recruiting students for one curriculum focus. The South east Alternatives Project in Minneapolis in the 1970s, where elementary students were in a cluster concept—a complete neighborhood choice of fundamental, continuous progress, open, and free school programs—proved the validity.

In most good open schools, students chose their own teachers and advisors based upon six factors—perception, age, sex, interest, skill, and personality—long before the learning styles workshops became popular. Few schools allow the youth to select their facilitators; in traditional secondary schools, counselors are still assigned, in spite of the evidence against such a practice. Even worse, where districts have supposedly been "innovative," and created magnet schools, they have also forced waiting lists. What a tragedy—to have a waiting list for learning. If the program is that good, it should be replicated, or the capacity increased by adopting a year-round calendar, waiting lists are indefensible in education, yet districts claiming to be "good" find them tolerable.

The early philosophy of choice recognized the affective domain as the most important factor in school success, followed by the psychomotor. The least important proved to be the cognitive, especially reading and math at the primary level. If students were in gear in the affective and psychomotor, the cognitive was not a problem, especially if the experience was introduced at the proper time—according to the research on the "teachable moment." At Mankato Wilson, some children could read at age 3; others were not in a structured reading program even at age 9. The early Greek culture acknowledged this factor, as the Athenian society focused upon physical and social maturation until age 10.<sup>16</sup> Now for many schools in America, the first priorities need to be breakfast and lunch, washers and dryers, and clean and warm clothing. The growing problems of homelessness and abused children reduce the cognitive imperative.

With personal and world economic wealth and power at the center of so many national, state, and local political education discussions, it is easy to overlook the fact that the failures in the savings and loan industry, the expensive political junkets, the construction of minimally safe cars, the polluted air and water, and the families in poverty have been problems of the affective

domain-not the cognitive reflected by lower test scores than those recorded by students in Japan. Toxic chemical dumping was orchestrated by college graduates.

Many have long recognized that the election years rhetoric for more traditional requirements and higher standards is not the answer. Over fifty years ago, in 1938, the Education Policies Commission of the National Education Association stated: "In a democracy struggling against strangulation by a myriad of urgent, real human problems, focusing on learning that the square of the sum of two numbers equals the sum of them squared plus twice the product, might be appropriate for some, but for the great majority of boys and girls, such learning is transitory, and of extremely little value."<sup>17</sup> Yet, beginning the 90s, schools re such "new" patterns, and even accepting that the delivery systems of the one-room schoolhouses were often superior to many of the traditional segmented patterns existing it 90s. They are admitting that the current technological capabilities are not yet being well utilized, for even in 1968, Mankato Wilson had six-year-olds on the computer terminal. There are elementary schools today where students receive no computer instruction, nor does the teacher integrate technology into the classroom curriculum, reinforcing the belief that there many efficient schools, a number that are effective, but only a few that are truly significant.

Possibly, this is the result of the reluctance to support, committed innovative administrators. As illustration, in 1973, a suburban Philadelphia high school principal who advocated significance was released<sup>21</sup>. He wanted to organize four optional schools-with school, with multiple small satellites in two of them. One of the negative factors cited was effort, without the support of the teacher union, to create a full-time position for an expert in technology to lead the development of a technological infusion into all the curriculum, with very latest equipment, software, teacher training, and ongoing updating. It was to be exemplary national model. Ironically, the developing 1993 Technology Master Plan for California schools advocates much of what was proposed by this principal 20 years ago. Futurist; *why educators and communities have been so reluctant to accept what has been known encouraged by societal and educational change agents for several decades.*

## EXCITING DESIGNS

In an effort to reinforce the philosophical rationale for moving from schooling to learning, and to unify these many startling practices and "re-discoveries" from the 30s, the Wilson Campus School at Mankato State University has been cited numerous times. From 1968 to 1977, it was considered as perhaps the most innovative, experimental public school in the United States.<sup>22</sup> The staff teed to create a whole from the various parts; they did everything wrong, backward, and upside down, if judged by conventional wisdom, yet the program proved beyond doubt that going far beyond traditional instructional patterns proved to be highly successful for those enrolled students. Their experiences confirmed that "if schools are to be significantly better, they must be significantly different." The impact of Wilson has been documented in a 1992 dissertation by Kathleen Long,<sup>23</sup> by over thirty master and educational specialist theses, and by both external and internal objective and subjective observations by hired educators, parents, students, and teachers-and even by results of traditional tests.

Wilson was not alone, but rather a contemporary of a number of other similar exciting research and development designs. These 60s and early 70s programs borrowed heavily from previous pioneers. (The schools of the Eight-Year Study in the 1930s contributed-the Ohio State University School being one-and from the same era, the history of the Gary, Indiana, district during the tenure of Superintendent Willard Wirt.) Wilson also borrowed from the 1900s University of Chicago Laboratory School, and the 1912 Newark, New Jersey; the 1925 Nashville, Tennessee; and the 1928 Aliquippa, Pennsylvania, year-round programs.

Reflecting upon the late 50s, early 60s, the Mankato effort adopted ideas from the nongraded elementary school programs in Milwaukee, and the non-graded high school at Melbourne, Florida. Much was adopted from Walker School, perhaps the most exciting elementary program in the United States during the early 60s, and from its companion secondary program in Tucson, Arizona--the Canyon del Oro Jr. Sr. High-where the staff co-developed the first national daily flexible scheduling process in 1963. Wilson utilized ideas from Ridgewood High School in Norridge, Illinois, and Bishop Ryan High School in Omaha, perhaps two of the top five secondary schools in the United States in the early 60s devoted to innovation, change, and experimentation. The Nova Complex in Fort Lauderdale, Florida, added to the knowledge base. Unfortunately, most of these beautiful early restructuring programs have been ignored, or are not even known, by the present reform leaders.

Surprisingly, the most dramatic statewide effort in the late 60s to change (restructure! reform 25 years ago) was in, of all places, South Dakota, where in 1966, the Kettering Foundation had ranked the state 49th nationally related to acceptance of and money spent for educational innovations. This picture was entirely changed by creating four Title 111 regions for innovation, and especially by the successes of the special focus consortium programs in such Lake Region communities as Watertown, Huron, Brookings, Sisseton, and Waubey. Their creative efforts brought visitors from throughout the country to see the Lincoln Learning Laboratory and Harmony Hill High School in Watertown; the nationally recognized individualized home economics curriculum at Brookings High School; the single location summer teacher education seminars on innovation conducted by four cooperating colleges; and the multiple other pioneering patterns adopted across the state.<sup>24</sup>

The most exciting school district design for change in the United States in the mid-sixties was in University City, Missouri.<sup>25</sup> (There an attempt was made to rapidly and significantly overhaul all K-12 schools, using curriculum reform--ITA reading, Piaget early childhood, interrelated teams, Unipacs, and the elimination of departmentalization in the secondary scheduling: Daily and modular scheduling were employed along with the revamping of all facilities (including tearing down 67 walls in 13 buildings between August-December, 1965. New resource media centers were planned in every school: The district became a national model for team teaching and schools-within-a-school, noted for its professional development center concepts and improved teacher educator relationships with Washington University of St. Louis; and research projects to document the impact of such reforms in conjunction with the federally funded regional CEMREL Educational Laboratory in St. Louis.)

Contemporary 60s/70s programs in other communities included the St. Paul Open School in Minnesota; the School of Tomorrow design in Glen Cove, New York; the Berkeley, Minneapolis, and Franklin Pierce (Tacoma) federally funded alternatives models; the Individually Prescribed Instruction (IPI) in Pittsburgh; the district wide innovations in Cherry Creek, Colorado; the modular schedule models in secondary schools, including one of the better overall efforts at Abington (Pa.) High, the K-12 locations

identified by the Kettering Foundation as "programs worth visiting"). Also of note here are the efforts to reform teacher education through the Center for Teaching and Learning at the University of North Dakota; and later, such NASSP Model Schools Project sites as Bishop Carroll High School in Calgary and Wilde Lake in Columbia, Maryland; and the open and community schools represented by such fine programs as the Jefferson County Open School in Colorado. Other fine programs included the Alternative Community School in Ithaca, New York; the Metro Alternative in Cedar Rapids, Iowa; and the multiple schools of choice in Cambridge, Massachusetts. The positive results of these different designs supported the belief systems of their founders.

During the same period, at Mankato State University, an undergraduate teacher education program was added to the Wilson Campus School. It was possible to earn a teaching certificate without taking college education classes by interning at Wilson; thus this new Studios for Educational Alternatives (SEA) gave direction to learning and teaching in an entirely different context. Attached to this effort was the first nationally accredited master degree program in Experiential Education-48 quarter hours with no requirements-a design your own do it your way-high standards graduate degree. Classroom leaders were encouraged to come facilitators and advisors, not "teachers," and to envision the potential of a transformation. The two programs were later modified, but they still existed entering the 90s.

Though most of the wonderful innovations of the earlier eras were lost during the political backlash campaigns of the late 70s and the 80s, the involved states, universities, communities, districts, and schools proved the value of immediately shifting away from conventional practices for many youth. Thirty years after these documented results, 60 years the Eight-Year Study, and 90 years after the concept of year-round education, educators politicians were calling for Plan 2000, restructuring, and reform, when the concepts, techniques, and evaluations were available decades ago. Using this information to transform educational practices now, while designing new learning systems for the future rather than pining for revising old schooling practices, holds great promise for beyond 2000.

#### REALISTIC LEADERSHIP

There are many unsung leaders who deserve recognition for these past startling practices and designs, the re-examinations of philosophy, and the valiant efforts to change African education. There are important lessons to be learned from their celebrations and appointments. To illustrate, major credit for the reforms of the 60s must go to one of the time great educators, Dr. J. Lloyd Trump. In 1960, his book, Images of the Future, cited the need for reform.<sup>26</sup> In the same year, the National Association for Secondary School Principals (NASSP) produced his film titled, And No Bells Ring, depicting how much better a school could be without bells or chimes. Thirty years later, an hourly noise still interrupts campuses. Even a strong call from their own organization could not convince secondary educators to do something as simple as turn the switch to off-not a monumental feat of structuring--but terribly significant--in that if a faculty would not consider silencing the bell, how could it be expected that change of a substantive nature would ever occur in education?

J. Lloyd Trump, from his role as Associate Secretary of NASSP during much of the 1960 to 1980 era, traveled the country-lecturing, encouraging, calling for dramatically different formats--and directing the Danforth Foundation which funded the Model Schools Project to assist principals and staffs to become agents of change. He catalogued his concepts in a landmark book, A School For Everyone--already forgotten by the majority of administrators.<sup>27</sup> This leader went far beyond calling for the "excitement" of core curriculum, rigor, homerooms and a longer school day; he focused on the learning opportunities for individual students.

Eugene Howard, one of the disciples of Dr. Trump, developed a pioneering model of many of proposals at Ridgewood High in Norridge, Illinois, and continued to cant his own message many communities long before "restructuring" became a political game involving the White House, National Governors Association, American Federation of Teachers, National School Boards Association, and most of the other advocacy organizations. Trump and Howard were not alone; numerous other visionaries joined the 60s/70s forts with their own designs. They included Ann Grooms, the educational consultant of almost every reform of the 60s/70s, and the one who wrote the original prospectus for middle school. Also included were Evelyn Carswell, principal of the famous Walker School of Tucson; Wayne Jennings, creator of the nationally recognized St. Paul Open School, leader in brain-based learning; Robert Finley, innovative superintendent at both Barrington and Glen Cove, N.Y.; Virginia Roth, principal of the Omaha non-scheduled Bishop Ryan E School; Glen Ovard, professor and designer of the first computerized daily demand schedule at Brigham Young University Laboratory School. Other dynamic leaders of note were Dwight Allen, dean of the exciting graduate school of education at the University of Massachusetts William Alexander, professor at the University of Florida, who led efforts to reform the I school and was part of the small catalyst group which invented the middle school; and Gunner Swensen, principal at Brookhurst Jr. High in Anaheim, and co-creator of daily scheduling and the Unipac development.

These pioneers were joined by Mary Anne Raywid, professor at Hofstra University spokesperson for alternatives with a plural(s) in education; Joe Nathan, educational consultant and champion of schools of choice; John Jenkins, principal of the model Wilde Lakes High School in Columbia, Maryland; David Beggs, professor at Indiana and early leader of structured flexible scheduling; Vito Perrone, dean of the exciting Center for Teaching Learning at the University of North Dakota; Arnie Langberg, leader of the open school in Jefferson County, Colorado; Leonard Solo, principal of the outstanding open school, Cambridge, Massachusetts; and Ron Barnes, education director and major designer of the famous Minnesota Experimental City--a community planned in the 70s with no schools.

This roll call of 60s/70s reformers further included the wonderful William Van Til, whose precious book, My Way of looking At Schools<sup>28</sup> clearly stated the need for educational change, historically preserved the work of the lab schools of the 30s. Then there were Robert Anderson and John Goodlad, who in 1959 in The Non-Graded Elementary School, documented need to adopt multi-age grouping patterns; James Nickerson, Kent Alm, Merlin Duncan, Brendan McDonald, four administrators who almost succeeded in overhauling an entire university of 14,000 at Mankato State; John Holt, Herbert Kohl, and Jonathan Kozol, whose work presented the insights offered by the perceived "radicals" of the 60s. Also of note were the private school educators who continued the concepts of Maria Montessori and Rudolf Steiner and Harold Gores, who directed EFL (Educational Facilities Laboratory) representing the best in school facility planning, and Jack Lown, who created the excellent Minnesota School Facilities Conferences; both helped reshape the rigid lines of structured buildings.

These cited individuals, and the many other leaders of educational change in the 60s, tried to promote significantly better practices based upon the research available to them from the innovators of the 20s and 30s; their own desire to invent better learning opportunities for youth and adults; and the potential created by the growing shifts in societal paradigms. Current politician educators continue to reinvent what has long been known. One portrayal of this *factor is the 1991* effort of the Education Commission of the States to create a national forum on the concept that "all kids can learn." That perception was already a hallmark of the 30s and 60s reforms, and one of the reasons that educational futurists have pioneered interdependent learning and an end to segmented curriculum disciplines; it is why such schools as Mankato Wilson mainstreamed special education students in the 60s. It is partially why most gifted students are bored with their classes.<sup>29</sup> Certainly late is better than never, but understanding and promoting the concept that all students can learn is another illustration of old wine in a different wineskin.

It is of interest that the new crop of restructuring advocates have failed to recognize the previous political efforts to change, even in a recent era. In 1974, Wilson Riles, State Superintendent in California, embarked upon a major plan to overhaul the California secondary schools. His blue ribbon committee included business leaders. The Report of the California Commission For Reform of Intermediate and Secondary Education (RISE Project)<sup>30</sup> stated: "the recommendations aim at transforming our education system from one that herds young people through a scholastic assembly line to one that is flexible, demanding, and humane . . . for each individual." Should the 90s "reconstructionists" continue to overlook such excellent documents because they were from a previous decade?

Those who ignore these past experiences and future visions to concentrate on defending the status quo, or a go-slow change process, cite community resistance. Present oriented advocates believe that "reshaping schooling"--as promoted by the Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development--will be accepted by the voters<sup>31</sup>. They have become convinced that by improving existing Chapter 1 programs, math curricula, textbooks, test scores, and discipline, and by lowering dropout rates and class size with increased financial support, educational problems will be solved for the near term 2000. Conversely, most societal and educational futurists promote rapid adoption of the better documented practices of the past, while volunteers within a win/win philosophy of choice, in experimental environments, invent the future. They believe educators have a responsibility to educate communities regarding the need to replace the 20th Century structure of schooling.

## DELIGHTFUL RESEARCH

The described startling practices, and the reform leaders of the past, were grounded with firm research as well as philosophical foundations. The evidence is obvious in reviewing the lessons from the previous decades, perhaps the most significant of all overlooked research in education is the Eight-Year Study<sup>31a</sup>; launched in April, 1930, when 200 educators met in Washington, D.C.; the implementation design began in the Fall, 1933-31 It involved 30 of the best high schools and 300 of the best colleges in the United States. In 1936, the first 2000 of the Eight-Year participants entered 179 colleges. Prior to the study, an evaluation was made of the students of 1930. The findings indicated that "most graduates were not competent in the use of the English language; the majority seldom read and were unable to express themselves effectively in speech or writing. The teachers, as a whole, were not well equipped for their responsibilities. The principals and teachers worked hard, but had no real measure of whether they had met the objectives, affective needs, and interests of their students." It is interesting to note that similar comments have been made by current critics of education. Will the same statements still be valid in 2050?

The participating research sites six decades ago utilized schools-within-schools; student-teacher advisor systems; student grouping on the basis of mutual interests; written reports of progress rather than traditional marking; team planning; independent study; learning how to learn; and interrelated curriculum-in science. It was difficult to recognize a course on physics or biology. There were few requirements; students spent much time in the community. In 1940, when the Eight-Year Study evaluations were completed, the results were clear: Graduates were not handicapped in their college work; major departure from traditionally required subjects did not lessen the readiness of the student; youth from the schools which deviated most from the traditional achieved distinctly higher results. The findings concluded that the strict requirement of certain subjects was no longer tenable; the assumptions of conventional college entrance criteria should be abandoned; students could be trusted with greater degrees of freedom; and the courses taken in high school had no relationship to success in college and later life. In spite of such evidence, 60 years later, few significant changes have occurred in most American high schools.

The faculty at Mankato Wilson, and the other 1960s leaders, knew they would be successful; they knew of the Eight-Year Study and the innovations of the 20s and 30s. They adopted many of the practices, and applied the concepts to the elementary level too; a number of the-most successful staff had taught in one room or small rural schools. Ironically, another Wilson High in Long Beach, CA during the 1940s had utilized some of the results-most notably a four-day week class attendance pattern; five days were not needed to "cover the book." Graduates were highly successful; the school was acclaimed as one of the best in the nation in 1947. As often happens, when principal Harry Moore retired, the incoming administration abandoned this exciting experiment. In the same district, in the 1930s, the Luther Burbank Elementary, with a grant from the Burbank Foundation, included gardening as a basic subject. Reduced time in the other "basics" did not handicap the students.

Further evidence was available for the change agents of the 1960-1975 period. In or the many studies supporting innovation, the American College Testing Service examined factors: achievement in co-curricular activities; high grades in high school; high grades in college; and high scores on the American College Tests.<sup>32</sup> The only factor useful in predicting success in later life was achievement in co-curricular activities. The same proved true for Scholastic Aptitude Tests.<sup>33</sup> In a related study, Project Talent interviewed 1000 thirty olds. The conclusions of the interviews suggested that a conventional high school education as a whole, "serves no useful purpose."<sup>33a</sup> Related to these observations is one of the amazing facets of all education histories: the Carnegie Unit, the base of high school credit for years, originated from a \$10 million Carnegie grant to investigate how to provide college professors a pension.<sup>34</sup> Institutions wanting Carnegie money had to require that enrollees had 14 credits-the outcome of accidentally discovering that students were in a class seats 120 hours each year-which was then equated as one "Carnegie Unit." Within five year; most all districts subscribed to this ritual without any educational validity. Why would educators in the 90s want to restructure such a system?

Continuing the evidence for overcoming tradition, an international study of mathematics, achievement concluded that students who began math at age eight rather than six caught quickly, and had fewer negative attitudes toward math, self, and school. The non-graded elementary, and the British Infant School, drew on the Plowden Report, which indicated that students who had part of their primary schooling in the bomb shelters in England during World War II did as well or better than students who had traditional lesson plans, books, and classrooms.<sup>35</sup> In a study of open schools versus conventional, in every area measured, the open school students did as well as the traditional.<sup>36</sup>

Additional questions regarding the value of existing practices surface from further examination of the literature. One arises from a strike of Philadelphia teachers which caused schools to close for eight weeks, while other comparable sites remained open. Those students who missed the two months did as well at the end of the year as those who had been in school. The Goodlad study, Behind Closed Doors, found that classrooms were inadequate using agreed upon principles of learning. Philip Jacob reported that there was no difference between graduates characterized as having a liberal education from liberal arts colleges, those graduating from technical colleges. In an affluent New York suburban district, schools were given 35 percent more money each year for three years; there was no difference in student achievement. Paulo Friere helped Brazilian peasant adults learn to read in 30 hours. In a related report, reading was identified as a talent, as is music; the conclusion that beginning reading should occur anywhere from ages 3 to 14, depending upon the individual.<sup>37</sup>

To again test these findings, the Mankato Wilson program refused to require reading instead permitting students, to read when they were ready-usually some time between age 10. This philosophy was supported by seven hundred reading teachers in New Mexico. From their classroom experiences, they confirmed that not all first graders should be in formal reading by interrupting the keynote speaker at their 1984 state conference with a rousing ovation when he stated that it is well known all six year olds should not be in reading, and especially from single series adopted textbook sets. Reading must be matched to the learning style the student-thus necessitating perhaps over 20 program approaches in a given school.

For those who continue to advocate "reshaping traditional schooling," it is especially important that they review historical and current research in the face of changing demographics. California presents the most striking example, where 54 percent of the school youth are minority majority representing 106 spoken languages. Limited-English-Proficient students total almost one million. The state is gaining 225,000 school-aged youth each year-the majority from lower income homes. Nationally, over 13 million youth are living in poverty; high divorce rates have compounded the problem. The continuing unacceptable dropout numbers, static low national test scores, only reinforce the claim that restructuring the existing system will not improve the conditions for most children with limited socio-economic resources. Education cannot make a major difference unless health and social services are interwoven with money provided for such programs as Chapter 1 reading and mathematics supplemental support.<sup>38</sup> Add in the increasing percentage of drug-addicted births, and the task of overhauling schooling at times does seem impossible. Futurists respond: "We must begin, the impossible; the possible is no longer working."

With the current results, thankfully, schools only teach reading, and not walking and speaking, or the cost of remedial instruction might be prohibitive; brain-compatible learning states that conventional practices do not match the patterns identified by brain research.<sup>39</sup> Further a University of Nebraska study confirmed that high school students from five Midwest states had negative attitudes regarding schooling. When asked if some teacher really knew about them, one-third responded with a strong "no", one-third with just "no," and one-third with "I think so," or "yes;" over two-thirds did not know whether a teacher truly cared. It is wonder that 300, or eighty percent of the "Eminent Personalities of the 20th Century" such as Albert Einstein, selected the phrase "loathed school," when interviewed regarding their formal education. From these limited research samplings, it is increasingly apparent educational futurists reject efforts to "restructure" existing practices.

## ENJOYABLE CHANGE

Changing learning environments can be enjoyable, simple, and successful, as evidenced by the efforts of the 60s educators to implement the reforms suggested through evaluation of prior experimental programs. One of the most delightful yet sad change stories was chronicled in the 1970 "Letter to a Teacher" by the Schoolboys of Barbiana<sup>40</sup>, where the authors concluded that "school is a war against the poor." It is a beautiful recounting of students who were failed in the structured Italian system. A priest, in very non-conventional settings, proceeded to help the schoolboys. To prove they did not major in "basket weaving," they then took the Italian state exams; all passed. Later they wrote to the education officials and asked: "Why could you not help us learn? Why did you fail us? Why did we have to be helped by a priest instead of teachers?" Why, knowing the experiences of these youth, do communities continue to find acceptable the number of current students who dropout and learn to loathe school?

Will truly innovative educators ever be allowed to develop an entire system- to create from scratch-or will the 1903 observation of William James prove to be correct: "The institutionalizing on a large scale of any natural combination of need and motive always tends to run into technicality and to develop a tyrannical machine with unforeseen powers of exclusion and corruption"<sup>41</sup> On paper, overcoming such an obstacle does not present a major problem, for over the decades numerous publications have clearly established principles for processing education reforms. The task now is to again turn theory into reality. There are important lessons from the perceived "failures" of earlier restructuring efforts.

In 1965, in Change Process in the Public Schools, Everett Rogers of Michigan State noted that innovative principals are "in tune with a different drummer; they march to a different beat." Arthur Blumberg, professor at Syracuse, confirmed this difference in a study of the personalities and styles of principals. Such findings had been suggested by the Eight-Year Study and related research from the 30s. During the 60s era, the "Designing Education for the Future" series delineated the approaches; Volume III focused on Planning and Effecting Needed Changes in Education. William Van Til reported the process through experiences of youth who were not excited about existing educational structures; he stated, "school was a place where you gave them back the facts they told you. School had nothing to do with living, thinking, feeling."<sup>42</sup> Ironically, some of the most successful experimental schools, such as Mankato Wilson, were the products of mandated, top-down voluntary change-sometimes a necessary step in the creation of systems designed to address

the deficiencies of tradition. It cannot always be achieved by grass roots efforts; a cooperative involvement combination can be the best blend.

Many such findings have provided major contributions toward understanding and enjoying the processes of change, and methods for evaluating degrees of success. \* Matthew Miles, Columbia University; Egon Guba, Indiana University; Daniel Stufflebeam and Verne Cunningham, Ohio State University; Warren Bennis, Cincinnati University; and Gordon Lippitt, Michigan University, are among those who have written outstanding articles and books. Don Glines, in the NASSP Bulletin, reviewed "Why Innovative Schools Do Not Remain Innovative."<sup>43</sup> In The Predictable Failure of Educational Reform, Seymour Sarason clarified the ineffectiveness of restructuring by identifying the unwillingness to focus on children rather than subject matter, and the inability to alter power relationships in most schools.<sup>44</sup> He suggested that people learn-they are not taught-and that most children already possess higher order critical thinking skills entering schooling. Robert Everhart analyzed the effect of choice in a community from the viewpoint of an ethnographer.<sup>45</sup> A summary of the barriers inherent in promoting new directions is found in Contributing to Educational Change, edited by Phillip Jackson of the University of Chicago, including explanation, speculation, and documentation as to why parents, communities, universities, administrators, unions, and teachers have been so reluctant to change, or to sustain the innovation once a program has been established.<sup>46</sup>

From the literature and from the experiences of the 60s, it is clear that if educational communities possessed a win/win philosophy, change would be much easier. Illustrating from year-round education, if 51 percent voted for the September to June calendar, and 49 percent voted for year-round, that would be beautiful. Both would be offered. There would be voluntary choice, options, alternatives within the district, community, or state. But education has followed a win lose policy of uniformity and mandates for all programs. In this case, 51 percent voted for a nine month calendar, therefore, everyone had to follow the "majority" who know best! This partially explains why voucher issues and proposals for schools of choice have surfaced on the agendas for education. Fortunately, Minnesota is providing leadership in the new legislation, but even there it is too limited, as parents still face lotteries for enrollment in some magnet programs. Change process students suggest that these debates need not reach conflict, if decisions are made by judgment-by dialogic agreement whereby change is incorporated into human understanding. Avoiding decisions by consensus or vote can assist in creating positive climates for learning. Programs such as the Center for Conflict Analysis and Resolution at George Mason University are seeking to help improve the process.

People already know how to change if there is support; additional money is desirable, but it is not essential or even the primary concern. Most of the truly innovative schools of the 60s operated on the same per pupil cost as the traditional. More important is a clear statement of philosophy: "We are going to begin the transition away from schooling for those who are ready because"-followed by utilization of the documented success methods, and a commitment to risk and unlearn. Mankato Wilson was funded at the district per pupil ratio. Parents and students were given the option of transferring to a traditional school, or becoming part of essential experimental research. If daring must be the next step, rather than tray formation, then it can occur now, given commitment.<sup>47</sup> For those who believe they need (cookbook recipe, an overflow of guides have recently been published.<sup>48</sup>

The many existing restructuring projects are well-intentioned efforts. However, they not enough. As illustration, the Coalition for Essential Schools offers that one of their nine tenets is to "teach" students-rather than help them learn--and that academic rigor is achieved by limiting the curriculum. This narrowness would suggest, given past history, the Ted Sizer-led network has little chance of long term success on a national level. However, the Coalition, and The Next Century Schools Fund, provided by the RJR Nabisco Corporation, the California SB 1274 legislation to create "model" restructuring programs in the state; The Blandin Foundation sponsored Center for Educational Reform at the University of Minnesota, the support for innovative projects by the W. P. Kellogg, Ford, and Danforth Foundations; the Washington Schools for the 21st Century Project; the St. Paul Saturn School and similar p programs in other districts; Project 2061 for the Advancement of Science; the Chrysler We Work Program; the Holmes Group and Carnegie Foundation plans for teacher education and the many additional illustrations, also had made contributions. They can provide optimism for overcoming obsolescence.

The sparks from their efforts are beginning to create brush fires, which, as societal conditions continue to erupt, could burst into bonfires of reform and eventual transformation. It could lead to a period of major transitions from 1995-2005. Unfortunately, for now, it appears closer to the efforts to produce a newly designed car model. The individual part may be improvements, but until the engine, chassis, fenders, wheels, and suspensions come together as one on the assembly line, the new version remains a form on the blueprint. Meanwhile, the separate pieces do not make the existing autos much better.

In comparison with education restructuring proposals, like the unfinished car or a remodeled older car, the same school remains in a slightly modified version. The current 21st Century visions are too limited in scope; they continue to focus on school. Even the quantity is suspect. As one illustration, California has over 7300 public schools. 1500 applied for restructuring grants. Only 200 received planning funds; what will be the fate of the other 7100, and the 80 new ones being built each year? The lessons on innovative signs are there to be learned by those who are committed to inventing learning delivery systems. There is no need to re-discover the planning, implementation, and evaluation processes.

## PREFERABLE FUTURES

Mickey Morse and Donald. Duck are known to millions of students, parents and educators. They can continue to represent the past industrial age. However, perhaps the most delightful of all Disney characters, Figment-a precious purple dragon-represents the hope for the future. Serving as the guide, with his friend Dreamfinder, at the Epcot Center "Journey Into Imagination", Figment reminds all that the ability to learn to unlock the imagination creates an exciting supportive world. Enjoyment of the present, and preferable futures-just survival-are within the grasp of humankind.

Negative critics, reviewing the 20s/30s and 60s/70s, either say the innovations did work, or that they are past history-that the programs, processes, and people are not relevant for the 90s and beyond. Those "leaders" do not understand that the existing structures the same as they were in those "old days." Secondary schools still have period 1-2-3 schedules, ABC report cans, and required English, history, math, and science-and football tea and cheerleaders. The only thing that has changed is the addition of some technology,

students with drugs rather than gum. Elementary schools have self-contained classrooms, grades 4-5-6, and reading for all first graders. The reforms of those earlier eras worked where they were understood philosophically, the implementation methods were appropriate and the research and evaluation supported the revisions. The blotched rejections occur when change was tried without a sound philosophical commitment, improper implementation techniques, and plans to address the expected political backlash. Shining failures are reflected in the demise of such appropriate considerations as flexible scheduling, open I classrooms, and team teaching.

Much of the blame for the current imagined or real illness of education has been predicated on the perceived damage caused by prior innovations and innovators-progressives, open education, alternatives, free-schoolers, and radicals. However, the irony of this perception that perhaps only one percent of the schools nationally tried the major reforms of the 60s. A prime illustration is the district of Mankato, Minnesota, where the Wilson School became a national "far-out" model, but the other K-12 sites remained basically conventional. One program, out of 13 is not a viable excuse for the supposed "downturn" in education. If there has been one, it has more likely been created by continuation of traditional patterns in the face of changing conditions. Educators have easily overlooked the fact that the many promising practices as illustrated by the list of 69 changes implemented at Mankato Wilson, were never give chance as a total program in the remaining schools. Unfortunately, Minnesota closed the laboratory schools in the state colleges as a way of expanding facilities without money for college buildings. Thus, the nine-year history of the Mankato experiment can only be used as a son for the future.

Innovators of the 60s now see the Wilson Campus School model as an obsolete blue for the 21st century. However, when described in workshops to most current educators, concepts and programs are still considered 'wildly radical.' Statements are made by those who learn of it that "our teachers and parents would never accept such extremes in the 90s." Yet Wilson was borrowed from the 20s/30s, and from the one room country schoolhouses. It would appear from these past experiences that if schooling is ultimately to be eliminated, and replaced by a learning philosophy, Buckminster Fuller outlined in the Critical Path the process which must be followed. He began: "We are at the dawning of a golden age maybe."<sup>49</sup> His explanation communicated that the golden age would only arrive if people, as individuals, were willing to change their lifestyles, their priorities, their values, and their institutions. He could not envision a golden era if schooling remained a central focus of society.

In a more radical manner, two decades earlier, neither could Ivan Illich.<sup>50</sup> It has been the societal futurists, not educators, who have been leading the effort to transform, not restructure or reshape education. Willis Harman, in An Incomplete Guide to the Future, noted such a need, as has Robert Theobald in Rapids of Change, and the exciting 1992 publication, Turning the Century. Harold Shane, a longtime leader in school curriculum, in Educating fore a New Millennium, called for new forms, as did the contributors to No Limits to Learning: Bridging the Human Gag. Joel Barker reinforced the concept through a videotape series on paradigm shifts. Michael Marien, editor of Future Survey, has for twenty years charted the recommendations of the many advocates to design 21st century learning, not reinvent 20th century education. Earl Joseph, President of Anticipatory Sciences in St. Paul, has long outlined for educators the coming impact of smart machines on future learning systems, and the technological approaches that must be interwoven with the human aspects, self-esteem, and synergetic learning.<sup>51</sup> The World Future Society in Bethesda, Maryland, has a bookstore full of these and the many other exciting publications referencing orientations toward the possible global futures.

In the literature related to learning, multiple varieties of ideas continue to be suggested, ranging from hazy visions to very specific proposals. Some are small jumps, as used in the automobile industry, where the new model is on the drawing board ten years in advance, and is produced and tested five years before it is presented to the public. Others follow the quantum leap format used by NASA, where only selected individuals working as teams pioneer radical departures by flying' an experimental rocket, rather than reinventing the single engine flying machine. Regardless of the extent of the plan, most all educational futurists advocate transforming from schooling to learning-to moving away from "growing up absurd," as Paul Goodman wrote thirty years ago, in a system that confines students to sit all day with the same age in the same or similar cells. .

Futurists believe that tradition can be overcome by imagining new designs. One of the best yet, the Minnesota Experimental City (MXC), serves as illustration of the planning for transforming to learning. Created during the 1970-1973 era, it was envisioned for a cross section population of 250,000 people; partly covered with a geodesic dome; no automobiles in the city; people movers; waterless toilets; village living centers; extensive shared open land; and the most advanced technological equipment. More important, it was to be a community with no schools. The city was to be the life-long living/loaming laboratory. As, portrayed by Ron Barnes and his educational design team, the MXC learning system would serve everyone, from birth to death. He described its basics in the Phi Delta Kappa Fastback #3 in 1972-20 years ago<sup>52</sup>.

The MXC education-blueprint had as an entry focal point the DOR- disorientation, orientation, reorientation-Center. In creating change, the process included the need to be disoriented before being oriented-to unlearn the old before learning the new. The LORAN computer network was planned to immediately access and match resources, both human and material. As part of the learning system, family life centers would focus on human services and information meetings; stimulus studios would provide a constantly changing array to extend learning perceptions; gaming studios would stimulate and design opportunities; project studios would offer work or life experiences; and community facilities utilization would enhance the concept that learning was a part of the culture, not separated from normal living, nor confined to special places or hours at a particular time in life. Much learning would occur at home and in the businesses, offices, and natural environments. It was, and still is, an exciting, potentially realistic proposal for the years ahead. It is not at all a "pipedream" in the 90s; the basic concepts can be adapted by current experimental project schools and learning centers, and eventually by newly constructed communities. For simpler examples of creative ideas that can be adopted, "Reinventing the Children's Room" in the September, 1991, Futurist describes the possibilities for the matrix, weather, interactive, intelligent, rainy-day, and toy rooms. Such imagining can continue to create new directions.

There are, individuals and groups ready to enroll in visions; the same as people commit to being astronauts. For those citizens and districts not yet ready to volunteer for a modified MXC environment, the beyond restructuring view can be the adoption of many of the formats from the research of the 30s and 60s, enhanced by the most recent knowledge and equipment from the current decade. The practitioners of the past will soon not be appropriate for the longer range future, for the immediate they hold answers to the necessary transitions during the remainder of the 90s. The task beyond for educators is to truly "imagineer"-imagine, invent, and

implement-teaming opportunities that are not yet available-or not even envisioned. "Imagineering" is the key for a society that must change all its institutions, not just schools. Willie Wonka, in the movie "The Chocolate Factory", said it best: "We must create dreams out of realities, and realities out of dreams, for we are the dreamers of the dreams"-for the learning future of America.

#### REWARDING REFERENCES

The histories, illustrations, research, statistics, ideas, visions related to "Restructuring Educational Futures" are well documented. There is fascinating information to support the need to eliminate such words as alternatives, restructuring, reform, and choice, and the efforts to invent the past. There are even more exciting possibilities advocated by societal future. The rewarding references selected are far from inclusive. There are literally hundred studies, books, articles, tapes, and printed speeches available to assist educators to move through the remaining 90s, as a period of transition, leading toward a learning transformation early in the next century.

1. Jennings, Wayne and Nathan, Joe, "Startling/Disturbing Research on School Program Effectiveness," Phi Delta Kappan, March, 1977; Conley, David, Restructuring Schools: Educators Adapt to a Changing World, Trends and Issues #6, ERIC Clearinghouse, University of Oregon, 1991; "Restructuring Schools: What's Really Happening," Educational Leadership, (entire volume) Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, May, 1991; Lewis, Anne, Restructuring America's Schools, American Association of School Administrators, Arlington, VA, 1989; Today's Children, Tomorrow's Survival: A Call to Restructure Schools, National Association of State Boards of Education, Alexandria, VA, 1990.
2. Dewey, John, The School and Society, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1900; Washburne, Carleton "A Program of Individualization," 24th annuals of the National Society for the Study of Education, Public School Publishing, Bloomington, IL, 1925.
- 3 Willis, Margaret, Guinea Pigs 20 Years Later, Ohio State University Press, Columbus, OH, 1961.
- 4 Glines, Don, Educational Futures III: Change and Reality, Anvil Press, Millville, 1978 one of a series of five volumes, Educational Futures, I-V, 1978-1980.
- 5 Raywid, Mary Anne, The Case for Public Schools of Choice, Phi Delta Kappa, Bloomington, IN, 1989; Nathan, Joe, Public Schools by Choice, Institute for Teaching and Learning, St. Paul, 1989.
- 6 Miller, Ron, What Are Schools For, Holistic Education Press, Brandon, VT, 1997.
- 7 Coates, Joseph and Jarratt, Jennifer, What Futurists Believe, World Future Society, Bethesda, MD, 1989; Theobald, Robert, Rapids of Change, Knowledge System Inc., Indianapolis, IN, 1987, and Turning the Century, Northwest Regional Facilitators, Spokane, WA, 1992; Brown, Lester, The State of the World, Worldwatch Institute, Washington, DC, 1991.
- 8 Banathy, Bela. Systems Design of Education: A Journey to Create the Future, Educational Technology Publications, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1991; Fox, Matthew, Creation, Spirituality; Harper, San Francisco, 1991.
- 9 Glines, Don, "Can Schools of Today Survive Very Far Into the 21st Century," NASSP Bulletin, February, 1989.
- 10 Goodlad, John and Anderson, Robert, The Non-Graded Elementary School, Revised edition, Teachers College Press, New York, 1987, and Pavan, Barbara, "Analysis of Research on Nongraded Schools" Elementary School Journal, March, 19.
- 11 Williams, Emmett, The Emergent Middle School, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York, 1967; Alexander, William, Innovations in Secondary Education, and The Exemplary Middle School, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York, 1970, 1981.
- 12 Beane, James, A Middle School Curriculum: From Rhetoric to Reality, National Middle Schools Association, Columbus, OH, 1990.
- 13 Glines, Don, "Implementing a Humane School," Educational Leadership, November, 1970.
- 14 National Society for the Study of Education, Adopting the Schools to Individual Differences, 24th annual yearbook, Public School Publishing, Bloomington, IL, 1921.
- 15 Helen Parkhurst, Education on the Dalton Plan, New York, Dutton, 1922.
- 16 Monroe, Paul, Source Book on the History of Education for the Greek and Roman Period, The Macmillan Co., New York, 1901.
- 17 Educational Policies Commission, The Purpose of Education in an American Democracy, National Education Association, Washington, DC, 1938.
- 18 Rapp, Doris, The Impossible Child, and Is That Your Child, Practical Allergy Research Foundation, Buffalo, NY, 1986, 1991.
- 19 Clarke, Harrison and Clarke, David, Application of Measurement to Physical-Education, 6th edition, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1987.
- 20 Glines, Don and Bingle, James, National Association for Year-Round Education: Historical Perspective, National Association for Year-Round Education, San Diego, CA.
- 21 Tucker, Judy, "Futuristic Principal Seeks Humane Ideas," The Evening Bulletin, Philadelphia, September 14, 1973.
- 22 Morton, John, "Nothing is Too Far Out to Be Tried in the Wilson School," The National Observer, July 28, 1969, and Glines Educational Futures III, op, cit.
- 23 Long, Kathleen, Teacher Reflections on School Restructuring: A Study of Alternatives in Public Education, unpublished doctoral dissertation, College of Education, University of Oregon, 1992.
- 24 O'Taole, Kathy, "Old Methods; Old Taboos Vanish," Watertown Public Opinion (SD), March 4, 1968.
- 25 Glines, Don, "Changing a School," Phi Delta Kappan, December, 1966.
- 26 Trump, J. Lloyd, Images of the Future, and Guide to Better School, Rand McNally, Chicago, 1960, 1961.
- 27 Trump, J. Lloyd, A School for Everyone, National Association for Secondary School Principals, Reston, VA, 1977.
- 28 Van Til, William, My Way of looking at Schools, Lake Lurie Press, Terre Haute, IN, 1983

- 29 Slavin, Robert, 'Are Cooperative Learning and Untracking Harmful to the Gifted,' Educational Leadership, March, 1991, and National Society for the Study of Education On the Education of Gifted Children, 23rd annual yearbook, Public School Publishing, Bloomington, IL, 1924.
- 30 The RISE Report, California Department of Education, Sacramento, CA, 1975.
- 31 Breaking the Mold: Reshaping Schooling," San Francisco Conference, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Alexandria, VA, 1991
- 31a Aikin, Wilford, Story of the Eight-Year Shy, Harper and Brothers, New York, 1942.
- 32 Hoyt, D. P., Relationship Between College Grades and Adult Achievement: A Review of the literature, ACT Report No. 7, American College Testing Service, Iowa City, IA, 1965.
- 33 Wallach, Michael, "Psychology of Talent and Graduate Education" presented for Graduate Record Examinations Board conference, Montreal, 1972.
- 33a "Project Talent," The School Administrator, American Association of School Administrators, Arlington, VA, February, 1976
- 34 Tompkins, Ellsworth and Gaumnitz, Walter, Carnegie Unit: Its Origin, Status, and Trends, Education and Welfare Bulletin No. 7, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC, 1954.
- 35 Husen, Torsten, International Study of Achievement in Mathematics, Vol. 2, Almquist and Wilsells, Uppsala, Sweden, 1967.
- 36 Central Advisory Council for Education, Children and Their Primary Schools, Her Majesty's Stationery Office, London, 1967; Weber, Lillian, English Infant School and Informal Learning, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1971. Horowitz, Robert, Psychological Effects of Open Classroom Teaching and Review of Research, University of North Dakota Press, Grand Forks, 1976.
- 37 Lytle, James, "The Effects of a Teacher Strike on Student Achievement," Phi Delta Kappan, December, 1973; Goodlad, John Behind The Classroom Door, Wadsworth, Belmont, CA, 1970; Jacob, Philip, Changing Values in College, Harper and Brothers, New York, 1957; Martin, John, et al, Free to Learn, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1972; Brown, Cynthia, Literacy in 30 Hours, Expression Printers, Ltd., London, 1975; Postman, Neil, "The Politics of Reading," Harvard Educational Review, May, 1970.
- 38 Knapp, Michael and Shields, Patrick, eds., Better Schooling for the Children of Poverty : Affirmatives is Conventional Wisdom, National Society for the Study of Education, University of Chicago Press, 1991; Griffith, Jeanne, et al, American Education: The Challenge of Change, Bulletin 4, Population Reference Bureau, Washington D.C., 1989; and Seashore, Karen and Miles, Matthew, Improving the Urban High School.
- 39 School: What Works and Why, Teachers College Press, New York, 1990; Hart, Leslie, Human Brain. Human Learning, Longview Press, New York, 1983; Caine, Renate and Geoffrey Making Connections: Teaching and the Human Brain, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Alexandria, VA, 1991.
- 40 Schoolboys of Barbiana, Letter to Teacher, Random House, New York, 1970 .
- 41 Cheney, Lynne, ed., Tyrannical Machines, National Endowment for the Humanities, Washington, DC, 1990.
- 42 Rogers, Everett, et al, Change in the Public Schools, Center for Advanced Study of Educational Administration, University of Oregon, Eugene, 1965; Blumbe Arthur The Effective Principal: Perks on School Leaders Longwood and Bacon, Rockleigh, NJ, 1980; Morphet, Edgar and Ryan, Charles, eds. Planning and Effecting Needed Changes in Education, Designing Education for the Future: An Eight State Project, Denver, CO, 1967; and Van Til, op. cit.
- 43 Glines, Don, "Why Innovative Schools Do Not Remain Innovative," NASSP Bulletin, February, 1973.
- 44 Sarason, Seymour, The Predictable Failure of -Educational Reform, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, 1990.
- 45 Everhart, Robert, Practical Ideology and Symbolic Community: An Ethnographic Studies of Schools of Choice, The Falmer Press, Philadelphia, 1988.
- 46 Jackson, Phillip, ed. Contributing to Educational Chance, McCutchan, Berkeley, CA, 1988.
- 47 Fadiman, Dorothy "Why Do These Kids Love School," videotape, Concentric Media, Menlo Park, CA, 1990; Glines; Don and Long, Kathleen "Transitioning Toward Educational Futures," Phi Deb. Kappan, 1991.
- 48 Hansen, John and Liffin, Elaine, School Restructuring: A Practitioners Guide, Aterspun Publishing, Swampscott, MA, 1991.
- 49 Fuller, Buckminster, Critical Paths, St. Martins Press, New York, 1981.
- 50 (Ilich, (van, Deschooling Society, New York, Harper & Row, 1971.
- 51 Harman, Willis, An Incomplete Guide to the Future, W. W. Norton, New York, 1988; Theobald, op. cit.; Shane, Harold Educating for a New Millennium, Phi Delta Kappan, Bloomington, IN, 1981; Botkin, James, ed. No limits to Learning: Bridging the Future, Pergamon Press, Elmsford, NY, 1979; Barker, Joel Discovering the Future, Charter House Learning Corporation, Burnsville, MN, 1990; Marten, Mice, Future Survey, World Future Society, Bethesda, MD, Monthly, 1991; Barnes, Ronald, Learning Systems for the Future, Phi Delta Kappa (Fastback #3), Bloomington, 1972; Jules, Jacques The Technological Bluff, William Eerdman's, Grand Rapids, MI. 1990; Norris, Neal, ed. Community College Futures. NewForum Press, Stillwater, OK, 1989; and, California Task Force Toward a State of Esteem, Department of Education, Sacramento, CA, 1990.
- 52 Barnes, op. cit,

**Don Glines is currently director of Educational Futures Projects, a consultant for the California Department of Education, both in Sacramento. He was the director of the Wilson Campus School, Mankato State University, Minnesota.**

**Epilogue CREATING EDUCATIONAL FUTURES needs continuation. Other experiences should be described, not only as past and present practices, but as insight for future potential. Especially needed is documentation of the smaller, public and private, alternative community schools and programs. Further startling/disturbing/delightful research must be gathered; there is so much more than what has been present It is essential for not only convincing the establishment of the need new directions, but for placing the future of alternatives on a sound sis.**

**Before the historians are no longer available, the programs of 1930s through the 1970s should be preserved. As illustration, the National School Boards Association document, Alternative Schools, an important milestone, has already been forgotten by most advocates of educational alternatives. Such records can help launch the efforts the 21st Century and a society that has witnessed the transition of schooling toward the transformation to life-long living/learning pursuit offered not through alternative schools, but through the concept of famous "57 varieties"- denoting the plural choices of learning alternatives for everyone during the coming period characterized by Robert Theobald and Ronald Barnes as potentially "the era of community."<sup>7, 52</sup>**