

CHAPTER TWENTY-THREE

OFF-CAMPUS SERVICES

The circuit riders of our day are the college teachers who leave the facilities and comforts of campus and home to brave the hazards of the modern highway, carrying the religion of education to every nook and corner of their expanded bailiwick.

Off-campus instruction is no novelty in our generation. Cambridge University, England, was a pioneer in this type of service, prompted by the desire to extend education to workers. This was undertaken first in 1867. On our own side of the Atlantic, at the University of Wisconsin, imbued with the "Wisconsin idea" that a state university should provide services for the whole state, the moving force was the urgent desire of Wisconsin farmers for vocational instruction. The University moved to meet this need in 1885.¹ At the University of Michigan off-campus lectures were held on Friday and Saturday evenings by members of the faculty given in response to public demand, probably as early as 1857. At the Michigan Agricultural College an extension division was organized in 1908 in response to the need of farmers.

For the teachers colleges, the need of teachers-in-service sparked the movement. Among the Normal Schools in Michigan the first to offer extension classes was Northern, at Marquette, in 1904. The report of the Principal to the State Board said:

In the spring of the present year, the normal school introduced a system of extension classes which has been quite successful. By this system, teachers who have taught at least six years successfully may avail themselves of work done in these classes under one of the professors of the normal school and gain full credit for the work done.

In the following year the Board accepted the recommendation of Principal Waldo, of the Western Michigan Normal at Kalamazoo, "that the policy of normal school extension now in operation at Marquette be made operative at the Western State Normal School under the same safeguards as prevail at the Northern Normal." With the Board's approval, Western thereupon developed a program leading to the Life Certificate that was based on a combination of residence and extension credit. The reasoning behind this move was explained by Waldo:

Many of the older teachers having, through various causes, been deprived of professional training, it seemed desirable that the normal should make an effort to reach and benefit this class.

The program was made available only to those who (1) were high school graduates, and (2) had taught at least six years. These could earn the certificate by completing work under the direction of the Western State Normal School faculty as follows: (1) three summer terms in residence; (2) two years of non-residence work, either "class work at some center within range of the school, so that an instructor can meet the students once a week," or "carefully organized courses taken by correspondence."²

This program proved to be very successful, and in 1921 the State Board provided for an "Extension Life Certificate" to be granted by all four of the state teachers colleges and Detroit Teachers College, under the following conditions:

- (1) Applicants must be high school graduates and must have had *ten* years of successful teaching experience.
- (2) Completion of three summer terms in residence, and two years of non-residence work-class or correspondence.

In the following year, however, serious questioning of the quality of the extension work led to a State Board resolution putting an end to all registration for the Extension Life Certificate.

The Normal College at Ypsilanti was cautious, perhaps overly so, about adopting an extension program. In 1904, under President Jones, it was announced that the College stood ready, insofar as their regular work permitted, to offer services of its faculty as lecturers. The announcement read:

The State Normal College hopes in the future to be helpful in developing and improving the educational work in city, village and rural communities by allowing its faculty members to give single lectures or courses of lectures at educational and social meetings.³

The cost to the community would be railroad fare and hotel accommodations, and it was noted that the most convenient dates were “of course, Friday evenings and Saturdays.” A list of available lectures and lecturers was appended. Included were such names as Laird, Hoyt, Barbour, D’Ooge, Ford, Strong, Lyman, Jefferson, and even President Jones.

With the arrival of President McKenny in 1912, the first extension course was offered in response to a request from the teachers of Bay City. Four years later, McKenny went to the Board with a request for a special appropriation. He said:

One of the latest educational movements is extension work for teachers already in service . . . The work is growing by leaps and bounds. The expense of this extension work cannot well be met out of current expense and should be provided for by special appropriation.

The Legislature did not honor his request, nor did they two years later when he repeated it, nor have they, to this day (1968), accepted financial responsibility for this work. The extension program is still operated on the basis of being self-supporting; the faculty who participate do so on their own time, in addition to the regular on-campus teaching load. The result has not been a refusal of faculty to participate, but a minimal compensation to them.

It was not until 1921 that a separate extension department, headed by Horace Z. Wilber, was organized. Under Wilber’s guiding hand in the next fifteen years, it could be said that classes were being offered from Cheboygan to Monroe and from Traverse City to Port Huron—that is, over the entire Lower Peninsula of Michigan. At the same time correspondence courses found enrollees in 63 of the 82 counties of the State, and in 25 states and 4 foreign countries.⁴

The justification for this outward flow of courses and instructors from the Normal campus was stated and re-stated from time to time. The trend was toward ever more courses, more services, and the involvement of more instructors. The time came when, to conserve energy and avoid conflict and duplication, the State Board found it advisable to limit the geographical area served by each of the four

colleges and to assign to each an exclusive territory. The Normal was given fourteen counties in Southeastern Michigan.⁵ The time came also when the State Board found it advisable to remind the colleges that extension work existed primarily for in-service teachers.

A chronological review of formal statements of purpose will be instructive.

In 1904, as we have seen, the intent was simply the improvement in quality of teaching in rural, town, and city schools. McKenny, who encouraged at first a desultory sort of program, in asking the State Board for financial assistance in 1916, said "Not only is it necessary to train teachers for their profession, but it is necessary to keep them growing after they enter the profession.

The announcement of the new Extension Department (1921) said that it stood ready to serve "all teachers of the State and others interested in educational work." In 1923, Wilber explained its function thus:

Our teacher training institutions have been founded on the assumption that the atmosphere in which one receives his training is a matter of importance. Efforts are made to surround the prospective teacher with all the influence essential to the make-up of a successful school. This would seem to indicate that instruction given to the teacher while engaged in her work, and in the midst of the usual school surroundings, has a value all its own . . . The teacher who receives instruction while engaged in teaching and who evaluates that instruction from the standpoint of her daily experience will gain more than is possible in other ways.⁶

Enthusiasm led quickly to a broader concept of the department's function. Suggested in the phrase contained in the original announcement as to the scope of its service, "and others interested in educational work," it became more explicit in 1924 with the published statement that the department would serve not only teachers in service but "others who wish college training but who feel they cannot spend the full time in residence . . . No young man or woman with ambition and a willingness to work need be without many of the advantages which come with a college education."

With time, programs grew and types of service multiplied. Wilber retired in 1944 and, after a short interval under an acting director (Professor Loesell), Carl Hood was appointed. The name of the department was changed to "Division of Field Services." The appeal

to all who would seek a college education was dropped, but in its place came a newer movement called “adult education.” The announcement now read as follows:

Those interested in field services include not only in-service teachers but people interested in placement of teachers, adult education groups and agencies seeking speakers and consultants.

In 1952, with Carl Anderson in charge, and in light of a growing discussion of the true function of extension work, a renewal of emphasis on service to teachers was evident. Anderson said:

All of the activities of the Division are predicated on the philosophy that our primary responsibility is the improvement of teachers in the field, so that the interests and welfare of the children of Michigan may be served to the greatest possible degree.⁷

In June, 1953, the discussion in the State Board as to the true function of field services came to a head with the adoption of a detailed recommendation from the Council of Presidents of the four teachers colleges. Its statement of objectives read:

The Michigan Colleges of Education were established primarily for the education of teachers so that the interests and welfare of the children of Michigan may be served to the greatest possible degree. Because the campus of any college extends over the entire area served by that college, it becomes the responsibility of the Field Service Divisions in the four colleges of education in Michigan to make available those services listed in the areas designated.

The “services” were then indicated as follows: “the preparation and improvement of teachers, emphasizing the area of their in-service training;” “experimental and research projects relating to the needs of the field;” “adult education programs in cooperation with public school directors of adult education, deans of community organizations;” “to encourage improved alumni relations and recruitment of qualified prospective teachers.”

This resolution, with its strong emphasis on service to the teaching profession, yet left the door open for the rendering of services of non-professional import by the inclusion of adult education and the improvement of alumni relations.

Standards

In a discussion of purposes one naturally raises the question: what quality of work has gone into the program? With what standards did Normal undertake extension work and how were they affected by the multiplication of demands both in number and variety and the increasing severity of competition for students among the colleges? What value, as compared with on-campus courses, was given to credits earned in Extension? What protection was afforded against the possibility that students might enroll in more work than one engaged in the full-time job of teaching could satisfactorily undertake?

During the early years of extension work the State Board laid down the restriction that not more than one-fourth of the credit hours leading to a degree could be taken in off-campus classes or by correspondence. To enroll, one must be a high school graduate. A student in residence at the college could not enroll. And no one could enroll in more than two courses at one time.

By 1922, at about the time that Normal organized an Extension Department, considerable discussion had arisen as to the quality of work being done, and the State Board felt obliged to take action. The following resolution was adopted:

The best interests of the schools of Michigan require that all work done under the direction of the state normal schools shall be of a character that will be accepted without question by the University of Michigan and the other leading universities of the country. This fact is of special importance as affecting the character of the extension work carried on by the normal schools.

This was followed by a series of regulations which in their content and wording reveal the problems that had developed:

- (a) After June 30, 1922, extension class courses shall conform to the same requirements, both as regards subject matter and recitation hours, as residence courses.
- (b) Correspondence courses shall be equivalent in subject matter and work required by corresponding courses given in residence.
- (c) After June 20, 1922, no more registrations for the Extension Life Certificate shall be accepted.
- (d) Only members of the faculties of the various normal schools shall be permitted to give extension courses for credit.

In 1941, the question of residence credit for off-campus courses became pressing. The State Board met the issue in a series of resolutions which stipulated that, to qualify for residence credit (i.e., credit of the same value towards graduation as that given for courses taken on the campus), the following requirements must be met: (a) the course must require unique facilities inherent in the community and not available on the campus; (b) instructors must organize their courses so as to make use of these unique facilities; (c) the course must meet requirements as to prerequisites and time allotment for class sessions, and library facilities must be comparable to campus requirements. The Board also provided for the establishing of residence branch centers but stipulated that each one must receive its prior approval.

In 1951, the Board reiterated these requirements. They also stipulated that credit earned in off-campus instruction could be counted toward a degree only to a maximum of 30 hours (not more than 15 of these to be earned by correspondence work).

Meanwhile, beginning in 1948, the directors of the extension divisions of the four teachers colleges had undertaken, by holding joint periodic meetings, to place their own houses in order and to work for uniformity of standards.

The Association for the Accreditation of Colleges of Teacher Education created a subcommittee to study the practices of its member institutions. Carl Hood, then director at Normal, was a member of that committee. In 1953, the committee included in its report a new set of standards for the conduct of extension work. Standard X, "In-Service Education and Field Service Programs," was adopted by the Association in February, 1954. It stressed the exclusive function of meeting the needs of in-service teachers, and read as follows:

The college for teacher education, in cooperation with responsible school authorities, should do whatever it can to help the school personnel of its service area to grow continuously and effectively as members of the profession and as useful members of the society. The initiating, planning, and developing of any program for in-service education of school personnel is a cooperative responsibility of local school systems, colleges for teacher education and state departments of education.⁸

Among the specific requirements that followed were two that paved the way for the placing of extension credit on the same footing as credit earned on campus. These were:

Require the same standards for admissions, the same amount of work and quality of teaching in off-campus credit courses as for similar courses in residence.

Prescribe as high qualifications for instructors and quality of teaching in off-campus credit courses as for similar courses in residence.

With this encouragement from the accrediting body, those in favor of recognizing credit earned by extension as of equal value to credit earned on campus gained complete victory. In January, 1954, the Council of Presidents was able to report that its recommendation "that all courses, with the exception of correspondence courses, should be considered of equal value whether given on or off campus, and would be considered as residence credit effective July 1, 1954," had been adopted by the State Board.

In the same year, Carl Anderson, then director at Normal, was able to describe the aims of his department in the following words:

This Department operates under the philosophy that all field work must be a reflection of the total campus program and all services so provided must be equal to, or superior to, the campus program because of the more mature and experienced clientele in the field.

The concept of "residence center" appears to have been accepted by the State Board as early as 1941. As originally understood and developed by the extension divisions of the four teachers colleges, a residence center was a location where courses were offered every year and for which credit was given. It was to be distinguished from locations where an occasional off-campus class might be offered, for which extension credit was given.

Four years later, a paragraph was added to the regulations providing that courses for residence credit might be conducted in any junior college where the available facilities were adequate.

Cooperative programs with the junior colleges of the State led rapidly to cooperation among the teachers colleges and with the other state-supported institutions. In 1952, a cooperative program was developed with the School for the Deaf in Flint. By 1954, it could be reported that the Normal had developed courses in cooperation with the Jackson and Flint Junior Colleges, the University of Michigan, Michigan State University and Wayne State University.

As we have noted, extension work was not subsidized by the State. This division thus had to be self-supporting. Hence it was permitted to retain its income, that is, it was not required to turn over to the State the monies it collected (as required of in-residence tuition money). To avoid the legal requirement that tuition money must be turned over to the State, the Division of Field Services, therefore, always used the term ‘fees’ rather than “tuition” for its charges. This was not always understood in certain quarters in Lansing. In January, 1953, the Board felt obliged to remind the Auditor General of “the authority of the State Board of Education to collect, administer, and deposit local fees.”

For many years the income derived from credit courses in extension and by correspondence was used to pay the instructors and defray office and publicity expenses. A modification in policy was made, however, in 1948 when the State Board decreed that a stipulated portion of the fee (about one-fourth) should be retained by the division for its operation. By 1952, this was raised to two-thirds of the gross income of the division. Henceforth, the instructor’s compensation did not rest, as heretofore, on the size of his class, but was standardized.

This new policy brought into existence a fund that was unrestricted, hence readily available for local projects and needs. It is probable that the division had been following such a policy informally for some years previous, for we find that as early as 1949, under Director Hood, two additional areas were placed under its supervision, each of which would require some subsidization—the Placement Office and the Office of Alumni Records; and the name of the division was changed to Division of Field Services.⁹

In 1950, a department called “Duplicating Services” was staffed, equipped and made available to the entire College for typing, duplicating, and printing services. This department undertook the publishing of an *Alumni News Letter*. In the summer of 1950, the division subsidized in part a Spanish Clinic, began to give financial help for holding conferences on the campus, and to subsidize faculty attendance at professional meetings elsewhere. Surveys and research were initiated. Cooperative programs with other state-supported institutions were undertaken. Requests for financial aid were evaluated in terms of benefit to the whole College.

The zeal for promoting new projects and areas of service outran basic policy, however, when in 1953 the State Board granted a

request from the field services divisions of the four teachers colleges to conduct an "experimental" program called the "Retail Round Table." This was to be a service to businessmen in small communities and was an undertaking to be sponsored jointly by the colleges and the State Board in Control of Vocational Education. The persuasive argument was that these meetings would increase the effectiveness of the business enterprises in the community, and would thus result in increasing the tax base on which the local school must operate. The only tangible connection with school work was the stipulation that the Round Table must be set up through the local Superintendent of Schools.

Another project of this year was the funding of a research project for evaluating "Outdoor Programs" for teacher education. These programs involved a camping situation, in which teachers and students were brought together for a short time.¹⁰

In 1951, under Hood, the division had pioneered a highly important project, a program to provide for student practice teaching in the public schools "in the field" in addition to the on-campus program in the College's laboratory school. It was later evaluated by the division and found to be comparable in effectiveness to the work of the campus school.

This experiment helped prepare the way for the time (to arrive within the next five years) when it would become necessary for the College to expand its practice teaching program to provide for the rapidly increasing number of college students preparing for teaching. Approval of the State Department of Public Instruction was sought and (through one of its department heads) hesitatingly given. The phrasing of the consent is, perhaps, significant:

For a long time I had certain convictions about these programs but I am beginning to think that at least it is an emergency measure and if adequate supervision could be given we should develop this possibility to the fullest logical extent. My reasoning on the thing is that we have such a fluid condition in the teaching profession and it is evident that real field experience is of superior value.¹¹

The division found itself the object of an increasing number of requests for financial aid and thus in a position to be of increasing service to the College. If departmental travel funds were inadequate, Field Services could supplement them. If no funds were available through the College budget for the organizing and hosting of confer-

ences, Field Services could provide them. If a proposed experimental program appeared promising and no departmental funds were available for its launching, Field Services could make this possible. A history of the Normal, now well past her centennial, needed to be written. Field Services supplied the funds.

A fringe benefit to the faculty in the form of a life insurance program was made possible through a plan whereby the College would make a contribution to the premiums. Field Services was the "College." The organizing and advertising of special clinics was made possible with Field Service funds. Travel courses became increasingly important, some extending as far as Europe, South America and Japan. Field Services provided the initial costs of organizing and advertising. A cooperative study by the several state-supported colleges and universities to lay the groundwork for an inter-institutional permanent organization was set in motion. Normal's share of the cost came from Field Services.

In short, it was not long before Field Services, in addition to its essential function of providing off-campus and correspondence credit courses and off-campus educational counseling for in-service teachers, was presenting a budget that included such items as Adult Education (non-credit), Correspondence, Business and Trade Programs, Alumni Fund, Community Relations, Committees and Conferences, Insurance Program, Duplicating Service, Michigan Congress of Parents and Teachers, Rackham School of Special Education, Conservation Program and Out-door Education, Association Development, and Curriculum Development.¹²

Thus, Field Services assumed a new and very important function in relation to the College: it opened an avenue to experimentation, research, and auxiliary services which previously had been unavailable. It became the searchlight of the College as the latter sought to adapt its facilities to a society that grew ever more rapidly both in size and in complexity, with attendant multiplying of problems.

A fascinating story could be told of the traveling faculty as they carried their prescient, demanding messages to the towns and cities and rural areas of the State. For the greater distances, trains and hotels were the indispensable media. As road systems and automobiles improved, the auto became the universal transport—each, for reasons of economy, arranged to carry several instructors to their several classes. This huddling of teachers representing disparate academic areas, in small groups over long miles of travel, promoted

conversation which inevitably covered the whole spectrum from the serious to the trivial, from the constructive thought to the petty gripe. Members of one department often gained new insight into areas other than their own.

Hazards of the road were faced together—a narrow escape from some reckless “other” driver; a vicious storm or blinding fog or snow; a hair-raising whirl out of control on an icy highway; speeding through the dark hours of the late night or early morning with a temperamental driver eager to return home. Similar experiences could doubtless be told by the students, some of whom drove over 200 miles to attend classes. Through all the years, the vicissitudes of a varied climate, the frailties of a machine, and the chance temperaments of the drivers, it is remarkable that very few accidents occurred, and that there was not a single fatality.

Out of it all came a stimulating and enlightening contact with teachers in service, new friendships, and a small but oh-so-needed added pittance to the modest it not quite inadequate salary. Out of it, too, came a subtle institution-wide formulation of a faculty opinion.

On December 11, 1941, Japan and the United States exchanged declarations of war. In the following months student enrollments declined rapidly and drastically. From an enrollment of 1,900, the figure descended to less than 900. This created a severe staff problem, alleviated only in part by the fact that many asked for leave of absence and joined the armed forces.

The answer to a suddenly overstaffed college was found in the Extension Division. Fortunately, neither depression nor war had materially affected enrollments in the field. To complete the normal load of the teacher, the extension class was included; the instructor no longer received a fee for his services. Instead he was given what was called an “energy increment,” a mileage rate to compensate him for the extra time and energy demanded. Not until 1955 was the original policy revived whereby extension work was made additional to the regular on-campus teaching load of 15 hours.

Remuneration for teaching in Extension, either in class or by correspondence, varied from time to time. In 1915, it was \$7.50 per credit hour plus, of course, expenses. In 1922, it was set at \$10.00. By 1923, it had been raised to \$12.50. In 1942, the “energy increment” was set at five cents per mile of travel, with minimums and maximums set at \$5.00 and \$14.00. By 1947, the rate had been doubled.

Because the instructor who undertook to give courses by correspondence had been held to no limit (the class instructor was limited to two classes in any one semester), it had been possible for a very few to derive a considerable income from giving work in extension. In 1951, the State Board felt moved to limit the amount an instructor could earn in an academic year in extension work to \$900.00 plus expenses. This limit was raised in 1956 to \$1,500.

Student enrollments have always been greater in the off-campus classes than in correspondence courses, and the rate of growth in the former much greater. A comparative statement covering a period of 30 years may be of interest. In 1923–24 the number of students enrolled in correspondence courses was 663; in off-campus classes, 1,460. The latter were distributed in 41 classes, taught in 25 class centers. In 1954–1955, there were 917 enrollments in correspondence courses, taught by 37 members of the faculty. In off-campus classes 2,911 students were enrolled, taught by 76 members of the faculty in 116 classes.

Administration

The Division of Field Services has been guided through its forty-odd years of existence by five division heads: Horace Z. Wilber (1922–1943); Clarence Loesell (1943–1946); Carl Hood (1946–1952); Carl R. Anderson (1952–1965); Earl Studt, 1965–on.

Horace Wilbur was an alumnus ('02) of Normal. His background included teaching in the public schools of Michigan and in Kansas State Teachers College. Added to Normal's faculty in 1907, he taught history of education, school administration, and philosophy. For ten years (1908–1918) he edited the periodical published by the Normal faculty, *The American Schoolmaster*. In 1918–1919, he was on leave of absence to serve as a Director of the Army Educational Work, where he assisted in organizing and supervising educational work in the Army of Occupation in France. From 1919 to 1921, he was Deputy Superintendent of Education in the Department of Public Instruction in Lansing.

Wilbur's first move, upon receiving the appointment at Ypsilanti, was to visit two schools where extension work was being developed with marked success, the Iowa State Teachers College and the Teachers College at Emporia, Kansas. From this visit came a joint invitation to other schools known to be conducting extension work to

gather to discuss mutual problems. They met at the annual meeting of the Department of Superintendence of the National Education Association at Chicago in 1922. The outcome of this discussion was the decision to form a permanent organization.¹³ It was first known as the Teachers College Extension Association, later as the Teachers College Association for Extension and Field Services (1948–1954), and presently as the Association for Field Services in Teacher Education. At its first meeting (1923), the Association elected Wilber as secretary-treasurer, a position he retained until elected president (1939). Writing on the history of this organization in 1955, Irving H. Hart said: "For the permanence of the Association and the efficient planning of its programs, credit is due first of all to Horace Wilber of Ypsilanti . . ."

Wilber's contribution to extension work at Normal, extending over a score of years, was vital in the period of policy formulation, and decisive in the basic problem of effective organization.

Upon Wilber's retirement in 1943 (in the midst of the war), the duties of the department were added to those of the head of the Natural Science Department. President Munson appointed Clarence M. Loesell as acting head, and the extension work was carried on without interruption.

In 1946, Munson appointed a full-time director. He was Carl Hood, former head of the Henry Ford educational enterprises, in which position he not only directed the famous Edison Institute in Greenfield Village but also the Ford educational enterprises in many parts of the United States, Great Britain and South America. Hood's background had been somewhat similar to that of Wilber, teacher in a one-room rural school, alumnus of Normal ('24), high school teacher and principal (in Dearborn, Michigan, where his work brought him to the attention of Henry Ford).

Hood's tenure (1946–1952) was marked by an enlargement of jurisdiction, expansion of services, active promotion of cooperation with the other state-supported institutions of higher education. Hood, in temperament, personality, methodical habit of mind and background of experience was particularly well suited to move the department on to broader fields of service.

At the local level he expanded the course offerings by introducing the concept of the post-summer school institute, a highly intensive workshop type of course, held in the field, extending over a period of one of two weeks after the close of the regular six-week summer session on campus. He made a point of expediting course demands from

the field to the several academic departments. With the encouragement and support of President Elliott, he assumed responsibility for the Office of Alumni Relations, providing it with staff and equipment to revive and develop the alumni file. He directed the Placement Bureau.

At the State level Hood very early was instrumental in establishing a pattern of periodic meetings of the directors of extension of the four teachers colleges, where they threshed out their common problems and developed uniform policies when possible. In recognition of the expansion of function and widening scope of activities the name of the Extension Department was changed in 1949 to Division of Field Services.

At the national level it should be noted that the Association for Field Services in Teacher Education had almost from the beginning maintained continuous relations with the American Association of Teachers Colleges, including cooperation on committees. In 1950, it became affiliated with the AATC (presently known as the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education). The practical meaning of this affiliation was that the field services organization would henceforth be represented on the Coordinating Committee of the teachers college organization. In 1951, the latter authorized a study of the extension services offered by member institutions. Hood was one of three representatives from the field services who sat on this committee. The report was adopted by the teachers college organization in 1954. It stated that standards for admission to credit courses, quality of faculty and of instruction, and the meeting of accreditation requirements should be the same as for on-campus instruction.¹⁴

In recognition of his valuable services to the national organization Hood, as Horace Wilber had been before him, was made an honorary life member of the field services organization. He was only the fifth to be so honored. Upon his resignation as head of the Division of Field Services in 1952 to return to teaching, the Dean of Administration in his annual report commented: "Mr. Hood's decision to give up an administrative position for full-time teaching is in line with the best tradition of the college, which places classroom instruction always first in importance."

Hood's successor in 1952 was Carl R. Anderson, a member of the history and social sciences staff at Normal, with academic background in history and political science. In Anderson, there was the happy combination of vision and dynamic action. His administration was marked by a wholehearted acceptance of the goal defined in the

standards set by the national teachers college organization. On the other hand, the services contributed by his division to the Normal were increased to a noteworthy extent, and in a number of instances have been of exceptional significance.

His office promoted and facilitated the holding of conferences on campus and, beginning with 1955, participated in a program of training for school bus drivers, set up by the four teachers colleges and the Department of Public Instruction. It subsidized evaluation studies, such as that which concerned the collaboration of the Normal with the Dearborn public schools in an outdoor education program. It made possible the initiation of a Summer School Session for High School Musicians, a Workshop for School Lunch Cooks and Managers, a Leadership Training Program for Parent Teacher Groups. It subsidized a study of college dropouts, the writing of a biography of Mark Jefferson. The list could be considerably expanded.

Experimental projects which might deserve State support but which were as yet untried and untested were given their trial by this division. Some proved their worth and were later included in the State budget. Such, for example, was the program of instruction by television. A similar instance was the original subscription by the Library to the invaluable *New York Times* microfilm series, later paid for by the State.

Naturally, such an expansion of activity brought an increase in income, which tripled from 1952 to 1962. In 1956, Earl Studt, from the biology staff of the Lincoln School, came to the division as Associate Director. The following year, Ralph Gessler, was added as Assistant Director. David Soule was made responsible for the School Bus Driver Training Program, and also charged with facilitating the holding of conferences on campus.

In the area of course instruction. Anderson worked consistently toward the raising of standards and the improvement of teaching facilities. His contributions to the College Library, for example, made possible the purchase of additional copies of books and instructional materials which instructors could take to their classes in the field. The purchase of duplicating equipment made possible the ready availability of articles and portions of books that could not be spared from the Library.

At the national level, Anderson was active with the Association for Field Services in Teacher Education, and in 1961 was elected its president.

In 1965, with the coming of a new president, Anderson was made Vice-President for Public Affairs. His assistant, Earl Studt, took over the reins of the Division of Field Services.

The story of the Division of Field Services reveals an institution that was particularly sensitive and responsive to the growing needs of a dynamic, growing society. Its mission was facilitated along the way by mechanical invention and improvements (the automobile, good roads, efficient copying machines), and in the future is certain to develop even greater impact as newer and better facilities appear. Beginning as an organization to improve teaching in the field, it not only established its place as an essential part of the teacher education program but in turn brought great benefit to the campus from which it emerged.

